

12.36 hrs.

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS ADOPTED

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up the debate on the confidence Motion moved by Shri P. V. Narasimharao on 12th July 1991. Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait may continue his speech.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know at what time the Prime Minister would reply and at what time the voting is likely to take place. It would be advantageous to the entire house if a tentative schedule is fixed for that.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI
AZAD): It depends upon the number of speakers. As far as the Congress Party is concerned, we would like to field as less M.Ps. as possible, but I do not know what is the number of speakers from the Opposition side.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I take it that the time will be between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: It will be tentatively at 4 O'clock.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. is O.K.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just started speaking on the Confidence Motion moved by the Prime Minister last Friday and I had just spoken for five minutes. Later on discussion on Private Members' Resolutions started at 3.30 p.m. and therefore, I had to leave my speech unfinished.

What I said the other day when I started my speech was that this Government of Shri Narasimha Rao is a Government legally and constitutionally constituted because the Congress (I) is the single largest party in the House and the President in his wisdom had invited the Congress Party to form the Government. Now, the alternative to this Government is only elections. Nobody wants the election. That would be disastrous for the country. Neither

any party in the House nor the people outside desire elections today. As far as the economic situation is concerned, the country is passing through a financial crisis. The other day, on the 11th of this month, Shri Vijaya Bhaskara Reddy, Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, said that the expenditure in the last elections was Rs. 1054.22 crores. You can understand the exorbitant expenditure we had to incur on election. And in addition to this, you can imagine how much money was spent by the parties, how much money was spent by the candidates and their friends. Therefore, it is totally disastrous to have another election now. So, this Government should continue particularly because we have got very very explosive and sensitive problems that should be solved and these problems cannot be left as they are today.

Now, Shri Advaniji pointed out that this Government had certain oddities -- so many seats are vacant and the constitution of the Lok Sabha is not complete, and so on. No doubt seats are vacant in Parliament and this is due to the faulty electoral system. Many seats are vacant because elections in some constituencies were countermanded and the cult of violence has crept in the political arena. Today muscle power and money power influenced the elections in a big way. The electoral system has to change because the present system does not actually reflect the will of the people. So, this system needs drastic changes. But one thing that has to be borne in mind is that this Government though it does not have a clear mandate, has at least got a near mandate. If any party has got something near a mandate, it is the Congress Party which has got it. As far as the main recognised Opposition Party is concerned, it is the Congress Party which has got double the mandate of the main Opposition Party. As far as the National Front is concerned, the Congress Party has got four times the mandate of the National Front. Therefore, it is just and fair that the Congress Party should continue to govern the country in the coming years. At this juncture, we must have a stable and strong Government in the country and therefore, I feel that all the secular and democratic parties should cooperate with the Government and should isolate fascist and communal forces; all the like-minded,

secular and democratic parties should come together. If they do not do so, they fail to serve the nation.

As far as the minorities are concerned, I must say here today, this Government deserves the support of the minorities. So far, we have not had any other Government which had come out so much sympathetically towards the minorities. I say this not only because of the Congress (I) manifesto but also because of the declaration of the Prime Minister and also because of the President's Address. We have got so many very complicated and sensitive problems like the Babri Masjid-Ram Janma Bhoomi issue. Here also, the Government has come out very clearly. (*Interruptions*) Let us not cry over spilt milk; let us try to solve the problem. I know full well that as far as the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid issue is concerned there is no difference between the Congress and the CPI(M); there is no difference between the Janata Dal and the Congress. So, all the parties can come together to solve the problem. The Congress Party has come forward with a very clear assurance on this issue. (*Interruptions*) I quote from the Congress(I) manifesto :

"The Congress is committed to finding a negotiated settlement of this issue which fully respects the sentiments of both communities involved. If such a settlement cannot be reached, all parties must respect the order and verdict of the court. The Congress is for the construction of the Temple without dismantling the Mosque."

Nobody is against the construction of temple. What we are against is that the temple should not be constructed demolishing the mosque. It is against the religious sentiments and against secularism; secularism will be demolished if the masjid is demolished. We should respect the sentiments of all the communities; the sanctity of the masjid should be respected; secularism should be respected; the masjid should remain there and the temple can be constructed without demolishing the mosque. Here also, an assurance has been given by the Prime Minister when he gave interview to the

INDIAN EXPRESS on the 8th of this month. Now, I want to quote from the President's Address, paragraph-3 :

"Places of worship must be treated with due respect. We cannot allow communal elements to defile their sanctity by using such places as instruments to generate controversy and discord. Government will make every effort to find a negotiated settlement to the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid issue with due regard to the sentiments of both communities involved. In case of all other places of worship, a Bill will be introduced to maintain the status quo as on 15th August, 1947, in order to foreclose any new controversy."

Never before in the independent India, the President has declared categorically about the sentiments of the country in his Address. It is a clear commitment not only of the Congress Party but of the Government of this country.

Minorities desire that the Government must stand by this commitment and the Congress Party must stand by this commitment and to protect secularism.

[Translation]

AN HON. MEMBER : Who was instrumented for the foundation in laying ceremony ?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT : We have always opposed the laying of foundation stone. If Congress has changed its stand that is their outlook but we have always opposed it. Circumstances change and if you want.....

[English]

We can sit together and discuss the issue to have a negotiated settlement where it has to be constructed. We want a peaceful settlement. We want communal harmony. We want communalism should be checked. We should come to an understanding. This is what Janata Dal also wants. Other secular parties also want the same. Therefore, I say that the Government should be given a chance to continue so that they must try to solve the problem amicably in a peaceful manner so that we can protect the integrity of the country and lead the country on the path of peace and progress.

Therefore, I feel that it is the duty of all the secular parties at this juncture when the country is facing grave crisis, to give their support to this Government so that this Government can solve the problems. We want the Government to be stable and strong and continue in order to solve the problems and to see that they protect the integrity and secularism of the country.

SHRI A. ASHOKARAJ (Perambalur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of my party, AIADMK, I rise to participate in the Confidence Motion.

In our Election Manifesto, my party leader, Puratchi Thalaivi Selvi Jayalalitha had requested the people of Tamil Nadu to vote for AIADMK and Congress alliance. The people had responded to the extent of 100% voting to Parliament and 98% of voting to Legislature of Tamil Nadu. The reason is that we wanted a stable Government at the Centre. Stability means not only stability of the government but also the stability of the nation. That should be the concern of all the political parties.

In 1977, a non-Congress Government, namely Janata Government came to power with a vast majority but they could not rule for more than 30 months. In 1989, Janata Dal came to power with BJP support, as the Congress which was the single largest party at that time refused to take over power. Therefore in the 6th Lok Sabha and 9th Lok Sabha, non-Congress Governments could not last long because the two non-Congress Governments had miserably failed on those two occasions. That is why we want to have a stable government under the Congress Party.

Mr. L. K. Advaniji hon. Leader of the Opposition told this House on the other day that the Congress Government was the fifth minority government. He knows that it is a different one from the other four non-Congress minority Governments. The four previous minority governments were formed, not by any single largest party but now the Congress which is a single largest party has formed the Government. But, Mr. Advaniji has conveniently avoided to tell this fact Mr. Advaniji is telling the arithmetics: i.e.,

242 of Congress and its allies against a total combination of 267 in Opposition. I would like to know from him whether all parties whom he had taken into account are with him as one combined opposition with the same principles and same goal. Where is the need to say about the arithmetics on the basis which are against truth? There are also 36 seats vacant. Does it mean the BJP will win in all 36 seats? So, Mr. Advaniji's calculations of minority government are entirely different from that of the other minority governments. Our nation is once again at cross-roads. Prudently, we have to manage our efforts and prove to the people that we are capable of defending the sovereignty of the nation and also take it forward.

We have immense faith in our people. They have almost sent all political parties to this august House. They have sent us here in the fond hope that all of us will put our heads and souls together whenever the question of national interest is at stake. We have to give up some of our old animosities. The whole world is undergoing rapid changes. That calls for new thinking and new approach on our part also. We are facing terrorism in many parts of India. Many precious lives are being sacrificed everyday. My party leader, Selvi Jayalalitha's life is in great danger. So, I request that adequate Central Force should be made available to protect her life. All of us, without any difference, should treat terrorism as our common enemy. No. use of throwing the blame on anyone party. It should be fought and defeated collectively.

Similarly, we are facing acute economic problems. The new Government is grappling with the problems. We should give enough time to try their best to set the house in order. Economic problems cannot be solved in a day or a week. We should keep in mind the need to take necessary care to see that the burden is not shifted to the shoulders of the poor common people. The IRDP and other welfare measures for the weaker sections should not be stopped and we should also see that it reaches the poor.

Our country has adequate natural resources. We have human talents also. We should be proud of our scientists and their achievements. Our workers too are contributing a lot to the wealth of the nation. Janata Dal should rise to the occasion. They should not forget that people are losing faith in them.

I would like to make one joke with some modifications at this juncture. A man was riding in his motor-cycle at night. He saw two lights were coming towards him. As he was riding in a motor-cycle, he thought that two motor-cycles were coming towards him with two headlights. Instead of going to the right or to left, he had decided to go in centre between those coming two lights. Unfortunately, the two lights were from a heavy vehicle. The fate of the motor-cyclist can be imagined. I request the Janata Dal to think of the motor-cyclist and come to a conclusion in the national interest.

It is my duty to point out the agonies of the Tamil Nadu people in not getting the Cauveri waters.

I request the hon. Prime Minister to intervene and do justice to implement the orders of Cauveri tribunal. I would make it clear that it has nothing to do with the confidence motion.

I request the Prime Minister also to assist the Tamil Nadu Government financially as Tamil Nadu, under the leadership of the hon. Chief Minister Selvi Jayalitha is going to implement the prohibition policy as a result of which the Tamil Nadu Government would be losing more than Rs. 350 crores.

At this juncture I would also like to remind that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had given a promise that he would safeguard the interests of the non-Hindi speaking people.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Saifuddin Choudhury to speak now.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, will there be a Lunch Hour today?

MR. SPEAKER: There will be a Lunch Hour and Lunch.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this minority Government is seeking the vote of confidence of this House. This is a minority Government. At the same time, it is also minor in age. Generally, the merits and demerits of a teenage Government are not judged by the performance of a Government. But this Government is truly exceptional in the sense that we never had this kind of a minority Government which did not have an assured support from outside. Also, we have been compelled today to judge, to make an opinion about this Government on the basis of its performance also within these three weeks. The kind of attitude shown by this Government is totally devoid of any real understanding of the complicated political situation that is prevailing today. After a long, gruelling and painful election process which produced a hung Parliament and thereby created a Government of minority support, the people of the country hoped that as we are having so many problems facing the country, this Government will pay attention to solve these problems with an attitude of cooperation and dialogue with the Opposition Parties. But in a most indecent hurry, this Government, before proving its majority in the House, without having the confidence of the House, undertook major policy decisions which are in our opinion totally harmful for the interests of the country and in many way a kind of surrender to the dictates of international financial institutions.

Sir, we have all criticised the decisions taken by the Government to devalue the Rupee. In a most clandestine way, this was done. It was said that the Government was just adjusting the value of Rupee with the basket of currencies, foreign currencies. One day after that there was another dose of devaluation. While doing this, despite the repeated requests by the Opposition Parties who understood the intricacies of the prevailing situation, who wanted that there has to be a Government to tackle the burning national issues, you never bothered to talk to them honestly and sincerely. In a most arrogant manner, you took unilateral decisions on which we have a lot of differences with you. This is not the attitude to be shown. We had minority Governments before. They had

an assured support, a committed support. But you do not have that. But the way you are behaving, it seems that you have got three-fourth majority in the House. And a Government with three-fourth majority in the past did not dare to do or behave in a manner in which you are doing now. Can there be any compromise in this? We know there are many problems. We have problems of terrorism, we have problems of secessionist agitation; we have problems of ethnic conflict in the country; we have problems of communal divide in the country. There is a need for secular forces to come together and see that communalism do not sway or divert the way that is being attempted. Why is that happening?

There are many in this country who have been fighting for secularism. But then have they been taken into confidence? Is that the approach to tackle the situation? I find you have totally disappointed us. We cannot just wish away the kind of political situation that is prevailing today. We had a hung Parliament before. This time we are having a hung Parliament. May be, next time there will be another hung Parliament. How have we to react to that situation? We cannot just go every month to the people and have a poll. We cannot go. Then how to react to this is a point. But then you have also to respond. What is that response? ?

Now, the verdict of the people during the last year has disappointed everybody—disappointed the Congress Party, the BJP, disappointed us also. We thought that the kind of stand taken by the V.P. Singh Government for secularism, for social justice would really give better results. But we did not have that because of many factors. We had two elections—one was preassassination and the other was post-assassination. I will never forget the kind of shock I had when I received the news about the gruesome murder of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. That was the sacrifice, I believe, for the country. He sacrificed his life for his party also. We have also found out that there are many surveys conducted by interested concerns. Surveys were conducted. I think, there were three or four surveys conducted. Many of them were prepaid surveys. Many of them indicated that you would have 300 or 280 seats. Even after the supreme sacrifice when you did not get that, I believe

you also got disappointed. And the BJP got disappointed in the sense that they invoked the name of Lord Rama. Still they could not come to power in centre. That is a shock for them. (*Interruptions*). If the God could not save them, I believe, no one can save them. I wish Mr. Advani would have been here. This is a good sign that majority of our people in the country are still secular. Mr. Advani had quoted the London Economist stating that 'winner come second'. It may be true in London. But in Lucknow what we find it is win by default BJP is in power in U.P. because the Janata Dal had been split. If you put together the Mulayam Singh Yadav's vote and the Janata Dal's vote and even if you do not take, for the time being, the Congress vote, then they are more and had they been together the results would have been like it happened in Bihar. This is the point. Now Mr. Advani has said that the days of anti-Congress regime is over. It is a deal-oriented declaration. But the real issue is to understand intricacies of the present situation, the gravity of the prevailing crisis. Now how to get rid of present crisis. Can we give our consent to this kind of economic reforms? Mr. Chidambaram who was the Minister in the Home Ministry looking after the portfolio of Internal Security, Public Grievances and Pension, he has become a Minister of Commerce. Now how does he know everything that in a hurry, he declared a policy? I want to know where was that discussed? Had the Cabinet discussed it? Did you discuss it with the Opposition? Now, you are going to have the industrial policy formulated. Did you discuss it with the Opposition parties? Are you serious to run this country and the Government? We know that there are many political parties which do not want to go to the people. But, you should not take the Opposition for granted. Today we are observing 'the Anti-Devaluation Day' all over the country. We are demonstrating in Delhi and in other parts of the country. We are organising people and they will resist all your reactionary policies.

In one stroke, you have devalued the rupee by 18 per cent or 20 per cent. Are you sure of getting the IMF loan? Are you going to get it? I do not know. Is there no other alternative but to accept the

IMF conditionalities? You have sent Gold to the London Bank. The explanation given for that is, "we are apprehensive of getting the IMF loan; We may or may not get that; and that is why we have kept it there; in case of need we will mortgage it and get money". But you have already given that. You do not know whether you will get the IMF loan or not. But, before that you have accepted the conditionalities. I read in the Press what the World Bank spokesman has said. He said, "we have sent programmes to the Government for reform; before passing the Budget, they will have to accept it and on their progress depends the further loan". Where is the report? Why it had not been shown to the then Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar? He had reacted on that. Is IMF the only way? Is there not any other alternative way?

Shri Manmohan Singh is the Finance Minister now. What did he as Secretary of the South Commission say? He said, "IMF prescription is of doubtful value". Shri Julius Narere is the Chairman of the South Commission. We have many economists and social scientists to say that the IMF prescription is not good for a third world country. In an article in the Statesman of 5th July this year, Shri J. K. Galbraith has said, "the IMF dictates and intervenes in the affairs of the Third World countries: I do not approve of these".

But, in one stroke by devaluation of rupee, you have increased the burden of foreign debt; you have increased the bill for the import that is taking place, without having earned a single paise of loan. It is a suicidal path. There are many ways to tackle the economic situation. An alternative approach has been given by the West Bengal Government. We are serious about it. We are not playing petty politics. The country is in real crises. We have to save the people from poverty. I saw a photograph in the Press and I forgot to bring that. In Orissa at one place, the poverty-stricken father beheaded his son and drank the blood. I saw it and I felt so bad about it.

There are alternatives. 35 economists have given their alternatives. (*Interruptions*). What will happen if we go on like

this? We cannot give our consent to the kind of sell out you are undertaking. Then, there is a talk of abolition of MRTP Commission. There are talks of a relaxation to the FERA regulation to the point of decimation. Then import liberalisation is there. How are you going to boost our export? Is this our policy? I do not know. You will find that there are many other aspects connected with international relations also. What will be our stand in the GATT, if we accept the IMF conditionalities? What will be our stand? Mr. Prime Minister had said that on NPT, "there is no pressure". That may be true today; but what will happen if that pressure comes tomorrow? Then, the problem of Jammu & Kashmir is there; and many other issues are also there. We have played a bright role in the past and we have to play that in future also.

There are alternatives. We have said so and many economists have said so. But, I will just quote one. Shri Arun Ghosh, former Member of Planning Commission had written something. I think you would have got the papers from your officials. One point he said is that, domestic savings should be equal to the domestic investment. To overcome fiscal deficit he suggested that past methods should be discarded such as cut on social expenditure, education, health, etc. Can we allow this? can we demolish our public distribution system? Can we allow cut on food subsidies? We cannot.

Then, I come to allocation to the States. Can there be a cut? We cannot allow it. It would be very harmful. I mentioned about West Bengal Government approach. It is our party approach. We are serious about tackling the pressing economic problems. Then, there can be increased in direct tax both by efficient collection and increase of rates; postponement of some investments which are not crucial enough. That can be done also. Then, strict control over inessential Government expenditure can be kept. We have to sort out our problems. Then, strict curb on inessential imports is also suggested. Real efforts to augment exports have to be made through labour intensive industrial activities. Mr. Manmohan Singh has said. We have to look out to Taiwan and South Korea and all that. Is that a model for India? It

cannot be a model. The kind of economic policies these countries are pursuing have led to the murder of democracy and freedom of the people. We have to find an Indian solution to our Indian problems. If we allow multi-nationals, if we open our economy to multi-nationals, our indigenous industry will be totally destroyed in this country. If capital goods are allowed to be imported like anything, what will happen to our capital goods industry? It is a very important question. Opposition can have cooperation with the Govt. But it has to be on real issues and not on certain considerations.

Mr. Advani said that some people wanted to avoid an election because that will benefit a particular party. But that is not the consideration. This is most shallow understanding of the situation. We need to make a new beginning of united India to tackle the burning national issues but the beginning is very bad. The attitude of this Government is very bad. There is no indication of a serious approach for cooperation and to tackle the basic issues confronting the people. What will happen to Punjab? We did not like when the polls were announced without proper preparations. That was a wrong thing to be done. Certain political steps have to be taken to take the people into confidence. That was not done. Then, security measures were not properly augmented. Many people were killed. Still we decided that we will take part. Then, we found that it was going to be a farce and the whole thing will be given to the terrorists on a platter. Then, we decided not to participate. We withdrew our candidates from Punjab election. Now a new date has been given by the Election Commission.

That date has to be honoured and kept. Before that, measures are to be taken so that all the political parties can take part. With the old approach—with military and para-military forces only can you tackle the situation? No. On the ground, the need is for the mobilisation of the people. That is what we had been telling in this House before also. But no serious attempt was made to really mobilise the people.

In Assam, in a most unilateral way, you have decided to give amnesty to ULFA

terrorists. Now what is the result of that? I find that they are now claiming that without independence, there cannot be any talk. Is this the way of appeasement that is going to help our country to remain united. No, that cannot be. We have seen this kind of movement cannot last very long.

You have seen the fate of AGP. What kind of hold they have on the people of Assam? Today they are divided and discarded by the people of Assam. We have to have some faith in the people. We have to talk to the people, not to this or that terrorist. It is a very very wrong thing to do that and we cannot support that.

There are so many things. Take Jammu and Kashmir. Is that a party problem? Can we go on politicking on that. Kashmir has to be saved. How? If secularism is declining in the country, we cannot save Kashmir. We cannot save Punjab. We cannot save our North-Eastern India. Some friends of ours should understand that. In this House we require reasoned behaviour. Right kind of signals must go from here that we are united. We should not try to communalise everything. We have to tackle the issue of Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute. We have to tackle it. I do not know which way it will be solved and it may be through dialogue. If dialogue fails, then, we have to abide by the court decision. I am dismayed to hear certain people say that they will not abide by the Court verdict. Why should not they abide by the court verdict? When they say that they will not abide by the court verdict and that they will fight it out in the streets, they are dishonouring the court which is part of the Rashtra. I say this because they swear on Ram Bhakti and say Ram Bhakti is Rashtra Bhakti. (Interruptions).

[Translation]

SHRI DEEN DAYAL JOSHI (Kota) : What happened when the Court gave its verdict in Shah Bano case? Why were you tight-lipped at that time? Why did you not speak on the *Shah Bano* case in the Lok Sabha at that time (interruptions).

[English]

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : That is a very right question. I must say

that then I was a Member of this House and I raised my voice of protest against changing the law on the *Shah Bano* case and we warned the Government. "If you do this, it will help other communal elements. Please don't do this. The country will be in a dire strait if you do it."

I talked to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, I am sorry he is not alive. We appealed to him and we exhorted him not to do it. Our women—Muslim women—came upto the gate of Parliament. I am not a Muslim when I speak in this House. I am a Muslim when I go to a mosque but, of course, I do not go to a mosque. As an MP, I am neither a Muslim nor a Hindu. I am an Indian. This identity has to be established in this House. Changing the law on *Shah Bano* case was the basic wrong committed and with that started the vigorous decline of secularism in this country. For that, I blame the earlier Govt. of the present ruling Party. Now, if you are fully committed to secularism you have to break with all your wrong past. Otherwise, if you continue with your hoary past policies, bad policies of the past, you cannot exude confidence in the minds of the people and may be by default you may continue for two or three or six months. But no power on earth will be able to sustain you. We cannot support the way you are going. We cannot support you and that is why Sir, we also declare in this House that we criticise, condemn and attack the policies that this Government is pursuing. We also mobilise the people outside and there cannot be any support from us on this confidence motion.

With these words I thank you very much for giving me time.

SHRI INDERJIT (Darjeeling): When will the voting take place, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I will declare that later. It may be tentatively between 4 and 5 p.m.

13.19 hrs.

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

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

(Shri Shared Dighe in the Chair)

Motion of confidence in the council of Ministers—Contd.

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Chairman Sir, the Prime Minister has asked for the confidence of this House in his Council of Ministers. The first question that I want to raise is this. For what is this confidence being sought? I raise this question because this discussion on the vote of confidence has come at a time or has been so fixed that the functioning of this Government is yet to unfold itself. So, it is not possible for anybody to give a vote of confidence in the abstract. We have to judge the Government on its merits and by its performance and functioning.

Therefore, I question whether this confidence is being asked for on the basis of whatever the Government has done or has not done over the few days that it is in office or whether it is being asked for in anticipation of what they propose to do during this year or during this budget session.

As far as what they propose to do is concerned, we have only got some bare outlines from some general disclosures which have been made on behalf of the Government and also from whatever is appearing in the press. I will come to that later.

If it is a question of seeking confidence on the basis of whatever the Government has done and how it has behaved during these very few days that it has been in office, then I must say that that functioning does not inspire any confidence. I am talking here particularly and naturally because the main performance of the Government is yet to come; I am speaking about the style of functioning which is very very important. For a Government which is in a minority; a Government which requires I suppose support if it has to keep itself in Office, for such a Government the style of functioning is very important.

Mr. Advani here referred, during his speech, to the occasions on which there was a minority Government in this House supported by other parties from outside. He referred more than once to the Government of Mrs. Indira Gandhi after the split which

took place in the Congress Party in 1969 and he mentioned that Government was sustained only because of refusal of some parties, including my party, to vote for the Vote of No-Confidence in that Government. It was a question of whether we should or we should not support a Vote of No-Confidence. Mrs. Gandhi's Government at that time undertook some very important though controversial reform measures including nationalisation of banks, the abolition of Privy Purses and some other measures which we broadly supported. Many people did not like those things and they opposed them. But there was some basis on which it was possible for us at least to say that we do not want such a Government, which is undertaking these types of measures, to be pulled down.

Sir, Mr. Narasimha Rao's Government is behaving, in my opinion from the outset, as though it is not a minority Government at all but that is a Government enjoying a majority in this House and, therefore, is at liberty to take unilaterally all sorts of drastic measures which can have very far reaching and very serious fall-outs. As far as I understand, Sir, a minority Government if it wants support has to function, whether it likes or not, on the basis of consultations and consensus and taking the Opposition or at least parts of the Opposition into confidence.

Everybody in the country agrees that there is a national crisis, perhaps of unparalleled magnitude and I don't agree that it is only a crisis which concerns Mr. Manmohan Singh only. Economic crisis is very grave. No doubt there is a financial crisis but there is also a political crisis; there is also a social crisis in the country.

We have also referred earlier to the protracted and seemingly insoluble problems. No Government has come forward yet with any solution of Punjab, Kashmir or of Assam. The problems of armed insurgency is cropping up in various parts of the country. Besides, in many States and in many outlying and backward areas of the country there is a growing feeling among the people of alienation from the Central seat of power. Rightly or wrongly people in those areas do feel that they are not getting a fair deal; they are not getting the

shares of the fruits of development and that they have been neglected. This is something which is vitally bound up with the whole question of Centre-State relations. But I don't find any reaction, any mention anywhere either in the President's Address. We are not debating the President's Address today but parts of it are bound to overlap for the simple reason that this debate is taking place now and President's Address has already been delivered and it is before us.

We in the Opposition did not appoint the Sarkaria Commission. At that time, the Government which appointed the Sarkaria Commission thought it at least sufficiently a serious matter to appoint a Commission to go into the whole gamut of Centre-State relations. That voluminous Report of Shri Sarkaria is gathering dust in the files. Not a least attempt has been made to process it, to discuss it with the Opposition to see whether the parts of that Report, the recommendations, can at least be implemented. Nothing. But this Centre-State relations is a matter which I think, this country can ignore now only at its peril. Therefore, I am saying that this Government is talking only about one aspect of the crisis, that is the question of financial deficit, budgetary deficit, balance of trade, foreign exchange crisis. All that, I agree. They are there. They are very serious. The remedy which is being proposed, is a matter which is open for discussion and controversy. But what about the other problems which are hanging fire for a long-long time? I do not know whether this financial and economic crisis of the magnitude which we have been told has assumed now could really have developed just overnight. It could not have developed overnight, so that suddenly the Finance Minister has to say that unless we manage to get some short-term loans from somewhere, we will not perhaps be able to meet our requirements, our expenditure, even in the month of July, or we have to transfer some tonnes of gold as collateral security we are told of foreign banks, in foreign countries so that that can act as a security to get some money otherwise, we are not in a position to carry on. Can such a situation develop overnight? It could not. This is something which has been developing over the years due to many factors, including reckless expenditure, reckless squandering of our resources and all kinds of populist measures.

I am not blaming anybody in particular. Everybody had the share of this. Anyway, what I am trying to say, Sir, is this. We had a meeting in which the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister were very kind to call the Leaders of the political parties on the 27th of June where, we were told that we would be taken into confidence and briefed thoroughly by the Finance Minister about the economic and financial part of the crisis. But on the 27th of June, in that meeting, we were not given the slightest inkling that within a very few days of that meeting, in two successive doses, depreciation or devaluation or whatever you would like to call it is going to be done. The value of the Rupees was going to be brought down by 21 per cent. No inkling was given of the fact that gold was going to be transferred because an earlier Government had transferred gold. Rather we were given to understand that this Government is not going to repeat that.

I am giving these examples to show—the Prime Minister may say that all these things cannot be revealed and that they are not going to tell all these things in advance to us—the seriousness of the situation. But I would like to say that if you want the Opposition to appreciate as I think you do about the depth and the magnitude of the crisis, then you must put your cards on the table otherwise, you cannot expect people to just swallow whatever is being told to them.

Therefore, my quarrel first is with the style of functioning which has been proceeding ever since then.

The Punjab elections were postponed thirtysix hours before the polling was due to be held. I do not know who is responsible for it. Somebody should tell us who is responsible for it. There can be endless controversy over whether conditions in Punjab were conducive to holding fair and free elections or not. I agree that there is a serious security problem also.

But there is also the dilemma that if we go on denying the democratic process to the people of Punjab and if we go on just depending on the President's Rule and the police raj, then also we have to consider whether that is eventually going to help the militants more or is it going to help the

country in order to restore normalcy and peace. So, it is not a very simple problem.

I may remind you that the election process which began with the calling of names for the candidates and all that, was started in the Punjab simultaneously with the rest of the country, although, at that time also, the polling date for the Punjab was fixed on 24th of June, but the process began on the same day. So, an extended period was there during which if you were really so worried about the security situation in Punjab, you should have realised that this extended period would give the militants further opportunities and time to kill candidates whom they wanted to kill in order to get elections sabotaged; and that was done. Some 25 or 26 candidates were killed. And then at the very last moment when 36 hours were left for voting, when the Governor of Punjab himself was saying that elections should be held in spite of the security problems, but they should be de-linked from the rest of the country so that after the elections in the rest of the country are completed, sufficient security forces can be mobilised in the Punjab, at that last minute, somebody decided that the whole process of elections in the Punjab should be stopped now. And now the whole thing has to be repeated all over again. I hope those unfortunate candidates who had been killed, at least during this period will be given adequate compensation for having foolishly got nominated as candidates not knowing that they were going to be killed in this way and no election will be held either. Somebody is botching up things. I do not blame the Election Commissioner; I do not blame the Government. We do not know actually what transpired. After the killing of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, when the election dates were postponed by three weeks, you remember there was a controversy which appeared in the Press also. The Chief Election Commissioner was asked, why did you do this? You could have postponed the election by some days, but why did you postpone it by three weeks. He said, I was following the Government's order. It was dictation to him by the Government. The Government which was there at that time. "The Government dictated to me; I had no choice", he said. And the next day, a spokesman

of the Government came out publicly saying that Mr. Seshan's statement was absolutely baseless; no dictation was done to him at all. Whom should we believe? What is going on I do not know. So, we must be very sensitive and cautious about the way we handle this kind of problems.

We are faced with a serious secessionist insurgency which is threatening to take a region of this country out of the country and to set up some kind of theocratic or some independent State there.

So, up-till-now, I consider that the first thing this Government, since it assumed office, should have done is not to just hold meetings for one hour or two hours with the Finance Minister explaining things, as he chose to do; but they should have a series of meetings with the Opposition where all these various issues could be taken up and considered in depth; and the Government should tell us and also ask us our suggestions, our opinions how they should deal with the matter and tell us what are the steps they propose to take. I do not want to elaborate this point any further. My point is that before the actual performance of the Government on the ground begins to unfold itself, we feel that the way they have been functioning from the beginning is not that of a government which is a minority government. If you were in a majority, I could understand you do not care for anybody else; you could do what you please. But, are you in that position?

Papers are speculating every day that this attitude of the Government may be due to the fact that they have still not given up hopes of covering that margin which is still there between them and the majority by recruiting some more allies here in the House. I do not know. (Interruptions) I do not know whether there was that recruitment drive still going on or not. You please tell us about it. But if there is no chance of that—I don't think there is a much chance.....

AN HON. MEMBER: You join us.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: then the minority Government should understand, should realise its own position.

It should act with a proper attitude and a proper outlook which it has not been doing.

Then, I come to the other question of why we are asked to give confidence to this Government in advance before they come out with all their package of measures. All we know about at the moment is that they are preparing to go to the IMF. That has been confirmed. They have gone to the IMF, not preparing to go. What the Finance Minister told us was that there is no other way to survive except to get a sizeable loan from the International Monetary Fund.

Now, apart from that, other things that they are proposing in the way of economic reforms, and so on are there. We have to depend largely on the Press, on what economists are saying, what economic journals are writing, and so on. But my quarrel here is not that. Of course, reforms may be necessary. I do not deny it. When socialist countries can bring about such big reforms, some of them delayed too long, and paid the price for it, why not India? But the biggest of the socialist countries which initiated a very massive far-reaching programme of reforms, has also had to give up many things which they had adhered to in the past because the passage of time and changing conditions showed that those outmoded or old methods and techniques would not do and therefore they are doing away with them. I do not know where it will bring them in the end. But they are trying to bring about some basic reforms. So, it is not a question of reforms being something which we are against. But what I would like to say is that for the first time since independence—I am addressing my remarks particularly to my friends on the Congress benches—the Government and the party, the Congress Party, is abandoning the ideological framework of the Nehru-Gandhi line of development within which it had sought to function all these years. This is my most serious charge against the Congress Party. I have to assume it largely from what we are trying to understand and study, because the Prime Minister never said a single word about when introducing this Motion. It may be your argument that things have changed so much in the world and India that all that old framework has

to be given a go-by now. If so, you have to explain it here to the country and to the House. The rationale behind it has to be explained to the House and through the House to the people. I think Mr. Gorbachov whatever his errors or mistakes or failings may be, he never hesitated to explain to his people and the Soviet Union what were those errors, what were those deviations, what were those mistakes committed under the old system which led their economy to a severe crisis. But here we are not told anything. It is just as though by magic overnight, yesterday everything was all right and today suddenly we find our coffers empty, we do not have a single pie to pay our debts. We are going to become a black-listed nation which is defaulting on its payments. There is no mention how it happened. Somebody must explain.

I am saying here, that a major departure is taking place. You may deny it. But I think in the weeks to come and sooner than later, it will be quite clear that under this Government a major departure is being carried out by the Congress Party to depart from the framework which it has followed from the time of Jawaharlal Nehru. I do not say, for a minute, that that framework or that line of development was perfect, that it had no blemishes, no mistakes or no short-comings. I do not say that. Changes may be necessary. But there was a broad framework and some basic concepts which I think were very much part of the Congress credo. And, if you decide to give up those things, you must explain to the country and the people why you are doing, and what is the need for it. Otherwise, I do not know why Mr. Advani in his speech should say as he said here on Friday. I am quoting from the record.

"The direction that the new Government has adopted is a direction with which my Party does not quarrel."

The BJP will say that. Why not? Why should he not say that?

Further, he said:

"I would expect this Government to recognise its limitation...."

It is a good advice.

He continued:

.... and to function in a manner as to start a new chapter in Indian political history."

Sir, the basic concepts may have to be changed. But you must explain how they have failed to meet the requirements of the situation. The concept of a planned economy, Mr. Advani refers to it as statism, that is to say, the state controlling the whole economy. Have we ever had an economy like that? People say that India has made a big mistake by following the path of socialism. When did we follow the path of socialism? We are from the very beginning followed the path of what we call the mixed economy, a state sector and a very flourishing private sector; and the state sector should be confined to certain areas of what we call the core sector or the public sector. This is not socialism. But now we are told that even this has to be diluted or watered down and some cases given up altogether. There was a concept that the commanding heights of the economy should be in the public sector. They should not be handed over to the private business people. What is the position now on that, I would like to know.

There is a directive principles chapter in the Constitution which says that the Government, the State, is committed to take action to see that concentration of wealth does not take place in fewer and fewer hands. That is one of the directive principles of the Constitution, which is binding on us. All the Members of this House the other day stood and have taken a oath to uphold the Constitution and what is written in it. But the line you are proposing to follow of opening up completely to the private sector, to the monopoly sector, to the foreign capitalists will lead to nothing but more and more concentration of wealth in the hands of a few big interests. So, that is another basic concept which is being given a go-by.

Then, I come to the question of agrarian reform. I think, agrarian reform for some years now has been shelved completely. It was carried out in a limited way in the early years upto a certain point and after that it has become paralysed and nothing

further happened. And the domestic market in this country, which is a vast market of many crores, hundreds of crores, of people but with no purchasing capacity except for some people who live in the cities and towns have the means of purchasing consumer goods, durable goods and all that. The vast ocean of people living in our villages, in our rural areas, do not have any purchasing capacity at all. It was mainly for them we had always advocated land reforms accompanied by other measures like setting up agro-industries and all that so that the level of standard of living of the rural masses could be uplifted and they could get purchasing capacity and this big domestic market could be served by our own industries. Industries are complaining that they cannot sell their goods because they do not have markets. But the huge internal market in the country is lying here without being tapped properly.

Of course there is always a slogan of self-reliance, which may mean many things. I agree. But self-reliance does not certainly mean opening up your whole economy to more and more penetration by foreign capital, by multi-national companies and all in the name of getting more technology, higher technology. It is being done in a limited way in some other countries also but subject to certain conditions and safeguards. Here, I do not know what conditions or safeguards if any we propose to impose.

Then, the curbs on monopolies—the papers are saying that the ceiling limit for the MRTP Act is going to be raised to one thousand crores of rupees. Any company whose investment limit is below Rs. 1000 crores will not come under the MRTP Act. Please tell us whether it is a fact or not. If newspapers are spreading baseless rumours it is your job as a Government to dispel those rumours and say “it is wrong; we are not going to do that”. Newspapers are writing that companies which have an investment limit of Rs. 200 crores will not require any licensing after this. Hereafter the whole thing will be de-licensed. Even locational restrictions on the industries are to be removed. I am provoked to say this by seeing Mr. Arjun Singh sitting in front of me because lack of locational vigilance, I would say, led to the disaster in Bhopal where a foreign multi-national company

was permitted to set up in the centre of that congested part of Bhopal city and which led to the gas disaster in which how many thousands of people lost their lives or crippled for life we do not know.

Locational restriction is the most important thing in any country like India from the point of view of health and safety. But according to what we read in the papers one of the further concessions you want to give to people as an incentive to come and invest is that there will be no locational restriction. God knows what we are in for after that. Such things are not permitted in the parent countries where those companies operate. In the United States of America, they would not permit that kind of a dangerous plant to be set up in a heavily congested area. But who bothers in countries like India and in Third World countries. These multi-national companies do not bother. Nobody is here to check them or control them and enforce any restrictions on them and we have this horrible tragedy.

The way things are going, you will beg my pardon but from what impressions we were given by the Finance Minister in those talks on that day, it seems to me—I may be wrong—that you have virtually already given a sort of an assurance that whatever conditionalities IMF may seek from us we are prepared to accept them. It comes to that. I am worried because I am beginning to think that after some time we will find that special weight is being put on us to change our Patents Law, the question of Intellectual Property Right where we have been standing up to these people and fighting for the last some years in the Uruguay Round of talks of the GATT. They will mount further pressure that the Patents Law must be amended and on Intellectual Property Right they must be given freedom to enter our country. Are we going to agree to these things? Suppose, the IMF says that your defence expenditure must be reduced by so much, are we going to agree to this? I am all for reducing defence expenditure wherever it is possible and wherever there is wastage because it is an unnecessary expenditure. You can read the audit reports which are published every year about the Ministry of Defence and you will see how many

lakhs and crores of rupees go down the drain. Certainly a great amount of money can be saved on that. But it is for us to do it. It is for India which understands its own security problems and security environment to do it. We could have done it on our own. Why should we wait for any IMF or some foreign agency to tell us that you must reduce your defence expenditure? It is not their business. It is our business.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO) : The day on which the debate began in connection with the NPT I had categorically stated that there has neither been any pressure from them nor is there any possibility of our yielding to pressure. I can repeat the same thing in connection with the defence expenditure. If we reduce it, we reduce it because we think it is good to reduce. But we will have to take into account our own threat perception rather than pressure from any side.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Well, I thank the Prime Minister for whatever clarification he has given. The point which I would like to know is whether there is any scope for our bargaining with the IMF on its anticipated conditionalities. If so, what is our bargaining counter I would like to know. What is the strength we have got in our hand?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : The strength is that we will not do anything which we consider is against our national interest. That is the bottom line.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : Why are these conditionalities not placed on the Table of the House, Sir? ... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, they would impose conditionalities, they will relax conditionalities. This is a long process of negotiation. But this Government's bottom line is that we will not do anything against our national interest... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir I am prepared at this moment to give the

Government the benefit of doubt to this extent that perhaps they themselves are not yet aware of all the conditionalities which will be sought to be imposed on them.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I do not have to know anything about these conditionalities to come to the decision which I have come to, and that is what I have just submitted.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : If I am not divulging anything that the Prime Minister told me in confidence a few days ago—I do not think it was in such a confidential manner—he told me that he had been told—he was frank and modest enough to say that he is not an economist, he is not a finance man but those of his people who have long experience of dealing with the World Bank and IMF and all these institutions have told him—that nowadays in the IMF there is a new thinking going on and that new thinking is that they try to impose very harsh conditionalities on several countries of the Third World—of Africa, Latin America and Asia—and because of the harshness of those conditionalities, the economies of those countries simply collapsed and there was chaos. Therefore, he told me—it is not what he is saying, it is what is being told to him—that IMF people are now thinking that it is better not to push these things too far because then the result may be opposite of what they want. I said that is a good thing but then let us hear from the Finance Minister what he has to say on this. I am sorry to say that the way the Finance Minister put his whole case, if I have not misunderstood him, is that we have really no go. We have no alternative. We will have to accept whatever the IMF wants, otherwise we will not get the loan, without which it is impossible for us to carry on. This is the sum and substance of the whole thing.

I do not want to take much time but I will tell my basic objection. The question of giving support or confidence to this Government at this stage just does not arise at all. Whatever little they have done in the last few days, does not inspire confidence and what they are proposing to do, according to whatever information we are able to gather, is something which is fraught with grave consequences. And in whose interest it is being done? I want to

know whether the vast majority of common people in this country are going to be benefited or are all the burdens going to be heaped on them. Nobody denies now that this deflation is going to boost up inflation much further than it has gone now. And the burden of that inflation will be borne by whom? Anybody who knows economics knows that in a period of inflation, it is not big companies or the big owners or the big businessmen who suffer. They get higher profits in a period of deflation. It is the poor people who suffer. And if they insist, as the Finance Minister told us, on drastic cuts in the subsidy, then what about the subsidy on food? If the subsidy on food is drastically cut, whom will it hurt? Will it hurt you and me? I do not think you and I bother much about the ration shops. We do not want to go and stand there in a line for hours together to get some 600 or 100 grams of sugar. Do we? It is the poor people. The whole public distribution system is meant as a cushion, as a safeguard for the weaker, the vulnerable sections of the society, not to put them at the mercy of the open market. But if under-pressure of IMF these subsidies are removed or practically removed, who will suffer? So, we have to know something about these things. We cannot just shut our eyes and say, yes, we support the Government. We cannot support the Government like this on these issues at all. I do not say that this Nehru-Gandhi framework of ideas, concept of ideas, was always very scrupulously followed in the past. It is not so. At least for the last ten years. I should say that a lot of erosion was going on. But at least some lip service was paid to this framework, to this ideology, that we are not going to depart from; we are sticking to it. But now what is happening is that in a kind of hush hush way, in a backdoor way, this whole framework and ideology is proposed to be given up. You are free to do it, if you can convince the country and the people that without it we cannot survive, and that the whole old thing should be thrown in the waste paper basket. But please tell us what is your rationale. You have not enough economists and experts at your disposal. They should explain.

Finally, I would say, that there is no question of our voting for your Motion or

expressing confidence in this Government. There is no question about that. We are worried because we do not want to precipitate another mid-term elections. That is also there. The people are in no mood. You know it very well. Everybody, whichever party he belongs to, from whichever part of the country he comes from, knows it. Tomorrow if we go to the people again and say: "Give us votes", they will give you shoe-beating. We are not going to do anything which will precipitate another mid-term elections. The leader of the BJP has stated here very emphatically on Friday that they were going to oppose this Motion. What he means by it, I do not know. We will see at the end, whether they are going to vote against this Motion or what. If they vote against it and if we also join with them, this Government will be out of office tonight. It cannot survive. Then there will be no option left but to go for elections again. That is the unfortunate part of it. Nobody can form the Government just now. You have not formed the Government. You are a minority Government. Nobody is in a position to form a majority Government. And nobody is in a position to go and tell the people that: "You must vote again, because we are not capable of running the show". None of us is in a position to do that. These conditions of instability—I want to make it clear—are not a party issue. The conditions of instability, prolonged instability, are the worst possible thing for the country and for the common people. All the burning issues are hanging fire. We are not able to attend seriously to any of them. And as far as ordinary people are concerned, the absence of stability only makes them worst victims of all kinds of exploitation, all kinds of arbitrary decisions which are imposed on them, may be by the big bureaucrats or may be by the monopolists who control the market and all that. And if that goes on, it breeds further cynicism and loss of credibility among the common people and then all kinds of devices and all kinds of other disruptive forces flourish on that.

SHRI INDER JIT : What is your remedy for all this ?

SHRI INDERJIT GUPTA : My remedy is in Gorkhaland. (*Interruptions*)

Gorkhaland is a model of stability. We are reading everyday in the Press. Mr. Ghising, who is a friend of Mr. Inderjit, is talking about the danger of a Greater Nepal coming and swallowing up Darjeeling and extending its claws all over the North.

SHRI INDERJIT : Seriously, I ask, what is your remedy for stability? I think you ought to come with all seriousness.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : A remedy for stability has been advocated yesterday or day before yesterday in a Press conference by my friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. I really do not understand what he has said and what his colleague says. He has said that in the face of this crisis, it is necessary that the country should be united and come together and, therefore, all like-minded parties should form a coalition government; but in such an event the BJP will stay out. (*Interruptions*)

15.00 HRS.

Nothing would be easier, Sir, than for us to press the 'No' button and vote against you. Nothing would be easier than that. But we do not know what our friends of the BJP are going to do, but subject to that also I would say because now I think the equations between you are changing to some extent—I don't say 'good', but they are changing to some extent and I don't grudge anybody that. But what is the price one has to pay, one has to see. You should not try, in my opinion, to cut off all your ideological moorings. Ideology is supposed to be something which is peculiar to Leftists—the socialists and communists. If you mention the word 'ideology' they say, 'Oh! you must be a communist.' So, nobody else is supposed to have any ideology. I don't follow it at all. If, in order to survive, Mr. Prime Minister, because of your being in minority, you think that you should be able to, well, take advantage, let us say, of the differences between the Opposition, then that is a path which is also fraught with grave dangers and serious consequences may ensue from that because today as we have decided, we are not going to vote for your motion and we are not going to vote against your motion. We are going

to abstain for now. I cannot give a guarantee for what is going to happen next time because such occasions will go on occurring. That is the whole problem. So, it is primarily the job of the Government to try to save itself. It is not the job of the Opposition to save it, it is the job of the Government to try to save itself. Since you have got into this position, you must try to save yourself. And I suggest once again that if you are serious about it, then your style of functioning has to change basically and you must not go on doing these things, taking the country by surprise and by dismay with all kinds of far-reaching measures which will have a fall-out, which cannot be imagined at the moment, and then saying, 'No, no, we have been consulting the Opposition.' What kind of consultation is that? I don't say consultation will satisfy everything, but at least we can judge the sincerity of the Government in trying to take the people into confidence. And if that is not done, well, next time I think you will have to think afresh. Each time you will to think afresh and I think that will also create a situation of tension for you because you never know what the Opposition is going to do, you never know what the BJP will do, you never know what we are going to do. So, you will spend many sleepless nights. I do not want you to spend sleepless nights, Mr. Prime Minister, your health is not very good. (*Interruptions*). But what about the health of the Government?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : Unpredictability on the other side!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Naturally. What is to be done? That is the way this House is composed, that is the way the people have voted this House. What is to be done about it? Neither you nor I can do anything. So, please take the reality into proper appreciation and accordingly I hope you will act. In the days to come I am afraid many of these so-called reform measures which will unfold, will meet with very harsh criticism and opposition by us because we cannot forget what is going to be the lot of the people outside, who have sent us here. That is the question. If they are going to be thrown to the wolves of unemployment and inflation and high prices

and closures—I am told one of the proposals is that the statutory legal provision which now exists that no employer can close down his factory permanently without getting the permission of the Government concerned, is going to be removed, he will be free at any time to close down his unit and to sell off the land, buildings and the equipment of his factory because that is something they are pressing for saying, 'Why should we run an uneconomic unit? Why should we run a loss-making unit? Give us the freedom to close it down and throw the workers out on the streets.'

But there is a legal provision which prevents that being done at the moment. Are you thinking of removing that? We do not know, but the papers are saying that you are planning to do that. So, you can better tell them not to write these things which are damaging your credibility. We regret very much that we are not able to support your Motion; we are not opposing also because of the consideration which I said earlier. Nobody would be able to face the people and another election. So, we will abstain from voting, but our abstention should not be taken as support to you. I know some BJP friends may like to say that they are the real Opposition and others are not the Opposition because of the abstention. We are not going to vote against the Motion. Let us see how they are going to vote and how many times they are going to do that. That is all I have to say. With this I close my speech now and I hope that the Government would seek to mend its ways and function in a democratic manner.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUN SINGH) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have all listened very attentively to what Shri Indrajit Gupta said just now; the seniority that he commands also commands our attention naturally. At the outset, I would like to say that the manner in which he has expressed his helplessness at the post-electoral scene that has emerged, does no credit to a party which always attempts to read or assess the developing the forces in a country and in the world. I would like to state humbly—though of course it is my assessment which I would

not like anybody to accept it as such—that the imperatives emerging out of this electoral decision must be clearly and dispassionately understood by everyone of us including the Congress Party and we should start taking steps that, we think, are in the interests of the nation. The imperative is that the people of this country have denied to give a clear majority to any party in the country. So, should we not think that the people of this country are pointing to a direction? They have posed a challenge to the sagacity and wisdom of every single political party as to what extent each one of us is equipped or is prepared to go to translate what the people have decided into action. I know some people have been saying about 'hung Parliament' and all that as though we are castigating the people of India for whatever decision they have taken. I am not in a position to put myself in that place where I will castigate the people of the country; whatever they have chosen to decide in their wisdom will have to be taken as it is and then we have to act upon it. Now, where do we go from there? One line of thought and then subsequent action could be that we go about making alignments with all and sundry just only to keep afloat. I am not saying this for the Congress Party alone; I am saying it for all the parties because keeping afloat may be one of the imperatives for every political party. But a party makes keeping afloat with end-all and be-all cannot even float, it will sink at the first opportunity. Therefore, I would like to inform the House that we have to start looking a new at the methodology of the political mechanics that are available to us to guide the country collectively to help resolve the problems and challenges that have come up in a manner so that while the country benefits by our action, certain basic fundamental perceptions and policies or whatever you call the core are left untouched. The only way as I see it is that we should try to determine and reserve areas of national concern, some of which have been pointed out in the House. Having determined those concerns, we should try to build up a method to arrive at some common consensus as to how the areas of national concern are to be dealt with. If we do not do this, then it will be like waving our arms trying to swim on the ground which I think, no rational person

would like to do. Once we have determined that, I see no reason why all sections of the House—from whichever part of the House he may belong to—would not be prepared to adjust themselves to resolve those concerns. Once that attempt is made and some progress is achieved, perhaps that could be the beginning of evolving a national agenda for action, which means the agenda for the entire country.

I am both happy and proud that the hon. Prime Minister has initiated and started this very process. If you find it insufficient or if you are not able to understand his intentions, as the day progresses, as time goes on, you will be convinced that the line he has adopted is the only one available in the country today and he will try to see—I am convinced of that—as time passes, the national agenda emerges and all sections of the House express their concern and their wisdom which is honest to solve most of the problems.

Shri Advaniji while initiating the debate asked us to observe certain realities that have emerged out of these elections. One of the realities which he naturally wanted us to observe was, the BJP—whatever it, belief whatever its thoughts and preceptions are—has emerged stronger. I do not think anyone could be blind to that. We must accept that from 80 odd seats, they have got 100 odd seats. They have made inroads in areas where they did not have any representation so far. But with all due respect, I would like to point out to hon. Shri Advani that the people of this country have also very clearly brought out a much larger reality that the unbridled pace of communal campaigning, communal activity, communal effort has been democratically checkmated and the composition of this House itself is a testimony to this.

I would like to say very categorically that this historic decision of the people of this country is a decision which is not only welcomed by us but I say that this decision is going to be the bedrock of all our policies and actions that any kind of communal force that wants to hold the country to ransom, which wants to vitiate the process of this great nation, which wants to poison the national politics shall be implacably, fundamentally and continuously

challenged by the Congress Party at every turn of the event and everywhere.

What else has come out is the socio-economic picture that has emerged. Over the decades, India has seen transformation from a totally feudal society to a society which is now fast approaching the 21st century. To say that somebody or one Party alone has been responsible for that would not be correct.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Bengaluru) : Previously there was feudal society. What is the character of the present society ?

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Kindly allow me to speak. I may not be able to convince you but, I would like to have my say. It is true that some of the policy framework which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the formative years of our independence formulated and implemented, accelerated this transformation. In the rural scene, we saw the farmers getting their rights. They became the owners of the land they till.

In the industrial sphere, we saw industrial labour coming into its own. I think that many of the things which Shri Indrajit Gupta pointed out are the culmination of that process. I see no danger that all of them are going to be wound up and that the law of the jungle is going to prevail.

In the international sphere, what Panditji started, has not only flowered but has become something which the international community itself has taken cognizance of and it has become more or less an order that prevails in the international body.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : Are you replying to Mr. Narsimha Rao ?

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I am only trying to intervene and if this intervention is not to your liking, I do not hesitate to sit down.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY : To whom are you replying ?

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : I am referring to the imaginary fears expressed on the floor of this House by people who would rather accept worse than see the reality unfold itself. It is those fears that I am

trying to quieten in my own humble way and, of course, I can try only to the extent that I can try.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY :
Of course, you can try.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North) :
Keep it up.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Well, when you ask me to keep it up, please always remember that when I keep it up and keep going, it would always be to the detriment of all that the BJP stands for.

The socio-economic scene that has emerged in the country which naturally wants it to be translated into political action, is something which the Congress has always fostered promoted and helped all along.

I know for some time there have been some doubts expressed as to what extent these people who are on the lower rung of the ladder economically, socially and politically, have been able to get a place in the Sun as of now. This doubt was to a very great extent removed in the manifesto which Shri Rajivji drafted himself and which was the Plan on which we went to the people. I can assure you that when the Prime Minister spells out his entire thinking in his Plan for the country, the remaining doubts will also dissipate. All that is needed is a little patience and, of course, sustained support. (*Interruptions.*) As Shri Indrajit Gupta has asked : "are we dismantling the frame-work which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi built up in all spheres of activity in the country." In all humility, I may say that these very questions were put to Shrimati Indira Gandhi when she came to power whether she was dismantling all that Pandit Nehru said. I think I am not wrong. I am historically correct. She answered it by actions. These questions were put to Shri Rajiv Gandhi whether he was dismantling all that Shrimati Indira Gandhi had said. He answered it by action. I can assure you this question will not only be answered but answered effectively by the Prime Minister that we are not dismantling anything. We are trying to build India within the broad framework that was enunciated by the leaders of the Congress Party.

We are not shutting our eyes to the realities of the situation. If Comrade Gorbachev could not shut his eyes, I don't think you can blame our Prime Minister for that. Therefore, whatever happens, will happen and very cautiously, very deliberately and very carefully the basic interests of the country will be kept absolutely and perfectly safe. Whatever steps the Government will take will be with a larger national interest in view and there lies the opportunities for all of us to do our work. I think the essence of the Motion before us is not whether somebody supports it, somebody opposes it or somebody abstains but whether each one of us with whatever capacity he possesses, is prepared to fashion his responses to the realities that have emerged from the latest election where the people of this country want this country to go on, its problems to be solved, challenges to be met not necessarily by flying at each other's throat but with a consensus and in an approach that takes into account all our fears and anxieties but extend our hands of cooperation where the people's and the country's interest requires.

The biggest problem today outside the political sphere is the problem of Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid. It is an issue which has come up in the last few years in the manner it has. Therefore, it requires not only careful handling but it also requires certain basic commitment to the manner in which it is to be handled. The President has very clearly mentioned in his Address that this problem can be solved only by mutual consultation and cooperation. I am sure all sections of the House will keep this in view. Any doubts that are raised unnecessarily because of what has been said about the legislation that is coming to freeze all such other problem places as on August 15, 1947 they should not be voiced without knowing what it means. Neither the Somnath Temple nor the Ram Janmabhoomi is covered by that legislation. It is very clear. There is no use confusing everyone that decision is going to affect all the places that were already settled. It is true it is a conscious decision and it is a decision which was there in our manifesto for the people to endorse that the country cannot afford more religious bush fires to

be lighted across the length and breadth of this country which will ultimately engulf the entire nation in a communal tension.

With these words, I would say—in whatever manner you want to do it, it is left to the individual parties—that this Confidence Vote which the Prime Minister has sought will be the beginning of a new political experimentation in the running of the country and I can tell you that the confidence he has of his party, the goodwill he has of the country will enable him to usher in a new era for this nation which wants to go forward and in spite of all the challenges, in spite of all the impediments it wants a place under the sun for the toiling masses, for the poor and the dispossessed. There lies the future of the country and the nation and that future we shall ensure with all our might.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : Sir, it is a time for the Treasury Benches to realise the reality of the situation particularly with the post-election situation in our country. The post-election situation of the country is marked by the fact that no political party or combination of parties have been given the verdict by the people to rule over the country. It is true that the Congress Party has not been able to become the largest plateau having a majority in the House. Of course, it has emerged as the single largest party in the House. But it should be also remembered by the Members in the Treasury Benches that the Congress (I)'s popular vote has dropped to 37.57 per cent and it is the second lowest since 1952. It has also to be taken note of particularly by the Treasury Benches that Congress vote dropped in the first phase of polls to 32.90 per cent. It, however, picked up in the second and third phase to 40 per cent. Therefore, these realities are to be known, appreciated by the Treasury Benches.

You are not only minority in this House. You have not urged the support of the majority outside this House. This psychology, that you are minority that you are not in majority, is not yet adopted by yourself. You are behaving, as it has been rightly pointed out, as if you are in a position to lord it over—to lord it over the House, to lord it over the countrymen in our country.

Sir, it is also to be taken note of that we are also conscious of our responsibility. We had been in the opposition, we are still in the opposition. We have got the responsibility of criticising you as the ruling party. We have also got the responsibility of correcting. We have also the responsibility of voicing, giving expression to the hopes and aspirations of the people outside who have voted for us. Our duty is not to salvage it. It we cannot salvage it. It is your responsibility to manage your misery. It is your responsibility to produce your majority. It is your responsibility to run the Government. It is not my responsibility as one of the hon. Members of the Left Opposition said, to salvage you from your crisis. You have to do it. We have been elected on the platform or on the planks of fighting against the undemocratic policies pursued by the Congress(I). We have been also elected to this House on the basis of fighting against the communal, aggressive Hindu communalism of the BJP. We cannot forget about the role we are to discharge. We cannot for a moment forget about the mandate of the people. The mandate of the people to us is to discharge the responsibility of the opposition to fight against the communal forces, isolate the communal forces from the mass of the people. Therefore, we are to adhere to our own mandate. And we are not here to salvage you from your crisis that you have produced yourself. The main contradiction of the Indian polity, I think, every left Member understands it, everyone, every countryman understands it, the principal contradiction in the Indian policy today is between the left and the Congress.

Sir, we as the Left party had made certain remarkable advancement. It has been possible only through a grim fight against the policies of the Congress with the help and support of the people. Never has there been an occasion from your side when you have left us unattacked. Please look at what is happening in Tripura and West Bengal. They should take note of the position that their party has been taking in different parts of the country where the Left has emerged as an important political force. Therefore, in

the Indian polity today, the main contradiction is between the Left and the Congress which you should remember, We are quite aware of that fact. In this particular situation it was expected that the Congress-I would consider it advisable to take the path of consensus and not of confrontation. We are conscious that the country is facing multi-dimensional crises. But while taking to the path of consensus, it appears and of course during the last three weeks they have taken some unilateral action without even consulting anybody from the opposition. It was that you did not consider it necessary to even give expression to what you want to do; what you want the opposition to do; and what you want your countrymen to do. You have devalued the rupee not once but twice. Yesterday, my esteemed friend, Shri George Fernandez raised the question that the devaluation was acceded to, under the advice of the IMF. You were pleased to reject the acquisition. I will only quote from the editorial of the Economic Times of July, 2. It gave expression to that very idea that the second devaluation was made only to please the International Monetary Fund. I quote :

"There is a feeling that the rupee will touch even the lower level by the time of the Budget so that the cumulative extent of the depreciation works out to 20 to 22 per cent which is reportedly what the World Bank and the IMF recommended as a condition for providing aid packages".

Who says this? *The Economic Times* says this. After devaluing the rupee for the first time and within a few days of time you have decided to devalue the rupee for the second time. You have agreed to take note of the advice of International Monetary Fund. You have said it in so many words. We were not informed about the conditionalities for this loan. As a matter of fact, whatever information has been made available through the Press, we feel convinced that it will lead to a disastrous situation for the country's economic sovereignty and also for the country's political sovereignty. If we compromise on the economic sovereignty of the country, we are ultimately to lose our political sovereignty. This is a disaster-

ous course that you have decided to take on. The logical conclusion or logical result of the policies of taking or accepting the loans on the insulting and humiliating hard conditionalities of the IMF will lead to an unprecedented price rise huge unemployment in our country, increase of black-money power, import of technology prejudicial to self-reliant economic and indigenous technology and concentration of wealth in fewer hands massive indirect taxation and weakening of public sector and elimination of subsidies an other important social welfare programmes that the people enjoy today.

These are anti-people measures. These will go against the basic interest of the people. On the other hand as I have already mentioned, we have been elected on the plank of defending the interest of the people. We have been elected here on the platform of bringing about better economic, social conditions for the people of our country. We have been elected here on the basis of protecting the democratic rights of the people; not only protecting and perserving the democratic rights of the people and the trade union rights of the working class, but also expand it. The conditionalities of the International Monetary Fund, as far as I am informed, crush the trade union and the democratic rights of the people. It has been agreed as far as I know that the democratic trade union rights of our countrymen would be abridged in order to satisfy the conditionalities of the International Monetary Fund. How can you expect us that we shall extent our support to you when you take to this path, the path of the anti-people; when your economic measures hurt the interest of the common people?

The Congress Party has not yet implemented the land reforms measures which can lift the country out of the economic morass that we have been placed in. As Mr. Arjun Singh was saying, you are for consensus, you want to consult us, you want to bring about a new era of cooperation as I have understood him.

The West Bengal Government, it is not an individual, the Left Front Government in its wisdom formulated certain alternative plan to lift the country out of the

present economic morass, realising the immensity of the problem; realising the gravity of the situation. Your Finance Minister had not even the courtesy of examining those alternative set of formulations and summarily, unceremoniously rejected them. What he has in mind, we do not know; what are his arguments, we do not know. On the one hand you want our cooperation; on the one hand you want consultation, consensus and not confrontation; but when there is a specific alternative strategy to lift the economy out of the morass you have got not the patience even to consult us, even to discuss, even to have some kind of a mutual discussion not with the individual, but with the Government of a State elected on the basis of popular mandate. Yet you want our cooperation!

The Centre-State relations are known to everybody. One of the major national problems is the Centre-State relations. The preservation of the perception of federalism, the question of extending political and economic power to the States to enlarge the scope of the States' autonomy can create a favourable condition for mutual consultation, mutual cooperation, mutual understanding of the problem and building up different ways and means to lift the country out of the multidimensional crises.

In this situation we should also take into account all the aspects. We cannot place our support to this Government or the Congress Party as such having this very important ideological position, taking into consideration that we differ on the basis of perception of the vast nature of our State. We cannot support.

But on certain occasions, on certain issues, there may be a situation where we are prepared to extend our positive attitude towards the policy, if they want to. For that also, it is your responsibility to take the initiative; it is your responsibility to take the lead.

During these three weeks time we have found that there is no change in their attitude, we have found that there is no change in their basic attitude, neither on economic policy nor on an ideological issue nor in any other form, whatsoever. So, I am

sorry, we cannot extend or pledge our support so long as they pursue these anti-people, anti-democratic and non-cooperative attitude towards the opposition in the country.

Lastly, Sir, at this stage, we are conscious of the realities of the situation. If they are voted out of power, where does the country go? BJP has already made it clear that as a true opposition, they will not hesitate to vote them out even today. And if we also join our hands with them they will be out of Office just today, within a few hours. As the opposition, as a Left opposition, we cannot remain oblivious of these things. Therefore we have decided and we do not like to see them out today. But, it does not mean that we shall not continue our opposition against their policies, against their stances; it does not mean that we shall not start our struggle in the streets against the disastrous policies that you pursue.

Sir, today just two hours before, I had addressed the Left Rally on behalf of four parties, protesting against your capitulation to the IMF loan and its harsh conditionalities. So, streets are open for us and you cannot prevent me or my party or any Left party or any democratic party to develop mass movements against your anti-democratic and anti-people policies which even now you have the intention to follow. This has been made clear in the last three weeks. It will be better for the country if you change your habits, if you change your policies if you change your stance and take to new path and new alternative policy.

Therefore, today, we shall not vote them out; we shall abstain from voting. But, I say that we shall discharge our responsibility of exposing them, of criticising them, educating the people about their role and we will continue to build our mass struggle in the field, factory and in the streets to combat their oppressive measures. With these words I conclude.

SHRI VENKATESWARLU UMMA-REDDY (Tenali) : Mr, Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak on behalf of my party, the Telugu Desam.

Sir, unlike in the past we have been meeting here in Parliament, in a very peculiar situation. Neither this Government is enjoying the total support nor this minority Government has got a committed support.

This is a Government which is in minority and a Government which is not assured of the support of any political party on the floor of this august House. Now a motion of confidence has been moved by the hon. Prime Minister seeking the support of the parties to continue the Government and govern this country in the days to come.

As our elderly parliamentarians have put it all the while really we are in a fix as to whether support this Government based on its past history or to support the government based on the deeds that it is going to have in future.

If we review some of the distortions that the Congress Governments made earlier, there were occasions to the credit of the Congress Governments during the periods where they had been enjoying an absolute majority. On certain occasions they had two-thirds majority of this House and on certain other occasions even three-fourth majority of this House. There are occasions when we have played with the democracy. We have distorted from traditions and conventions in the House. Going into the past history, I have got some of the instances. This Government or this Congress Party had supported earlier two minority Governments. One was in the year 1979 Mr. Charan Singh's Government. And another was in 1990, Mr. Chandra Shekhar's Government. The people have not forgotten the way in which they had pulled down those two Governments. One Government that the Congress supported in 1979 was of Mr. Charan Singh. The Government was not even allowed to face the Parliament once. The second occasion was when the Congress Government had lent its support in 1989 to Mr. Chandra Shekhar's Government. Mr. Chandra Shekhar's Government was not even allowed to present the budget. These are some of the instances. They have departed from their commitments and also the

sacred traditions of this particular Parliament.

In addition to these things to the credit of the Congress Government earlier, there were occasions where they had misused to any extent the confidence placed in them and also the provisions of the Constitution. As many as 96 times, the popular Governments were pulled down and the President's rule imposed. I have got one instance from my own State, Andhra Pradesh. In 1984, a popularly elected N.T.I.'s Government, which was enjoying an absolute majority of 202 Members out of 294, was pulled down far no fault of the Government.

15.50 hrs.

[Rao Ram Singh in the Chair]

It was just an undemocratic act. It was just to encourage a faction in the T.D. Party, a split was created. But the people of Andhra Pradesh were bold enough. There was a huge upsurge in the entire State. Though the Union Government and the party at the helm of affairs had not realised the importance of democracy, the people of Andhra Pradesh had fought for the democratic values and the N.T.R. Government was seen to be back even within 30 days of its toppling. So Sir, the Congress Party which was in Government earlier, had made several deviations on this front. Encouraging split and factionalism is not new to them.

In 1979, when Mr. Charan Singh faction was promised that it will be supported, it was toppled down. In 1990, Mr. Chandra Shekhar faction was also pulled down from power and was toppled down. In 1984, Mr. Nadendra Bhaskara Rao, with the support of the Congress, toppled the N.T.R. Government. Like these, there were several occasions, when the Congress Party had played with the Constitution and the democratic values. Leaving aside these things, in the recent past of 1989, the National Front-Left Front-BJP alliance had secured more than 300 seats. And every time, the Congress, who was in the Opposition then, haunted that Government saying it was a minority Government and that at

any time that Government can be pulled down. There was an occasion when that Government was kept in an embarrassing situation. Even to lend its support for a Constitutional Amendment Bill on Punjab issue, it had abstained itself from participating in voting. History will not forget all these things. We could prove our own majority but as far as the Constitutional Amendment Bill is concerned two-third majority was required at that time and it was a natural obligation for the Congress to have lent its support. But it abstained.

Sir, this Government was formed 20 days back. Leaving aside all its past history, we thought that this Government will have a good start a promising start and will start by instilling confidence in all the Opposition parties and the people of this country and that this Government is at least going to serve the country and the people in future. But Sir, the developments are very disappointing. The way in which the Punjab elections were postponed just a few hours before the commencement of polling is an example. On Friday, Chandra Shekharji made it clear on the Floor of the House that the Election Commission had not even consulted them.

But it is very vivid and we know who is behind this decision and who exactly has prompted this decision to postpone the elections in Punjab.

Sir, the whole nation finds itself in a very panicky state about the financial conditions of this country. The statements that have been coming from time to time and the actions that this Government has been taking from time to time have left the entire population in a state of panic.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please wind up.

SHRI VENKATESWARLU UMMA-REDDY : I am speaking for the first time. Kindly allow me to speak for another five minutes.

When we see the decisions that have been taken during these 20 days, we find that on the financial front, the state of affairs that are prevailing in this country are very fluid. The public is in a very panicky condition. The successive decisions that the Government has taken with

regard to the devaluation of rupee - twice in quick succession - and also the mortgage of sale of gold or depositing it in some other banks, that too twice in quick succession, have left an impression that prices are going to be increased like anything. The prices are going to rise beyond the purchasing capacity of the people and particularly the rural population. How the IMF conditionalities are going to be reflected on the price structure of this country is not exactly known to the common man.

At this juncture, I have to make a mention about the statement that has been given by our hon. Prime Minister on Friday. He has stated that the Rs. 10,000 loan waiver extended by the National Front Government in 1989 is responsible for these state of affairs. Sir, we are not going to accept that statement. For over 40 years, it is the Congress Government which ruled the country. The cumulative effect of those 40 years' rule is being faced by us at the present juncture. It is certainly not because of the commitment or the relaxation that has been given to the farming front in 1989 by the National Front Government. Now we are entertaining doubts that this Government is going to play a role of anti-peasantry government for the reason that they have not relished this loan waiver. The IMF is also imposing conditions that several subsidies including those subsidies extended to fertilizers should be cut off. If this is going to be done, naturally the cost benefit ratio in agriculture is going to be very alarming and the food production in this country is going to be effected to be effected to a great extent. If we just think back about our agricultural conditions hardly ten years ago, we find that in the past ten years, right from 1980 to 1991, we have achieved a growth rate of 25 million tonnes in this country from 152 million tonnes in 1980 to 177 million tonnes in 1991. Our target with regard to agricultural growth rate should not be less than 4 per cent to feed the teeming millions of our country.

16.00 hrs.

But, Sir, the growth rate is hardly 2.5 per cent. It is very disappointing growth

rate on agricultural front. Even the target that has been fixed for 1991-92 is only 183 million tonnes. Sir, if it is going to be the state of affairs, if all the subsidies on agricultural inputs hitherto extended are cut off and also the waiver scheme etc. are taken for criticism, naturally the agricultural front is going to be affected like anything.

In the recent month the gold was sold twice. In Telugu we have got a saying :

*Parapatti Poyina runagrastudu, pella
medato thali ammutadu.*

It means that a boy after exhausting all the sources resorts to selling of the Mangalsutra of his wife. So, now, the condition of the Government is like that. They have exhausted all the sources. They are now bowing down to the conditionality of the IMF and are trying to sell the gold that is lying in RBI. I would say that they should accept the condition that is laid down in the Reserve Bank of India Act, i.e. that the gold sold outside should not exceed 15 per cent of the gold reserves. We, I think, now hardly have 322 tonnes of gold. Technically you have been telling that this is confiscated gold but in total about 45 tonnes of gold has already been departed from our country. Unless, this 15 per cent check is going to be there, people are going to sell away gold that is available in this country. Our condition is like that.

I have one more point to make. I would say that the Congress Government is playing a game of convenience and not a game of convention; not the politics of tradition but it has been playing a game of convenience. Sir, when the Hon. Speaker's election came up, very conveniently the B.J.P. our elders, came with a formula that the Speakership should go to the Ruling Party and Deputy Speakership should come to the next largest group. It has been endorsed by the Congress leaders. Sir, I will just cite two examples where they have deviated from this convention.

In the year 1980 when the Congress was in power, the Janata Party was in Opposition but, the Deputy Speakership was given to the D.M.K. Member. In 1984, 9—545 LSS/91

the Congress Party was in power and the TDP was the next largest group but the Deputy Speakership was given to the AIADMK. But this type of deviation has not been done by non-Congress Government.

In 1977 when the Janata Government was in power, I was in Opposition, Shri Gode Murahari a Congress (I) Member was the Deputy Speaker. In 1989, National Front Government was in power and Congress in Opposition, our present Speaker, Shri Shivraj Patil was the Deputy Speaker at that time.

As you know the Congress (I) Government is hoodwinking the people and also the Opposition parties. In 1971 'Garibi Hatao' was the slogan but it was never accounted for. Slogan in 1991 was to roll back the prices to the level of July 1990. Now, the Finance Minister himself says that it is not possible. The goal of giving jobs to 10 million people is a far reaching one. So with all these past records, this Congress Government wants the support of the Opposition Parties. The TDP Members are going to abstain from voting. Let the Government continue. They will have to face a lot of troubles in the days to come. You know that in their own house, there are lot of squabbles, lot of factions and so on. In the first instance, they have to appease them. But, we are confident that they are going to perish themselves and they will not give any chance to the Opposition Parties for toppling them.

With these few words, I thank you very much for giving me time to speak on this Motion and we are abstaining from voting.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to know how many Members are still remaining. Are there only two speakers? Or are there any other Members from smaller parties who would like to speak on this Motion? If they want to speak, you please give them time first because in the first round, our Party had already participated.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no firm thing about the time. If the House wants that the time should be increased, I am sure, it can be done. He has asked a question whether any more Member still remain to be called.

[Translation]

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL (Godda) : J.M.M. is also in the list.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is there in the list. Please let Shri Jaswant Singh speak.

[English]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : If you want them to complete, let them complete. Afterwards, you can call me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : As I have already pointed out that the Speaker has already given a ruling that the voting will take place between 4.00 P.M. and 5.00 P.M. I do not think he will be able to give his reply before the scheduled time. I think the maximum that can be done is, let us allow 2-3 more hon. Members to speak.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : The time may be extended.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It can be done only with the sense of the House.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : All the parties must get at least one chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is it the sense of the House to extend the time for this discussion ?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GULAM NABI AZAD) : I had already held a discussion with the Speaker. There are some major political parties for whom some time should be given. For example Jharkhand, the RSP and such other parties. They should be given at least 5 or 10 minutes each. So, there is no harm in extending the time by one hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The time for this discussion is extended by one hour. Shri Nani Bhattacharya.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in my submission. At the outset, I would like to

make it clear that, fortunately or unfortunately, within the Opposition of this House, there is also BJP. So, it cannot be taken for granted that the Opposition will take a common stand; it is not possible at all, although I know there is very little difference between the BJP and the Congress. If you go deep into the things you will find that they represent industrial and commercial interests in India. It cannot be denied. Both of them are same with however, changed colour. One is having 'Tri colour' and the other is having 'Saffron flag'. But in their heart of hearts, they have to serve commercial and industrial interest in India as also foreign capitalists and multi-nationals. (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : You joined hands for 11 months.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : We never joined hands. (Interruptions). During the election of the Speaker, what was the game behind the scene ? We do know; but the country does not know anything. (Interruptions) As I have said, Congress, though claims to be wedded to secularism, it has distorted it in its game of power politics over this period of 40 years. It cannot be denied; and it has been done most opportunistically. That cannot also be denied.

There is a report from Kerala also. There was a platform behind the scene where all the fundamentalists including the Congress so-called secularist joined hands in defeating the Left Parties. This is known to all. (Interruptions) This is the beginning, I am afraid. (Interruptions).

PROF. SAVITHRI LAKSHMANAN (Mukundapuram) : The ex-Chief Minister of Kerala was from your party. (Interruptions).

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : But this position was taken by the Congress, BJP and the Muslim League.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani) : Never.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : It has come out in the Press; it has come out from local as well as national reports. The anti-left canard was launched and the religious fundamentalism provided common platform in Kerala for BJP, Congress and Muslim League in the last election of that State. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please continue. Kindly take your seats, gentlemen. Mr. Bhattacharya to continue his speech.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : How the election was conducted, I am giving some idea. The tragic assassination of Shri Rajiv Gandhi has proved to be a water-shed in the election process. It cannot be denied. And there has been a widely varying results in the pre and post-assassination phases during which the political and other issues to which the election is related got blurred and hate psychology ruled. Can it be denied? It cannot be denied. And, to our utter surprise and shock also, the hate psychology was fanned up by the Congress (I) with extraordinary promptness by making the blood-spattered dismembered body of Rajivji the sole platform of the electioneering. Can the Congress deny this? They are seeking our confidence. Has the country confidence in this Congress regime? Leave aside the rule of money power and muscle power and the role of the business houses and the hoodlums employed in favour of the Congress? (Interruptions).

[Translation]

SHRI RAM PRAKASH CHAUDHARY (Ambala) : You are wrong. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : And the BJP was not lagging behind in this race. They talk of so many great things, principles, ideology, etc. etc., and say Hindu, Hindu, Hindu. They have mixed religion with politics and they spent money like anything. Wherefrom did they get the money for so many types of posters and for the election expenses? (Interruptions) I have a commitment to the electorate. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : I request the hon. Members to sit down. Please sit down. I

request the hon. Members not to use any unparliamentary language.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : This is not unparliamentary. (Interruptions):

[Translation]

SHRI LAKSHMI NARAIN MANI TRIPATHI (Kaiserganj) : Mr. Chairman Sir, the word 'Goonda' should be expunged. Is word 'Goonda' parliamentary or unparliamentary. How has it been used for a party safeguarding the national interests. (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have already said it. Do not use any unparliamentary language. If any unparliamentary word was used it will be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA : Even after all this, the Congress (I) has failed to secure a majority in the House. After all the using of money and muscle power, using Rajivji's death in that particular fashion by displaying the blood-spattered body and all those things, the Congress could not get the verdict of the nation, the verdict of the people. They could not secure a majority in the House. That is why they have come here to seek our confidence. The people's mandate so rule, is not behind the Congress (I). This must be kept in mind. (Interruptions).

I have already said that I would be very brief. But because I had to expose certain things which happened currently that causes some delay. As you know, the ideological and political position of the RSP, the extreme misery of the common people, coupled with ever-growing unemployment and pauperisation for perpetual capitalist exploitation of diverse nature with ever-expanding magnitude and the distortion and degeneration of public values and secular and democratic norms in the hands of the Congress-I. All these necessitated in the past and do necessitate now to carry on prolonged struggle against the Congress-I misrule in order to defeat its pro-capitalist, anti-people and authoritarian policy. That must be kept in mind.

Sir, I was just making an enquiry from Mr. Arjun Singh. He is not present here now. The Prime Minister is here. I asked Mr. Arjun Singh a question, what

emerged from feudalism and what is the character of the society? But it was not replied. Intelligently he avoided it. Language is also a problem for me. I could not impress him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sure that due note is being taken and adequate reply will be given later.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: If you wish, I can cover that ground in my reply. Or otherwise, I can do it right now.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Please do it right now.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have done something on land reforms in my State. No one can fault me on that. I have a matchless record in bringing the land to the tiller. And I can say with full confidence that a large portion of this country has been liberated from feudalism; the Congress Government brought in the abolition of zamindaris the Congress Government brought in some of the best pieces of legislation on tenancy; gave full rights to the tenants. I can show you examples of such legislation in any number of States..... (Interruptions).

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): But they were not completed and implemented..... (Interruptions).

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, I agree that that process has not been completed and needs to be completed. Year after year feudalism has not been allowed to flourish. People have voluntarily sold their lands. Please come to my State. I will tell you that in 1949 people had five thousand acres, six thousand acres of land. Just because the Congress Government brought in this legislation, there was so much of voluntary sale of land.... (Interruptions) So, why are you saying about feudalism? (Interruptions).

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: That was because of Telungana movement in your State..... (Interruptions).

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Mr. Acharia, do you know when did the

Telungana movement took place and when did the Congress Government come into power? Please revise your history (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: How much benami lands are there? (Interruptions)

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA: My question was different. What emerged out of feudal society now? What is the character of the present society? (Interruptions).

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The character of the present society, where feudalism had been ended, is a society of peasant proprietorship, who own below the statutory ceiling. That is the present proprietorship pattern which we have in this country and we will continue to have that.... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would request the hon. Members to address the Chair.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA: As stated by Leftist friends elaborately—I do not want to repeat those things—this minority Government has already forfeited its right to seek confidence and definitely we the Left cannot but oppose this Government. We would have been glad if we could have unsettled this Government here and now which is the representative of the capitalists, industrial and commercial interests. But then again there is the mood of the masses according to the major parties—those who claim to have hold over the masses like the Congress, BJP etc. fortunately or unfortunately. They have command over the people in a bigger way—they think to hold elections at this moment would be very much unwise. So we have to take note of it. You may call it watering down our policy. But I should warn this Government that you are absolutely dependent on the mercy of the Left which is genuinely secular, genuinely democratic and you should remember it.

[Translation]

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL (Godda): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion of confidence brought by the hon. Prime Minister. I am against the Cong-

ress (I) getting a vote of confidence in this House because it has ruled the country most of the years after Independence. It has ruled about 39½ years.

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chinur): Was the Congress (I) forcibly ruling over the country? (Interruptions)

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL: People who represent the majority have ruled the country for only 4½ years. Today the Congress (I) has no moral right to claim a majority in the House. During the Congress rule no one bothered about the 85% of the Indian population living in villages and remote areas.

16.20 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the chair)

Ever since Independence these people have been exploited. These are members of the B.J.P. who come from poor backgrounds and these are such members from the Congress (I) also. So I would like to ask the Congressmen whether they have ever taken care of the rural masses. The Congress has divided the country into two parts, one is 'Bharat' and the other is 'India.' You belong to India and the people of India have ruled the country for 39½ years. and exploited the masses. So the Congress (I) should not get the vote-of-confidence at any cost.

Sir, adivasis, Harijans and minorities have been asking for their due for the last 40 years but, as desired by Pandit Nehru, has an 'Adivasi' ever been made a Cabinet Minister? Mr. Amarsinh Chaudhury may have become the Chief Minister of Gujarat but he cannot be a Cabinet Minister or a Prime Minister at the centre. Your policy is good, but not your intention. Sir, it is a matter of different policy and intention. There is a difference between policy and intention. Previously, those who represented 15% of the Indian population ruled the country and the representatives of the remaining 85% sat in the Opposition. But regrettably in this 'Trishanku' Lok Sabha representatives of 15% of the masses are sitting on the Treasury Benches and representatives of another 15% are sitting in the Opposition..... (Interruptions)

Sir, everyone knows the numbers of members of the ruling party in the present Lok Sabha. The Congress very well knows that it has 244 or 246 members, while 256 members are required for a majority still they claim to have a majority which is quite surprising. They want to indulge in the politics of temptation. They have exploited the maximum number of poor people in this country. They have a proposal to increase the price of fertilizers. But remunerative prices are not paid to the farmers to meet the expenditure incurred by them in producing the paddy crops.

I hold the Congress solely responsible for the existence of terrorism in the country today. The 'Jharkhand Movement' is the oldest of all movements in our country. When the country became independent S. R. C. Commission was formed. The Simon Commission gave an indication that a Jharkhand State be separated. It has been mentioned in the book, written by B. R. Ambedkar and published by the Maharashtra Government that Bihar State should have been bifurcated. The leaders of the Jharkhand Movement, which was launched in 1952, have followed the path shown by Mahatma Gandhi. The so-called followers of Mahatma Gandhi are sitting on the Treasury Benches but those who are really following the Gandhian ideals have not got the recognition I know Congress is responsible for spreading terrorism in the country. The crisis in Punjab and Assam and the problem of the Bodas is the creation of the Congress. Agreements and accords were signed but they were of no avail. The prevailing situation in the country is the same as it was just after Independence. We know that the Congress will not let any other party rule the country for very long. They do not have the courage to stay out of power. Nor do they have an inclination to serve the people when they are in power.

Bihar has 41% of the national mineral wealth of which the Jharkhand region accounts for 30%.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL: This is my maiden speech. The rails are used for

the transportation of minerals from one place to another but after Independence not a single inch of railway line has been added to supplement the railway lines constructed by the British. We have made promises to the people which have not been discussed here. We will fulfil those promises. We would like the Government to find a well-thought out solution to the Jharkhand problem. Otherwise Jharkhand and Assam will become another Punjab. There is an old saying in the rural areas that—"Andha ka rona aur apna deeda khona." So this is the situation. You have been given a fresh lease of life for six months. Make arrangements for the period after that as you are quite capable of doing so. We are also opposing this motion. Those who are presently supporting you may continue to do so after six months and the picture will become more clear. We cannot support this motion. I am in the 'Jharkhand Mukti Morcha' and our party is with the National Front. We shall support whatever decision is taken by them.

[English]

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI (Autonomous District): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand here to oppose this Motion of Confidence in this Government and I oppose this Motion of Confidence. I do not want to elaborate much, as many of the Opposition leaders have already elaborated, but very shortly and precisely, I want to draw the attention only on three points.

Firstly, I would say that the way this Government has handled the financial crisis of the nation during the last three weeks has definitely created non-confidence in this Government. They are seeking the vote of confidence but they are not taking this House, the Opposition Parties and the nation into confidence. What are the circumstances under which this financial crisis has arisen is not clear to the nation. What is the exact amount the Government wants to raise as foreign reserves to earn credit-worthiness in the international market? What are the exact conditions of the IMF? These things are not clear to the nation. One point on which I oppose this Government is the very approach. They have adopted to solve this financial crisis. This Govern-

ment has failed miserably to appreciate and to recognise the intrinsic resilience of the Indian society, the inner strength of the common Indian. I am saying 'miserably' because it is the Congress Party which led the Indian masses during the freedom struggle. This is the Congress Party which mobilised the strength of each and every Indian up to the last point to fight the British rule, but now in 1991 the Congress Government is having no faith in the Indian people, they are undermining the strength of the Indian society and I think the hon. Members of the House will agree with me that if the Indian masses, the people of this country, are convinced, if we tell them the facts, if we make them understand and if we take them into confidence, I think each and every Indian will be ready for even greater sacrifice to take the country out of this financial crisis. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I still remember in 1962 when there was a conflict in the India-China border, the people of my village in the remote corner of the North-East even skipped their meals and they deposited their savings etc. so that a fund could be raised and deposited with the Government and the financial crisis could be contained. This is lacking on the part of this Government to take the people into confidence and to utilise the strength of the common Indian man to tide over this crisis. Instead of that, this Government is taking shelter in the lap of the international financial agency, the IMF. and what is the result? The hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the House have stated that the interest of this country will not be surrendered to them. But only the other day when I went through the Presidential Address, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not found a single word about imperialism. Nehru and other leaders have a leading role in the shaping of our foreign policy. The crux of the non-alignment policy is our anti-imperialist thrust. But in the same Presidential Address, the very word 'imperialism' is missing. Why? I would say that this is because of the dictates of the international financial agency.

The second point I want to say is about Punjab. The postponement of Punjab polls itself is a surrender to the forces of disruption and terrorism. It will further

demoralise and weaken the resolve of the people to fight against terrorism and the Government must decide between the two concepts—peace before the poll or poll for peace. If we go for peace before poll, I think we will never get it, given the objective situation of Punjab as it stands today. But we should go in for poll for peace. If we achieve poll, if we can have election there, it will create a better atmosphere and it will start the democratic process there and terrorism can be combated effectively. So, peace before poll is a wrong idea. We should go in for poll for peace and we should take Punjab election as a struggle against terrorism and in this respect I have seen that the Government has failed miserably.

Regarding ULFA, the Government has handled the situation in a piecemeal, shortsighted and over-pragmatic way. The Chief Minister of Assam has said, as reported in the press, that they have consulted the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and other leaders and after that they have released all the ULFA detainees—more than 300 in number—general amnesty has been given and they have been invited for a discussion. I am saying that we are not against this step. But we oppose this because we consider this approach as a piece-meal approach. The Government is yet to approach the entire picture in totality and ULFA should not be seen in an isolated way from the overall ethno-political situation of the North Eastern region. There is not only ULFA but there are some other movements which are going on like the demand for an Autonomous State comprising of two hill districts of Assam under the provision of Article 244(A) of the Constitution. The Bodos are demanding a separate State on the north bank of Brahmaputra and there are a host of others who are demanding either proper scheduling or area autonomy. Now, in these prevailing circumstances only, different kinds of extremist forces are thriving.

I want to clarify our position very clearly. We are against secessionism; we do not want Assam to be separated from India. But now the Government has conveyed a dangerous signal to all other organisations by this piece-meal, appeasing

approach to ULFA. Hundreds of cases are pending against the leaders and supporters of Bodo movement; hundreds of cases are pending against Autonomous State Demand Committee, but now the Government has given general amnesty to ULFA only and has withdrawn all the cases against them and not against the activists of other organisations. It will give a message to the people that cases will be withdrawn only when you demand secession from India on gun point and also amnesty will be given only when you demand with AK-47. It will give an impression that they will be invited for a discussion only when they demand secession. This very approach is giving a wrong signal to the entire North Eastern region. Even after all this I would have supported the Government had there been even a faint sign of self-criticism.

In the past, we have seen so many programmes like the 20-Point Programme. Is there any reevaluation? Is there any assessment?

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI: So, I once again register my opposition against this Government.

[Translation]

SHRI SULTAN SALAHUDDIN OWAISI (Hyderabad): Sir, the issue is only this much that the hon. President has said that the Congress Government seek a vote-of-confidence. At times it so happens here that a momentary lapse of reason can have adverse effects. If we look at it from a partisan point of view, no party would be in favour of another election. Nobody has the mental, economic or physical capacity to go through another election but had the hon. Prime Minister discussed the problems with the Opposition and taken them into confidence, such a situation would not have occurred. These complications would not have arisen if major issues like the devaluation of the rupee had been discussed with the Opposition. Secondly, the rise in prices has put the country in a difficult position. Thirdly, in the light of such a major decision being taken, what is the Government's stand on socialism which

we have been harping on since the time of Jawaharlal Nehru. The Government should have a clear-cut policy.

Will the Government's view on secularism also change? If the post of Deputy-Speaker is being offered to the B.J.P. then whatever has been written in the Congress (I)'s manifesto regarding the Babri Masjid issue becomes meaningless for us. This would be a blunder on the part of the ruling party. They should bear in mind that they will not be able to get Muslim votes in future and they should also keep in mind that . . . (Interruptions). We have had a neutral policy regarding secularism and we have always raised our voice against injustice done anywhere in the world. America is exploiting Iraqis and planning to attack Iraq, but we are keeping mum. We must register our protest at the way the Iraqi people are being starved to death (Interruptions). When we talk of being neutral we have to show that in action also. I wouldn't like to say much but for the time being we can only pray to God because we see strange faces here. Never have we seen such a scene in Parliament. What can be expected of them? These voices will not last long. Raising slogans will not solve the problems. Why are you raising slogans now when you have been ousted from the States where you were previously in power. Only cry for the result now because eventually you alone will have to ring the death knell.

[English]

16.53 hours

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have to unfortunately clarify what this discussion is all about. This is not a discussion on the President's Address. This is also not a discussion on the Budget which is yet to be presented. It is not a discussion on a No-confidence Motion moved in the House. It is a discussion on a motion moved by hon. the Prime Minister of India, seeking confidence in his Council of Ministers.

Now as my friend and senior colleague, Shri Indrajit Gupta has quite rightly pointed out, we have actually very little to go on as to why this House ought to give its confidence in the Council of Ministers. The Prime Minister has not explained why, though of course, the

Leader of the House in an interesting and thought-provoking intervention did explain and put across some of the view points. But characteristically he has also attempted to simultaneously straddle far too many conceptual bridges and I regret that in the process, he could also not resist a Pavlovian swipe at the BJP. This Confidence Motion is not a Confidence Motion for the BJP. We have not sought it. Therefore, I shall wait for another opportunity to answer some of the points that the Leader of the House has made about the BJP. Of course, I would reply to them though not now. But there were two thought-provoking aspects of his intervention. One was when he talks about methodology and of political mechanics. He spoke quite rightly, with which point we entirely agree, that there is need currently to determine areas of national concern and from which thereafter evolve a national agenda, a thought with which we are entirely in agreement. In fact, the entire House is in agreement. But again, if that is why the confidence vote has been sought, we are at sea because we do not know what this national Agenda is that the Government wishes us to agree to, how they wish to go about arriving at a national consensus and, unless that is defined, we would find it very difficult to lend confidence as again it was quite rightly pointed out, to lend confidence to an abstract notion of a Government which is yet to demonstrate its basis. That is why we have some difficulty in lending our confidence to this Council of Ministers. And here there are primarily three difficulties.

One is at the conceptual level. I am unable at the present to determine exactly what the form and shape of the conceptual content of the Congress party is. The hon. Leader of the House has said "Don't worry. Our actions will prove irrespective of what our thoughts, utterances and actions might already have demonstrated." But that is my precise difficulty. Because the actions of this Government, of the Congress party, in the few weeks that they have been in power, completely go against its earlier utterances, as I will illustrate in a few moments from now. That is why, at the conceptual level, we find it difficult to lend support because the Congress, as

it stands today, is a Party devoid of a central idea.

Then again we have a second difficulty which is the difficulty of the arithmetic of numbers, the sheer logic of numbers, as this Parliament has arrived at and, as the Leader of the House indeed was very wise in pointing out. The electorate has reduced the Parliament into a sheer logic, the arithmetic of numbers is against the Council of Ministers. That is the central reality. If the Council of Ministers was to behave in a manner cognisant of that central reality of the arithmetical aberration, it would be reassuring. But we do not find evidence of that. That is why, we have this difficulty. It is the hon. the Prime Minister and I could well be faulted on the exact wording of it. The hon. the Prime Minister somewhere said that "We will arrange a coalition of numbers on issues." I could be faulted on the exact phraseology. If he did not say that, then I can drop it because that point will then not arise. But the issue is that the conduct that you have demonstrated in the past one week or so in Parliament is, as was pointed out by my Leader earlier, that you want to arrange a coalition on each issue.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have said it times without number that I have been in touch with the Leaders of the Opposition Parties. I had general discussions with them and what I am being offered is that issue-based support. They have said so and, I said I shall have to be content with issue-based support and run this Government. I would welcome if the support is anything more than issue-based, but I do not see it right now. But issue-based support is good enough for me, because I am coming to the House with issues on which I am bound to get support. I exuded that confidence.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I do not wish to get into a needless argument on this aspect of the functioning of the Government. But the verdict of the electorate, in all humility I submit to you, in the last two elections has been the verdict of an honest coalition and, that is why, we submit to you and that is precisely what the Leader of my Party Shri Atal Bihari

Vajpayee meant when he said that it would be far preferable if you have an honest coalition rather than this coalition on issues, on issue-based support. [17.00 hrs.] It be because there is an inherent fragility when you talk of issue-based support. I don't think anyone in this House will say that this inherent fragility is the right recipe to meet the many challenges that the nation faces today. But it is not for me to suggest to you how to run the Government. That is for you to decide.

The other difficulty that we have in lending our support to this Confidence Vote is on some of the steps that this Government has already taken. I will not go into the details of them. I will not repeat what the others have said. Regarding Punjab, the action of deferring the poll is deeply disturbing us. It was a cruel act, a cruel act really of unbelievable cynicism and whimsicality. You called off the elections in Punjab at the penultimate moment. You tell us that you had nothing to do with it. That worries us even more. If you did have something to do with the calling off of elections in Punjab then that is unforgivable. I leave a thought with you. The Janata Dal Government, early in 1989, made a very great error in the manner in which it handled a sensitive kidnapping in Jammu & Kashmir. It is my belief, for whatever it is worth that a similar fashion, whoever has taken this decision, has committed a very great wrong to India in postponing the polls there. If you say that you didn't take this decision, then even more worrying is who asked whom to take this decision? Who took the decision at the mid-night when one Prime Minister was relinquishing office and another Prime Minister yet to take office? It disturb us very much. You are the Government and you are responsible for actions taken. Therefore, we are unable to lend our support on this issue.

I will be very brief. On the question of Assam, in an earlier intervention by the Prime Minister interrupting, the Leader of the Opposition when he was making a point, the hon. Prime Minister was good enough to say that the general amnesty in Assam is not a quid pro quo for whatever has happened there. The

fact remains that the Chief Minister of Assam came to Delhi; he consulted with the Prime Minister and the Government and having consulted—he is on record that he came here he gave a Press Statement. He is again on record with the Press. He was asked: "How do you react to the killing of the Soviet Engineer?". He says: "It is a breach of trust by the ULFA." I do not know what to say. On the one hand, the Prime Minister says that there is no quid pro quo. But the point is you granted a general amnesty. You have given a general amnesty in Assam in a certain context of time and in a political context when 16 people in Assam were kidnapped within 24 hours of the Government there having been sworn in. Despite that, the Prime Minister asserted that there is no quid pro quo; there is no connection between the happenings there and the general amnesty. I am left confused and unconvinced. Therefore, I am unable to lend my support. Thirdly, the hon. Leader of the House said something. I think he used the phrase: "We will follow the Nehruvian socio-economic continuity." This is precisely our difficulty. The Leader of the Opposition and Leader of my party in Parliament was categorical in saying that the steps that you have taken on the economic front are steps, about which we don't find fault with you because these are the very steps that we have been advocating for long. But we find it difficult to understand what you do. You are confronting yourself with two primary difficulties. You are coming to us with piecemeal steps one at a time when we are asking for the totality of your economic thought and package. I think trade policy reforms have been announced by you, which have long been advocated by us. It is my view that a very eminent economist graces the Chair in the Ministry of Finance. We entirely lend support to it. But we are looking for your total economic philosophy. Instead, we are served this disingenuous argument, and yet you reject the entire legacy of the past. In words, however, you still continue to follow it. I am unable to understand this. That is why I appreciated the point that my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta made that President Gorbachev displayed much great political honesty. He identified all that had gone

wrong in the past. And then he came forward and said, "this is what we have to do now? I would expect the Government to come to the House with equal candour, not to continue worship yesterday's cliché, yesterday's thoughts. That would make it easier for us to lend our support to you.

I will conclude. I sensed the mood of the House and will not proceed with this debate. We are all waiting for the Prime Minister's intervention. I leave just one final thought. The tenth general election is not a mandate for the Congress Party. Of course, it is not a mandate for us or anyone of us. Therefore, if you go by the tenth general election which is not a mandate for the Congress Party, please take that as a central political reality both outside the Parliament and inside the Parliament. Only then the two aims that the Leader of the House enunciated—very worthwhile aims of national agenda and a national consensus—can be attained at. Until that is done, I am afraid, we are unable to lend our support to the Confidence Motion.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the position here is the same as it was before the elections. After the elections some political parties have gained while some are loser. Before elections there was mainly three political groups viz. Congress (I), National Front-Left Front and B.J.P. At present political scene is the same. Before elections National Front had 75 members and after election its strength is same. Both the B.J.P. and the Congress (I) have improved their strength. But no political party has got majority in the House. I remember that our Government fell on the basic issues like secularism and social justice, raised by Shri V. P. Singh when he was holding the position which Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao holds today. These issues are of no importance for you and B.J.P. but are of great importance for us. We cannot give up these issues. I remember the persons who played treachery with us on that fateful day, November 7, 1990. The B.J.P. openly revolted. The Congress (I) which advocated secularism and social justice...

(Interruptions)... We thought that at least Congress (I) would not shake hands with the B.J.P. and would bring down the Government though no-confidence motion later on because we had lost majority. We were aware of the result but we wanted to show the people... (Interruptions) But we stood the ground. We wanted to tell the people of the country, who were their real friends and who were their real enemies. Had we not done that the people would have remained ignorant... (Interruptions) Mr. Khurana, I am not accusing you... (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA :
Shahi Imam is your friend.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : We go hand in hand with both Hindus and Muslims, but your party is the admirer of Nathuram Godse. Please do not raise this matter here... (Interruptions)... Sir, when on November 7, 1990 the National Front Government was in office, we were expecting.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Where is Mr. Nathuram Mirdha, there is a reference to his name sake.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I am referring the Nathuram Godse. Sir, I was saying that at least people like us did not expect that Congress (I) would bring down our Government on November 7, 1990 on those issues. If they wanted to bring down our Government they could do so by bringing a 'No-confidence Motion' after two days. But they did not want it. With the result they had to face the consequences though they have bagged quite a few seats in the South, and this may be the result of sympathy wave started after the death of Shri Rajiv Gandhi or because of some other factors. In Andhra Pradesh the elections for 17 seats were held on 20 May 1991. Congress (I) just won 2 seats and in the June elections Telugu Desam, a constituent of National Front, won only 2 seats out of 24 seats. And so far as the North India is concerned Congress (I) must analyse the

causes of their outright defeat? It is time for you to undertake an analysis. North India was your vote Bank....

AN HON. MEMBER : Your party was also wiped out in North India.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : If bagging of just one seat in Bihar is a matter of satisfaction to Congress (I), then let it be so. In U.P. the Congress (I) was completely wiped out. Sir, I want to tell the Hon. Prime Minister, that it is a subject for introspection for the Congress (I) as to why the vote bank of the party, which it nursed for quite a long period viz. minorities and downtroddens, got disillusioned and drifted away from the Congress (I). Another subject for analysis is, why did the leaders of the stature of Shri Jagannath Mishra, Shri N. D. Tiwari, Dr. Rajindra Kumar Bajpayee and others met their Waterloo in Bihar and U.P. Sir, I want to state... (Interruptions) I am also saying the same thing.

In Bihar we raised the issue of social justice which prevailed over Ram-Temple issue but in U.P. it went into the background. I assure you that in the next election "Jai Siya Ram" slogan will not gain prominence over Mandal Commission issue and you will not be able to reap any benefit because of it. Sir, my submission is that the Government talks of principles and values but have no faith in what they say.

You passed and implemented anti-defection bill. Why did not the Congress (I) itself muster enough courage with 212 members in the last Lok Sabha to form the Government, after the fall of the National Front Government on account of withdrawal of support by the B.J.P. Why did they encourage on other party to form government through defection? What is the present strength of the Congress (I). At that time it had 212 members and now 224. Now the Congress (I) is seeking our support to form Government. Why did not the Congress (I) form Government with 212 members, but instead stated that it would form Government only if the party got majority of its own... (Interruptions)... I am saying the same thing. Sir, I advise Congress

(I) not to talk of principles and ideologies. A little while ago Mr. Arjun Singh was referring to the work done by Congress (I) since independence. 44 years have elapsed since independence. Every child grows but if a 44-year old man looks like a toddler then he cannot be treated as a healthy person. 44-year old man must be six feet in height but not 3 feet. The Government claims that the nation has progressed but upto 3 feet only and not upto 6 feet. It means country has not progressed to the desired extend. The Government conveniently forgets that out of 5,76,916 villages in the country 2 lakh villages have not been provided drinking water facilities. In these villages there are common ponds for drinking water for both the human beings and animals and still the Government claims that we are progressing. Even today, in reply to a question, you as the Minister of Human Resources Development have stated that 47 per cent population in the country is illiterate. Even after 44 years of independence 48 per cent population is illiterate. Is this the progress? In our country one crore persons are blind—is this the progress? People in the country are dying of leprosy, even then you claim that we are progressing. Sir, the Government claims that the nation is progressing, but I say that we are lagging behind. Every one knows that night soil of one is carired on head by another one. Have you any scheme for the abolition of this inhuman practice within six or 12 months (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Why did not you people do anything in this regard ? (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Golden era can be brought if the present Government adheres to the policies initiated by my party. Where is Mr. Sitaram Kesri, who makes hulla-baloo about the implementation of Mandal Commission reoprt. Even today's reply is meaningless. In reply to a question the Government has expressed its helplessness regarding the implementation of the Mandal Commission report and pretexted that the matter is *subjudice* in the Supreme Court but the newspapers carry reports that it will be implemented. Even the common list of State backward classes and the backward classes

mentioned in the Mandal Commission report, prepared by us, has not been published till today. Even then the Government promises to implement Mandal Commission report. Sir, therefore, I was saying (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI K. JAFFER SHARIEF) : Mr. Paswan, you raised the issue of carrying night soil by human beings. A progressive programme to end this practice was started by Congress (I) Government in Karnataka.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Whole of the country has been under the rule of the Congress Government. Only in in 1967, in some State the Opposition came to the power for the first time. For twenty years your party ruled in every State. Why did not you introduce land reforms? Why did not you abolish the system of carrying night sold on head? In today's independent India, children die of hunger and mothers throw their kids in the wells because they are unable to feed them. All this happens even today (Interruptions)

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us not paint a very wrong picture of the country. Can he quote any example where a child has been thrown into the well? (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : I can quote. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : No, it is not there. Don't paint a wrong picture. This is too much; it is not there (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, a women, named Omvati, committed suicide alongwith her three children. Everybody knows that she committed suicide alongwith her children because of her inability to face hunger and poverty (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are not claiming that. (*Interruptions*) But, let us not paint a wrong picture of the country that the children are thrown into the well. This condition is not there in the country. (*Interruptions*)
(*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if Shri Pilot wants, I am ready to accept the challenge to prove that not one but dozens of children are thrown into the wells because of starvation. Mothers kill their children because of these conditions. What do you talk ?

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, just three days back, a woman named Omvati committed suicide along with her three children. (*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : There is a communication gap. (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I will conclude within ten minutes. If I use an unparliamentary word you may check me. But if the hon. Minister has any objection on what I submit, he may challenge me, I would be ready to meet the challenge (*Interruptions*) You have not seen poverty. You visit that area in Bihar to which Shri Soren and Shri Mandal belong, even today the people of that area tie a piece of bamboo stick whenever a person breaks his leg. No hospital is there even today. You can see the deplorable condition of Bastar, even today the people of that area drink contaminated water which inducts germs into their bodies. They are living in such poor conditions. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chimur) : Today, you are reminded of poverty. For eleven months you were not aware of it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Till now, this Government has been dancing to the

tune of Tatas and Birlas. When you do justice to the poor you will also have to meet the fate which Government of National Front had met. You should always remember that it is not easy to do justice to the poor, though it is easy to speak of these things. (*Interruptions*) Today, all the capitalists are with Congress. (*Interruptions*) Congress has been in power till now. Now the Government is changing from anarchy to democracy. It is for the first time that it has tried to change to democracy. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI BALKRAM JAKHAR) : You may say anything but we will have to go by the thought content? Have you gone bankrupt? Deans may take place but we have to see as what are the reasons behind these deaths. In order to meet the requirement of the population of 34 crores foodgrains had to be imported, whereas now we have 20 million tonnes of foodgrains in buffer stock even after meeting the requirements of 85 crores of people. You must keep in mind the progress we have made. (*Interruptions*) It is not correct to say that we have not made progress.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Credit goes to the farmers and I am thankful to Shri Jakhar for what he has said. However, in 1977 when I was elected to this House I had asked a question about India's total foreign debt and the reply was Rs. 21 thousand crore. In 1980 when the same question was raised, the answer was that not a single penny had been taken as loan during 1977-79. But how is it that in 1982 the amount of foreign debt increased to Rs. 23,000 crore and in 1985 to Rs. 4500 crore. Foreign debt at present is to the tune of Rs. 1 lakh crore. What did you do with that money ? (*Interruptions*) I think you have done nothing except increasing the assets of Tatas and Birlas. You have mortgaged the country. Foreign debt has increased to Rs. one lakh crore and even then you have not made provision for drinking water in the rural areas. You have not opened schools and hospitals in villages. You were talking of our eleven months' rule. If you complete the works started by us during our eleven months' rule the country would make great progress within a period of five years (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my submission is that our Government was voted out of power on three issues. First one was secularism. There is no doubt that communal forces in the country are raising their head and are strengthening themselves. There are such parties in the country that when I went for my election campaign (*Interruptions*)
.....

During electioneering when I visited the constituency of Shri Sharad Pawar. I heard leaders of Shiv Sena openly declaring that if their Government came to power they would remove the statue of Mahatama Gandhi and install the statue of Nathuram Godse. However the next day, Shri Lal K. Advani contradicted the statement. I am thankful to him for this. But again the leaders of Shiv Sena repeated that whatever they had stated was true and Shri Advani was nobody to interpret their statements. There was not a single newspaper which did not report this news item. Shri Advani himself is aware of it (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANANTRAO DESHMUKH (Washim) : No statement to this effect was made, I refute this statement (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few words to my Congress colleagues, that so far as communalism is concerned, they cannot claim that they have clean hands. So far as Babri Masjid issue is concerned, they committed the very first blunder by laying the foundation stone there. They cannot deny this fact. Whenever, such occasion comes, there is not much difference between Cong. (I) and BJP. They raise the bogey of threat to the Hindu nation in the name of communalism RSS is the first to come to their rescue. Even today, they are having secret understanding but in future it is bound to come to light. Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to submit that in 1980 on Bhindranwala issue, Shri Advani and Shri Vajpayee had said that people should not indulge in the politics of religion. Do not carry on political activities from the Golden Temple. My submission that when it was not fair to indulge in poli-

tics from the Golden Temple, then it is also not fair to play politics in the name of temple. Both are wrong . . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad) : Paswanji, don't link it with the temple, link it with Jama Masjid. You surrendered before the Imam.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Prime Minister of a secular country meets the Shankaracharya, bows to the Pope, meets a Muslim leader, that does not mean communalism in a Secular State (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit to my colleagues that this country is like a garden and all of us in Parliament are like gardeners.

I agree with Shri Saifuddin Soz when he said that he goes to mosque as a Muslim devotee but in Parliament he came to Parliament as an MP, as a representative. Therefore, I would request all the Members to nourish the country like a gardner, only then the country will prosper every flower will have opportunity to bloom. This country has Hindus, Sikhs, Christians downtrodden and Brahmins also. You talk of a Hindu nation. I would like to ask you whether it is not a Hindu nation now ? (*Interruptions*) I will take an active part in the discussion when the resolution on Ram Janam Bhoomi—Babri Masjid will come up. However, today, I would only submit that even today ours is a Hindu nation. Does anyone, whether it is the Prime Minister, President, Vice-President, Chief Justice or Chief Election Commissioner of India belong to a minority community ? All are Hindus. Which nation do you want to create ? What type of Hindu nation do you want ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North) : If the head of a country is Hindu, does that mean that it is a Hindu nation ? If the leader of his party is Hindu does that mean that his is a Hindu party. This is wrong. People will start calling Janata Party, a Hindu party. He should think before saying anything (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, religion is a separate thing and nationality is a separate thing. Who is a national and who is a foreigner? The person who is prepared to sacrifice his life for the country is a true national, and the person who is a traitor may be called a foreigner. If someone asks me, 'who was the greatest patriot', I will name Shri Abdul Hamid, who was given the highest award—the 'Param Veer Chakra'—for his courage during the Indo-Pak war of 1965. Sardar Bhagat Singh was another great patriot, who merrily faced the gallows. The biggest traitor is the person who accumulates wealth of the country in foreign banks and makes money as a middleman in Bofors deal (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, our country is based on secularism and social justice. We cannot leave it. During these 43 years of independence, you have talked a lot about the backwards and scheduled castes.....

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Member, please conclude. You are a very good parliamentarian.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will conclude within 5 minutes. A lot is said about the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. But even after 43 years of independence, everybody is aware that there is increase in the naxalite activities. Have you ever thought as to why naxalite activities are increasing in Andhra Pradesh and Bihar? You are trying to kill the mosquitoes only. You can kill mosquitoes with D.D.T. but until the dirty drains are cleaned, it will continue to breed mosquitoes, even if you kill lakhs of mosquitoes. From where these problems of naxalites, Bodo Land and Jharkhand are arising? They could not get justice even after these 44 years of independence and were tolerating injustice in one form or the other. Therefore, they have only two ways—one is of non-violence and the other is violence. When the issue cannot be settled peacefully they resort to violence. Don't think that people, who are meek, do not have heart or feel pain. You should remember that your party is bound to disintegrate if you implement the report of the Mandal Commission. No one wants to live in this darkness. This is not so simple. Those who

have ruled over the poor and the backward for thousands of years, are not going to leave this practice easily. Today, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Shri Naik, belongs to a Banjara Community and Shri Advani appointed a Kurmi as the Chief Minister (Interruptions) In Maharashtra, Shivaji, Sahuji, Mahatma Phule and Dr. Ambedkar brought social revolution. In South, this revolution was started by Periyar and carried on upto Annadurai (Interruptions) The Congressmen were the first to oppose Mandal Commission, and as a result, they were wiped out from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. B.J.P. was also wiped out from Bihar. Shri Advani was arrested in the constituency from where I have won (Interruptions) The person, who laid the foundation stone contested against me and secured third place. Advaniji and Atalji went to this constituency but in vain (Interruptions) Because they have opposed the Mandal Commission. I would only like to submit that we cannot leave the issue of social justice. You have said about providing "power to the people". I would like to amend it as "power to the poor". Power to the people means people like Tatas and Birlas. Whenever you refer to power to the people, you should talk about providing power to the poor. During our regime, the labour participation in Management Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha and I remember that even the trade union leaders belonging to the Congress Party and the B.J.P. were in favour of referring it to a Select Committee. You will not implement it because it is our commitment to provide social justice, secularism and power to the poor. It is immaterial whether the number of our MPs is 56 or it is only six... (Interruptions). This is our basic struggle. Sita was kidnapped ... (Interruptions) ... Leave this topic, but in the name of Rama you cannot mislead the people for long. The issue should be of social justice, secularism and power to the poor. You will have to pay attention to the farmers and the labourers and should not give importance to Tatas and Birlas. You must take oath to have rule of the farmers and the labourers ... (Interruptions) ... Not only the downtrodden and the minorities but the people like Dayanand Saraswati, Buddha, Gandhi and Vivekananda also

fought for social justice and now Shri V. P. Singh is fighting for it ... (*Interruptions*) ... I am saying why Shri V. P. Singh is being abused. He belongs neither to the backward classes nor to the minorities, but even then he is being abused, because he tried to implement the report of the Mandal Commission and tried to maintain secularism by saying that the Mosque should be kept intact. A lot depends upon the reply, that is to be given by the Hon. Prime Minister, regarding the Government's stand in this regard, because the Uttar Pradesh Government says that they will demolish the Mosque

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : This has never been said. He is misleading.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I would like to know from the B.J.P. leaders whether they have not said that the temple will be constructed by removing the Mosque.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : Just now the hon. Member has alleged that the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh has said that the Mosque will be demolished. I would like to challenge him where this has been said.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : 'Gur khao gulgule se purhaze' ... (*Interruptions*) ... Is it not true that the BJP and the Government of U.P. want to construct a temple at the same site, where the Shilanyas Ceremony had been performed? If this is not correct, they should spell out their programme.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : It is wrong to say that the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh has spoken of demolishing the Mosque and he wants to incite communal feeling by saying such things.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : Is it not true that Shri V. P. Singh had said that there was no mosque, in Ayodhya. When there is no mosque, the question of demolishing it does not arise.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : It is very good, if the Members of the BJP say

that no temple will be constructed by demolishing the Mosque. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please take your seat. I think we have a lot of discussion on this issue and Shri Paswan is able enough in expressing his views in a few words. Please conclude.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I was saying about the attitude of the present Government and about the understanding, they have reached with the BJP during the last two three days for the posts of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker. I would like to submit if the National Front and the Left Parties wanted to elect their own candidates for the posts, they would have done so, but I have already said it in the very beginning that both the Congress and the BJP are equally poisonous to us. Therefore, we are not ready to enter into any agreement with anyone of them. (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : When Shri V. P. Singh was the Prime Minister and we were supporting him, we were all right. But, when we withdrew our support, we have become like poison for them.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA : They came to us with folded hands for our Party's support.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : We were not like poison to them, when their Government continued for 11 months and they remained in power with our support.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in those 11 months, we were like Lord Shiva and were drinking their poison.

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karolbagh) : How can they talk of justice now, when they themselves have caused maximum damage to the scheduled castes? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying that the present Congress Government has no programme before it regarding social justice, secularism and power to the poor. I don't know what will be the reply of the Hon. Prime Minister and therefore, I and my party totally oppose this motion.

[English]

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated-Anglo-Indian) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the noisy speeches what I am going to say is like an antidote. (*Interruptions*) I rise to give my supreme support to the motion of the Prime Minister. I am not abusing anybody. I have never been a member of the Congress Party. (*Interruptions*) I am the senior-most Member of this House. For the last 40 years. I have been associated with the Nehru family.

I cannot understand the innumerable oddities which Shri Advani has mentioned. The supreme oddity is that in one breath he said that he was opposing the Motion, and in the other breath he said that the Motion will not be lost because nobody wanted the Government to fall.

And another supreme oddity is, here is a party that sits in the Opposition committed to the extreme form of religious fundamentalism. That is what I do not understand. They had taken an oath that they would support secularism but they preach bitter hatred against one particular religion and the largest minority in India.

May I say this that while the Nehru era was there, democracy was in its best form. May I also say this, that Shrimati Indira Gandhi was hailed in the British Press as the 'Iron Lady' as the Iron Lady who controls the largest democracy in the world and she was the only democratic leader in the world who controlled inflation. That was Indira Gandhi. She was hailed in the World Press also as the Iron Lady. I was at one time a student of Economics but given it up later. Now I see a number of economists who are giving divergent opinions. As a lawyer I know that one lawyer can take care of one side of a case and another can really reject it completely.

I have some very good friends in America. One of those friends sent me three books. In one of those books the author talks about the effects of the recent war in the middle-east. The unemployment rate has gone up tremendously. In America many people are unemployed now. Many people are sleeping on the streets and getting their food from the dust-bins of five-star hotels.

May I say this, that when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was presiding over the Centenary Annual General meeting of the All India Anglo-Indian Association, she mentioned—I had the privilege of being the elected President of the institution that celebrated its centenary in 1976—that Mr. Frank Anthony refused to allow his community to be referred to as a backward community; he never allowed it to be branded as a backward class. What I say is this. Here are some people who, because of their considerable contribution to the development of India, refuse to be branded as backward.

I give here an example of their gallantry. In the Kashmir conflict, when the tribals were a few miles away from Srinagar the infiltrators were driven away by the Indian Air Force which was manned by people of my community. Half of the gallantry awards were given to Anglo-Indian fighter pilots. The task that you have undertaken Mr. Prime Minister is gigantic and unusual. We talk of a nation but we are much more than a nation; we are a sub-continent. In fact, we have 179 languages and 500 dialects and patois. That is the extent to which you have to control this country. I wish you well. Although the five Prime Ministers have always recommended me for nomination to the first Anglo-Indian seat in the Lok Sabha they never asked me to join the Congress. This was the tribute to their sense of secularism.

MR. SPEAKER : I think the House agrees to sit until this item is disposed of.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : So, it is agreed. Now the Prime Minister.

(/ THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and given me invaluable views, opinions, guidelines, admonitions, etc., etc. I am grateful to them because we stand at a point in the history of this country, where all these become relevant just because we fall short by ten or twelve votes. That is the immediate reason. But, Sir, that is not really the reason which I see from the experience

of the elections. Before the elections we know that a lot was being written and said about a hung parliament. Even before the elections were announced, wise leaders of this country warned that the days of massive majorities are over. This country should know, the people should know what to expect in future and they should also be mentally and politically prepared to face situations where no single party would get the majority and be able to form the Government. It is not that this was unanticipated. These situations were anticipated and I am sure each of the political parties in this country had anticipated—not necessarily was sure about it but had anticipated in passing, my party certainly did. And in that view, we had to consider how this party would function or the Government of this party would function if the people voted it to power. I was asked times without number, Sir, by pressmen during the campaigns, whether I believed that the Congress party would get a majority. I said: "yes". The next question was, if you do not get a majority, what will you do? The answer was: "I would not say anything about a hypothetical question. I am sure that I am going to get a majority. That was what any leader of a party going to elections would say. At the same time, I made it very clear because of the warnings uttered by our wise leaders that whether I get ten more or ten less, it does not matter so much to me, my style of functioning is to be one of consensus. I said this. I have gone on record publicly to say that I will not ride rough-shod, the Congress party would not ride rough-shod and we would like to create areas of agreement. These were the words that I had used.

18.00 hrs.

We would like to keep areas of disagreement aside because we have both areas. And the delicate situation, the very dangerous situation in which the country finds itself today demands this approach of all parties and I said certainly of my party. I agree that this is going to be my approach never mind whether we get ten less or ten more. Even if we get 300 we cannot solve the problems just by the strength of numbers. That time has gone. The problems of the country are much too

complicated for one party or one party Government to go ahead single-handedly to try to solve them. It will help if you have a majority. It will be a little difficult if you do not have a majority. But in any case, to say that if I have a majority I need not consult any one else and I will consult only if I fail short would be wrong. That has not been my approach.

On the fourth day of my assumption of office because one or two days were spent in giving portfolios, I had separate meetings with revered leaders of the opposition parties. All of them have worked with me. We have worked together. I have very good relations with each one of them. So I called them. They were good enough to come. So far as Mr. Chandra Sekhar is concerned, I called on him as is the custom. We discussed generally about how to go about it. Because we are ten short, it did not deter me from forming a government and it did not deter me from going ahead with my consultations in general with all the parties. And I am glad that the response was encouraging. The realisation that today the mandate of the people, whatever it may be, positively or negatively is not for going to them again. This mandate has gone home. It has been realised by all parties, all Members. And apart from the other impracticability of having elections in the next two or three months the political message was clear that you do not expect a massive majority hereafter but you do try to run a Government and solve the problems of the people which are crying for solution.

You cannot be harping on what you do not agree with. Keep them aside and go ahead and serve the people.

So my interpretation of the result is this. The people have come back to the Congress but with a warning. They say, yes, Congress will form the Government but Congress will not ride rough shod. The Congress will have to try its very best to find a consensus with other parties. But still the people said, if there is a party in which we have faith that it will run the Government, it is the Congress Party and no other party.

Having said that I would certainly agree that the consensus that we need could **clude us** sometimes. Suppose I want a constitutional amendment which my party considers very important, it is obvious that I cannot bring it unless Advaniji agrees, unless Vishwanathji agrees, unless other friends like Indrajitji and Somnathji agree or at least I have enough agreements to push it through even if there is a little disagreement here and there. It happened before. In 1977 the Janata Party had a massive majority in this House and the Congress had an equally massive majority in the other House. From the 42nd to the 44th amendments we held discussions, negotiations. We were members in the opposition at that time. We said: "We will not allow this to go through unless you allow that to go through." So after a good deal of negotiation we agreed ultimately on the 44th amendment. So that is how many of the provisions which were brought in the 42nd amendment got modified in the 44th amendment. That is the only way of running the government in this country successfully hereafter. I believe that. Unless the people in their wisdom again give a massive mandate to one of the parties I do not see any other way of running the government.

On the fifth day when we had individual discussions, I called the leaders to come for a joint meeting where the absolutely desperate economic situations in the country, which brooks no delay at all, I want that situation to be explained by my Finance Minister. I could have waited. In fact I would have waited had the situation been not as desperate as that. Today it is the 15th of July. If those measures had not been taken on the 15th of July—it was clear, absolutely certain—that India was going to become a defaulter. Once you become a defaulter what happens to the country, what happens to the economy is well-known. I do not have to describe it. What happens to inflation, what happens to your credibility, what happens to your credit worthiness, what happens to all the deposits which the N.R.s have put in your banks in the confidence that this Government would be stable, any Government in India would be stable and their ~~money~~ **money** would not be jeopardized. There would be a run on these banks and where

would be? Therefore, the absolute urgency of the situation made me request these friends to come and have a little chat, a sitting with my Finance Minister at which all this was explained. Now, we did not tell them two things. Mr. Indrajit Gupta has complained about those two things not having been told to them in so many words, but I do not plead guilty in that. When a step like adjustment of exchange rate is taken, I do not think that we could tell that to anyone in advance. I know they are all my friends. I know I need their support. I know if they want to bring the Government down they can. *Even so*, I would say that it is neither fair for them to ask for these two decisions to send gold outside to be deposited in a bank, so that you can immediately take some money which you need so badly. About those two decisions, it was not fair, it would not be fair on their part to ask and it would not be fair at all on my part to divulge at that stage. All the other measures which were really written about in newspaper times without number. For months and months they were being discussed. Panel discussions took place. So, it is not as if the measures which we have taken just dropped from the heaven overnight, we were not even three-four days old, how could we prepare all those papers? The papers were ready. The decisions had not been taken and personally I think they were not taken, they could not be taken for very valid reasons. The Governments the Chandra Shekharji's Government was not in a position to take those decisions and it is as well that they did not take those decisions. The result was that the accumulated decision making fell on our head and we had no time to lose and, therefore, we had to take all these decisions.

Now, it was not a piecemeal approach at all. We have taken all the decisions. There is only one thing now which is to come before the people, but it will have to come before the House since the Parliament is in Session and that is the Industrial Policy reforms. I am sure that in the next two or three days we are going to give final touches to it and it will come before the House and it will go before the people. But to say that it is a piecemeal approach, it is not correct. It has very

much to do with industrialisation, and the products of industrialisation being sent in trade and export matters. So, there is a multi-faceted thing and which is inter-disciplinary, and it is not a decision or a series of decisions taken within five or six days in isolation. They are not decisions in isolation. They emanated from the same decision or same approach to the problems that are facing today. Now, what have I done? What has the Government done? We know that there are no alternatives to what we have done. We have only salvaged the prestige of this country.

"Sarvanashe Samutpanne ardh tyajati Paaditah."

This is precisely what we have done. I do not say that our economy has been booming or is going to boom immediately. What I am saying is *sarvanashe samutpanne*. What would have happened today if we had not done that? We have done it so as to salvage the economy. Naturally there is a long distance to go. This is not all. This is not the final solution, this is only the beginning. If you do not have a beginning, you cannot have an end. Therefore, the journey, the mahaprasthan starts today after we have taken these decisions. These decisions have not been criticised . . . (Interruptions). And what has been the result? This is what I want our friends to understand. What has been the result in the atmosphere? What has been the change in the atmosphere? Within the last one week, the Finance Minister has received literally hundreds of messages from the NRIs abroad saying that they are going to support India now. They are not going to pull their moneys back. People have come from other countries to say : we are here to trade with you let us enter a long-term agreement. Within the next few weeks we will be entering long-term agreements to supply things to other countries and they might be in a mood to give us some money in advance also to tide over the crisis in which we find ourselves today. Now, these are the immediate fall outs of the decisions taken.

As I said, these decisions are not without hazards. These decisions are not unqualified decisions and I cannot say, I can-

not guarantee that these decisions will not bring their own distress and their own disadvantage. But that is where the Congress manifesto and the history of the Congress, the party that runs the Government, comes into the picture. It is not Mr. Manmohan Singh. Manmohan Singh plus Mahatama Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi and we, the small people on whom the mantle has fallen, this is a combination. Here is a person who knows what is to be done and here we are who know what the people want. There will be a marriage between the two. There is absolutely no doubt about it. We will not pursue anything which will be against the national interest or against the programmes of the Congress meant for the poor. This is the guarantee that I can give to this House. We go by the manifesto.

Just two days back . . . (Interruptions) Just day before yesterday, we have given some finishing touches to the new Public Distribution System that we want to bring in to this country. Public Distribution System has been talked about. Except in two or three States, it has not been a success. It has not been successfully implemented. For hours and hours we had to go into the loopholes of the Public Distribution System. This would never have happened if it had not been a Government devoted to the poor, devoted to the interests of the poor. So, we had to start work from scratch, begin at the grass-roots. We will see to it that when the programme comes on the ground, this stuff, these essential commodities will certainly reach the last of the Fair Price Shops in the village. That is the nitty-gritty we have gone into. We have not only enunciated principles. We have not only repeated from the paras of the manifesto, we have gone a head and arranged for this. Now, before the House adjourns after the session, I am going to announce those things in this House and in the other House. That is the time frame I have kept before myself. How we are going to reform the Public Distribution System, what is going to come in the place of the ramshackle that you have in the name of Public Distribution system today, these things will be clearly brought before the House. I have committed myself. I am now committing before the House. I have

committed my Government to this course of action. So, first we take this commitment.

As regards the political aspect, I am waiting for this vote to be passed in this House, I should be very plain. I did not want to touch the political aspect before the confidence vote is passed by this House. That is in the fitness of things. That is what political or other propriety demands that I should be armed with a right to run the Government, the mandate to run the Government. Positively or negatively, by whatever means the voting pattern suggests or allows, the Government should be in a position to run from tomorrow so that I take up these matters. Not that I have not done the home work, I have done the home work, but I will start consultations with other party leaders tomorrow. I have spoken to one of the leaders this morning and he said, 'Yes, you are right, we will start our sittings from tomorrow.' I can assure the House that on these very important matters that have so far defied complete solutions, we have to be in touch, we have to discuss, we have to find a consensus and without a consensus it will not be possible to solve those problems for good. Even with consensus, whether we will be able to solve them within the time frame that we have in mind I am doubtful, but at the same time if there is no consensus there will be no solution, I am absolutely clear on that. So, this is going to be the methodology, this is going to be the approach and with this approach I have come to this House because the President asked me to find out whether this House is prepared to let this Government run from tomorrow. This is the *summum bonum* of the whole thing. We have gone into the question of what the Congress Governments have done and what the others have done. We have bandied insults and abuses times without number in the last 40 years. But at the end of 40 years, the people have given this mandate. At the end of 40 years I am sure they must have considered all aspects of Mr. Paswan's diatribe, I have no doubt about it. They have done it and may be they wanted to tell us also that we have not done so well in the past, so beware. Agreed... I agree that this is so. This is a warning, I take it as a chance given by the people to me to mend the Party Gov-

ernment if there have been any lapses, and there have been plenty of lapses in the past; to correct them in time so that this Government will not really be leading to another national disaster. I would not lead to another national disaster, I would take everybody into confidence to the extent it is possible. Still there are areas in which nobody can be taken into confidence. If hon. Members want me to tell them what the budget is going to contain, sorry, I cannot do that, and I am sure I won't be asked such questions. So, let us start with consulting each other. In the process of consultation we will immediately find out, we will come to know what is to be discussed, what is to be kept aside. The area of agreement we will concentrate on; the area of disagreement we will keep aside, if possible. Within the area of agreement we give and take. If there is a view which is better than the Government's view in some respects, I am prepared to take your view and see that what I have started with is modified accordingly. I have no difficulty, I have no inhibition in doing that. That will be the approach. So, this is the approach with which I am entreating this House. I have come to this House with this motion. Whether it is confidence or not, whether in 15 days you could judge, whether you could really judge what we are going to do in future, all this is there, you can ask yourself all these questions to which you may or may not find answers. But at the end of the day you have to vote on this. That is what is before you, that is the vote. That is the thing I am concerned with. I have to run the Government tomorrow, I cannot have the debating society *ad nauseam*. We can debate, we can debate the lapses, we can debate the plus points, the minus points, all these are all right, but the point is that the Government has to run tomorrow and by common consent, as far as I could remember, all sections of the House and the people themselves want that there should be a Government and we should not go back to them with a beggar's bowl saying, "Well, we are not able to run the Government but still give us votes again. This kind of thing they will not tolerate." That is why we are here discussing, debating on this motion and this is what is what I beg of you to consider as the most crucial aspect of the voting today.

Sir, about Assam I just wanted to give a little clarification. It is said that there was a general amnesty and all that was done wrongly. I have to tell the House that we have a State Government there which is dealing with this problem. Left to myself, I would let the State Government deal with the problem without interfering, without taking an initiative from Delhi itself and creating more confusion in the short run. I would see how the State Government deals with the situation, I would not like to come to any hasty conclusion about that. What Mr. Saikia, the Chief Minister before the election did was that he gave a commitment to the people that those against whom there are no cases pending or only small, petty cases are pending—if I have understood his report correctly—will be released. That is what he has done after assuming power. It is not an amnesty in the sense in which those against whom heinous offences are there, have been released. It is not like that. He made a commitment. There was nothing of this abduction in the picture at that time. So, after the abduction, he has naturally started efforts to see that those who have been abducted are not killed. One person has been killed already; we do not know under what circumstances he has been killed. But his first priority is to save the lives of these people and if any exchange or any releases are necessary in order to do that, then as a responsible Chief Minister he will do that. We should watch the situation for some more time before pronouncing a verdict on what has been done. It is not a question of general amnesty that everybody is being released as a *quid pro quo*. As I said, it is not a *quid pro quo*. It is an one sided commitment which we gave before the election and which he has implemented after the election. But the rest, it is a question of negotiation and that is going on. That is how I understand. I also understand that the local units of all the parties whose leaders have criticised this decision today are in favour of this decision. They have passed a resolution. I have got a copy of that resolution. So, there seems to be some hiatus between what the leaders here think and what their junior partners there think. You may better check up with them. I have an authority that there is a resolution. A resolution has been passed

with the signatures of the leaders of all the parties, not just Mr Saikia himself. So, I would like to place that before the House and that would explain all these things.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Ban-
kura) : What is there in the resolution?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : There is an appeal to both sides in this resolution, asking the ULFA to respond to the steps taken by the Government and release of TADA detainees. The signatories include representatives from all the national political parties including those at the national level appear to be critical of the offer of release. This is what I said. So, it is all right, I mean if the local units think in a particular way we should respect the views of the local units because they know where the shoe pinches. So, let them do it. They are doing in a joint manner. I think the Chief Minister is taking others into confidence evidently and they have come out with this joint statement. So, let us wait and let us not pronounce anything just now.

Sir, about the industrial reforms, I said they are still in the offing. In the next two or three days we will come out with them. But as always happens, three or four newspapers have come out with versions which do not tally entirely with each other and any intelligent guess is possible to bring all those things that have appeared in the papers. So, let us not go by what has been contained in the newspapers. What I would say is that we are deregulating the economy, but at our own pace. We welcome foreign investment, but on our terms and in areas we deem important and critical. This is the cardinal principle subject to which we are doing this. If we consider that in an area no industrialisation is necessary or if it is injurious from the point of view of a developing country—and we can conceive of many such situations where it may not be injurious from their point of view in their countries, but it is certainly injurious from our point of view in our country—the Government reserves the right to stop that kind of industry from coming here. It is not as though we have opened up to an extent where everybody is welcome to come and do everything here. It is not

ossible. So, bulk of our controls, we have found have hampered the economic activities in the past. This has been the experience. Time has come according to the Government and according to everyone because this change is sweeping the whole world. I do not want to say anything about Comrade Gorbachev and what is happening in other countries. All this has been said already. People are more knowledgeable than myself on what is happening in the Soviet Union. That has been spoken. So, I do not have to repeat all that we cannot keep out of this change, this complete global sweeping change that is coming. May-be in the manner in which we manage the change in this country, we may be committing mistakes. I am not quite sure that others are not committing mistakes. But I do not want to commit. So, let us find out. You are authorities on this. I am prepared to sit with you and discuss what we did, what we should do and what needs to be done. BJP friends also can tell us what needs not to be done, all that. Let us come to an understanding of what should be done in pursuance of this great change which you cannot ignore and if we ignore, we do it at our peril. We will be simply isolated in the world and we do not want this isolation to come to India. That is why, there is so much of area in which we could come to an agreement, to an understanding and I can assure you that I will keep my mind open. The Government mind will be absolutely open to new ideas, new innovative ideas that may be coming from any quarter. This is the spirit in which we are approaching the problems of the country.

I need not reply to all the points that have been raised, some of them are relevant but you know in such a long debate, some irrelevant things also slip in. Nothing can be done about them. You will pardon me if I do not really follow those hon. Members, I do not chase them into those fields which I consider irrelevant.

Thank you very much. I command this Motion for the acceptance of the House. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against will please say 'No'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the 'Ayes' have it. The 'Ayes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The 'Noes' have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be cleared—

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, As Division Numbers have not so far been allotted to Members, it is not possible to hold the Division by the Automatic Vote Recording Machine. Division will now take place under Rule 367AA by distribution of slips.

Members will be supplied at their seats with 'Aye'/'No' printed slips for recording their votes. 'Aye' slips are printed on one side in green, both in English and Hindi and 'No' in red on its reverse. On these slips, Members may kindly record votes of their choice by signing and writing their *identity card numbers*, names, constituency and State/Union Territory and date legibly at the places specified on the slip. (*Interruptions*) Or else, you can write your names at least. Members who desire to record 'Abstention' may ask for the 'Abstention' slip which is in yellow colour. Immediately after recording his vote, each Member should pass on his slip to the Division Clerk who will call upon his seat to collect the same for handing over to the Officers at the Table. Members are requested to fill in only one slip for the division.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, hon. Members I think the Hindi version of this statement is available to you. I will again read it out. To be more exact, you can put on your earphone. You would get word-by-word translation of what I am reading

here again because if I just translate, there may be a slip here and there. Well, I will repeat it again. If you want, I can translate word-by-word. But that would be more correct. I will read it out again.

As Division Numbers have not so far been allotted to Members, it is not possible to hold the Division by the Automatic Vote Recording Machine. Division will now take place under Rule 367AA by distribution of slips.

Members will be supplied at their seats with 'Aye'/'No' printed slips for recording their votes. 'Aye' slips are printed on one side in green, both in English and Hindi and 'No' in red on its reverse. On these slips, Members may kindly record votes of their choice by signing and writing their identity card numbers. If they do not remember their identity card Nos., they can write their names, constituency and State/Union Territory and date legibly at the places specified on the slip. Members who desire to record 'Abstention' may ask for the 'Abstention' slip which is in yellow colour. Immediately after record his vote, each Member should pass on his slip to the Division Clerk who will call upon his seat to collect the same for handing over to the Officers at the Table. Members are requested to fill in only one slip for the Division.

[Translation]

I would like to speak in Hindi. The electronic voting device is not working and the division numbers have not been allotted to the Members. Therefore, you will be given a slip and you have to write your name on it. The slips would be in two colours—green and red. Whatever you want to write, whether Ayes or Noes, you can write. If you want to write on both the slips, you can do so. You have to write your name, State/UT and Identity Card No. ... (*Interruptions*).

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, he has got neither any identity nor any State because he is a nominated Member. (*Interruptions*).

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Thereafter you may record 'Aye' or 'No'. He will be provided with another slip in yellow colour.

You may vote according to your choice. Our staff members will collect it from you and then the slips will be counted. Thereafter the result will be announced. The 'Aye' slips are printed in green letters and 'No' in red. The 'Abstention' slip is in yellow colour. I think this explanation is enough.

[English]

The question is :

That the following motion moved by the Prime Minister be adopted :—

"That this House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers."

Now Division—Let the slips be distributed.

AYES

[18.46 hrs.

Div. No. 1]

- Ahamed, Shri E. (Manjeri)
- Ahirwar, Shri Anand (Sagar).
- Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin (Hanamkonda).
- Aiyar, Shri Mani Shankar (Mayiladuturai)
- Anbarasu Era, Shri (Madras Central)
- Annayagari, Shri Sai Pratap (Rajampet)
- Anthony, Shri Frank (Nominated Anglo-Indian)
- Anulay, Shri A. R. (Kulaba)
- Arunachalam, Shri M. (Tenkasi)
- Asokaraj, Shri A. (Perambalur)
- Athithan, Shri R. Dhanuskodi (Tiruchendur)
- Banerjee, Kumari Mamata (Calcutta-South)
- Bansal, Shri Pawan Kumar (Chandigarh)
- Bhadana, Shri Avtar Singh (Faridabad)
- Bhagat, Shri Vishweshwar (Balaghat)
- Bhagey Gobardhan, Shri (Mayurbhanj)
- Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan (Andaman-Nicobar)
- Bhandari, Shrimati Dil Kumari (Sikkim)
- Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram (Sarangarh)
- Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu (Sambalpur)

- Bhonsle, Shri Prataprao B. (Satara)**
Bhonsle, Shri Tejsinghrao (Ramtek)
 Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh (Jhabua)
 Birbal, Shri (Ganganagar)
 Buta Singh, Shri (Jalore)
 Chacko, Shri P. C. (Trichur)
 Chaliha, Shri Kirip (Guwahati)
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal (Durg)
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati Maragatham
 (Sriperumbudur)
 Charles, Shri A. (Trivendrum)
 Chaudhri, Shri Narain Singh (Hissar)
 Chaudhary, Shri Ram Prakash (Ambala)
 Chaure, Shri Bapu Hari (Dhule)
 Chavan, Shri Prithviraj D. (Karad)
 Chavda, Shri Ishwarbhai Khodabhai
 (Anand)
 Chennithala, Shri Ramesh (Kottayam)
 Chidambaram, Shri P. (Sivaganga)
 Chinta Mohan, Dr. (Tirupathi)
 Chowdhury, Shri A. B. A. Ghani Khan
 (Malda)
 Demor, Shri Somjibhai (Dohad)
 Deka, Shri Prabin (Mangaldoi)
 Delkar, Shri Mohan (Dadra and Nagar
 Haveli)
 Dennis, Shri N. (Nagercoil)
 Deora, Shri Murlī (Bombay South)
 Deshmukh, Shri Anantrao (Washim)
 Dev, Shri Santosh Mohan (Tripura
 West)
 Devarajan, Shri B. (Rasipuram)
 Devi, Maharani Bibhu Kumari (Tripura
 East)
 Dighe, Shri Sharad (Bombay-North
 Central)
 Digvijaya Singh, Shri (Rajgarh)
 Diwan, Shri Pawan (Mahasamund)
- Dutt, Shri Sunil (Bombay-North)
 Farook, Shri M. O. H. (Pondicherry)
 Fernandes, Shri Oscar (Udupi)
 Gaikwad, Shri Udaisinghrao (Kolhapur)
 Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath (Berham-
 pur)
 Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai (Mandvi)
 Gangula, Shri Prathap Reddy (Nand-
 yal)
 Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya (Nandar-
 bar)
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok (Jodhpur)
 Ghatowar, Shri Paban Singh (Dibru-
 garh)
 Giriappa, Shri C. P. Mudala (Chitra-
 durga)
 Gogoi, Shri Tarun (Kaliabor)
 Gomango, Shri Giridhar (Koraput)
 Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi (Palani)
 Govindarajulu, Shri R. Kanaga (Siva-
 kasi)
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K. (Bijapur)
 Handigue, Shri Bijoy Krishna (Jorhat)
 Hooda, Shri Bhupinder Singh (Rohtak)
 Imchalemba, Shri (Nagaland)
 Inderjit, Shri (Darjeeling)
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K. (Bangalore
 North)
 Jakhar, Shri Bal Ram (Sikar)
 Janarthanan, Shri M. R. (Tirunelveli)
 Jangde, Shri Khelan Ram (Vilaspur)
 Jatav, Shri Bare Lal (Morena)
 Jawali, Dr. B. G. (Gulbarga)
 Jayamohan, Shri A. (Tirupattur)
 Jeevarathinam, Shri R. (Arkonam)
 Jhikram, Shri Mohan Lal (Mandla)
 Juvvadi, Shri Chokka Rao (Karim
 Nagar)

- Kahandole, Shri Z. M. (Malegam)
- Kale, Shri Shankar Rao (Kopergaon)
- Kaliaperumal, Shri P. P. (Cuddalore)
- Kamal Nath, Shri (Chindwara)
- Kamat, Shri Gurudas (Bombay-North-East)
- Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram (Osmanabad)
- Kamson, Prof. M. (Outer Manipur)
- Kanithi, Dr. Viswanatham (Srikakulam)
- Karreddula, Kamla Kumari (Bhadra-chalam)
- Kasu, Shri Venkata Krishna Reddy (Narasaraopeta)
- Kaul, Shrimati Sheila (Rae Bareilly)
- Khan, Shri Aslam Sher (Betul)
- Khan, Shri Ayub (Jhunjhunu)
- Khursheed, Shri Salman (Farrukhabad)
- Konathala, Shri Rama Krishna (Anakapalli)
- Krishnaswamy, Shri M. (Vandavasi)
- Ksirsagar, Shrimati Kesharbai Sonaji (Beed)
- Kuli, Shri Balin (Lakhimpur)
- Kumarmangalam, Shri Rangrajan (Salem)
- Kuppuswamy, Shri C. K. (Coimbatore)
- Kurien, Prof. P. J. (Mavelikara)
- Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri (Mukundapuram)
- Lourdusamy, Shri Adaikalaraj (Tiruchirappalli)
- Made Gowda, Shri G. (Mandya)
- Malik, Shri Dharam Pal Singh (Sonapat)
- Mallikarjun, Shri (Mahbubnagar)
- Mallu, Dr. R. (Nagar Kurnool)
- Mane, Shri Rajaram Shankarrao (Ichalkaarnji)
- Marbaniang, Shri Peter G. (Shillong)
- Mathew, Shri Pala K. M. (Idukki)
- Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan (Bhilwara)
- Meena, Shri Bheru Lal (Salumbar)
- Meghe, Shri Datta (Nagpur)
- Mirdha, Shri Nathuram (Nagaur)
- Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas (Barmer)
- Muniyappa, Shri K. H. (Kolar)
- Muraleedharan, Shri K. (Calicut)
- Murthy, Shri M. V. Chandrashekara (Kankapura)
- Murugesan, Shri N. (Karur)
- Muttemwar, Shri Vilas (Chimur)
- Naik, Sh. A. Venkatesh (Raichur)
- Naik, Shri G. Devraya (Kanara)
- Naikar, Shri D. K. (Dharwad, North)
- Nandi, Shri Yellaiah (Siddipet)
- Narayanan, Shri K. R. (Ottapalam)
- Narayanan, Shri P. G. (Gobichettiyalayam)
- Nawale, Shri Vidura Vithoba (Khed)
- Nayak, Shri Mrutyunjaya (Phulbani)
- Nayak, Shri Subash Chandra (Kalahandi)
- Netam, Shri Arvind (Kankar)
- Nikam, Shri Govindrao (Ratnagiri)
- Nyamgonda, Shri Siddappa Bhimappa (Bagalkot)
- Odyar, Shri Channaiah (Davangare)
- Owaisi, Shri Sultan Salahuddin (Hyderabad)
- Dr. (Smt.) Padma (Nagapattinam)
- Padmasree, Shri Kundumula (Nellore)
- Pal, Dr. Devi Prosad (Calcutta-North-West)
- Palacholla, Sh. Venkata Rangayya Naidu (Khammam)
- Pandian, Shri D. (Madras North)
- Panigrahi, Shri Sriballav (Deogarh)

Panja, Shri Ajit Kumar (Calcutta-North-East)	Raju, Sh. S. Vijaya Rama (Parvathipuram)
Patel, Shri Praful (Bhandara)	Ramamurthy, Shri K. (Krishnagiri)
Patel, Shri Shravan Kumar (Jabalpur)	Ramaswamy, Shri R. (Periyakulam)
Patel, Shri Uttambhai Hargibhai (Bulsar)	Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally (Cannanore)
Patil, Shri Anwari Basavaraj (Koppal)	Ram Babu, Shri A. G. S. (Madurai)
Patil, Shri Prakashbapu Vasantao (Sangli)	Ram Singh, Rao (Mahindergarh)
Patil, Smt. Pratibha Devisingh (Amravati)	Rath, Shri Rama Chandra (Aska)
Patil, Shri Uttamrao Deorao (Yavatmal)	Rao, Shri V. Krishna (Chikballapur)
Patil, Shri Vijay Naval (Erandol)	Rathva, Shri Naranbhai Jamlabhai (Chhota Udaipur)
Patil, Shri Yashwantrao (Ahmednagar)	Rawat, Shri Bhagwan Shankar (Agra)
Patra, Dr. Kartikeswar (Balasore)	Reddy, Shri Anantha Venkata (Anantapur)
Pattanayak, Shri Sarat Chandra (Bofangir)	Reddy, Shri M. Baga (Medak)
Pawar, Shri Ajit Anantrao (Baramati)	Reddy, Shri Mahasamudram Ghanendra (Chittoor)
Pawar, Dr. Vasant Niwenti (Nasik)	Reddy, Shri Megunta Subbarama (Ongole)
Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal (Chidambaram)	Reddy, Shri R. Surender (Warangal)
Pilot, Shri Rajesh (Dausa)	Reddy, Shri Vijaya Bhaskara (Karnool)
Poosapati, Shri Anandgajapati Raju (Robbili)	Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya (Solapur)
Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram (Chandrapur)	Sahi, Smt. Krishna (Begusarai)
Prabhu, Shri R. (Nilgiris)	Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman (Ponnani)
Prabhu Zantya, Shri Harish Narayan (Panji)	Sajjan Kumar, Shri (Outer Delhi)
Pradhani, Shri K. (Nowrangpur)	Sangma, Shri Purno A. (Tura)
Prasad, Shri V. Sreenivasa (Chamarajanagar)	Sanipalli, Shri Gangadhara (Hindupur)
Rahi, Shri Ram Lal (Misrikh)	Sawant, Shri Sudhir (Rajapur)
Rai, Shri Kalpnath (Ghosi)	Sayeed, Shri P. M. (Lakshadweep)
Rajaravivarma, Shri B. (Pollachi)	Scindia, Shri Madhav Rao (Gwalior)
Rajendrakumar, Shri S. S. R. (Chengeelpattu)	Selja, Km. (Sirsa)
Rajeshwaran, Dr. V. (Ramnathapuram)	Shankaranand, Shri B. (Chikkodi)
Rajeswari, Shrimati Basava (Bellary)	Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal (Karnal)
	Shingda, Shri Damu Barku (Dedhanu)
	Shivappa, Shri K. G. (Shimoga)
	Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan (Raipur)
	Sidnal, Shri S. B. (Belgaum)

- Silvera, Dr. C. (Mizoram)**
 Singh, Shri Arjun (Satna)
 Singh, Shri Dalbir (Shahdol)
 Singh, Shri Khelsai (Sarguja)
 Singh, Shri Manphool (Bikaner)
 Singh, Shri Motilal (Sidhi)
 Singh, Km. Pushpa Devi (Raigarh)
 Singh, Shri S. B. (Rajnandgaon)
 Sodi, Shri Manku Ram (Bastar)
 Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu (Dhar)
Soundaram, Dr. (Smt.) K. S. (Tiruchengode)
 Sridharan, Shri R. (Madras South)
 Srinivasan, Shri Chinnasamy (Dindigul)
 Sukh Ram, Shri (Mandi)
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt (Shimla)
 Sundararaj, Shri N. (Pudukkotta)
 Suresh, Shri Kodikkunil (Adoor)
 Swamy, Shri G. Venkat (Pedapalli)
 Tara Singh, Shri (Kurukshetra)
 Thakur, Mahendra Kumar Singh (Khandwa)
 Thangkabalu, Shri K. V. (Dharmapuri)
 Tharadevi Siddarth, Shrimati D. K. (Chikmagalur)
 Thomas, Prof. K. V. (Ernakulam)
 Thorat, Shri Sandipan Bhagwan (Pandharpur)
 Thungon Shri P. K. (Arunachal West)
 Tindivanam, Shri K. Ramamurthee (Tindivanam)
Hope, Shri Ankushrao Raosaheb (Jalna)
 Topno, Kumari Frida (Sundargarh)
 Tytler, Shri Jagdish (Delhi Sadar)
 Umbrey, Shri Laeta (Arunachal East)
 Upadhyay, Shri Swarup (Tejpur)
Urs, Smt. Chandra Prabha (Mysore)
- Vandayar, Shri K. Thulasiah (Thanjavur)**
 Verma, Shri Bhawani Lal (Janjgir)
 Verma, Km. Vimla (Seoni)
 Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S. (Palghat)
 Vyas, Dr. Girija (Udaipur)
Wasnik, Shri Mukul Balkrishna (Buldana)
 Williams, Maj. Gen. R. G. (Nominated Anglo-Indian)
- NOES
- Abedya Nath, Mahant (Gorakhpur)
 Advani, Shri Lal. K. (Gandhi Nagar)
 Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra (Jhansi)
 Baliyan, Shri N. K. (Muzaffar Nagar)
 Bandaru, Shri Dattatraya (Secunderabad)
 Berwa, Shri Ram Narain (Tonk)
 Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal (Jaipur)
 Chaudhary, Shri Rudrasen (Bahraich)
 Chauhan, Shri Chetan P. S. (Amroha)
 Chavda, Shri Harisinh (Banaskantha)
 Chikhaliya, Shrimati Bhavna (Junagarh)
 Chhotey Lal, Shri (Mohanlalganj)
 Chikhliya, Km. Dipika (Baroda)
 Choudhary, Shri Ram Tahal (Ranchi)
 Chowdhary, Shri Pankaj (Maharajganj)
 Das, Shri Dwarka Nath (Karim Ganj)
 Deshmukh, Shri Chandubhai (Bharuch)
 Dhumal, Prof. Prem (Hamirpur)
 Dikshit, Shri Shreesh Chandra (Varanasi)
 Drona, Shri Jagat Vir Singh (Kanpur)
 Fundkar, Shri Pandurang Pundlik (Akola)
 Gangwar, Dr. P. R. (Pillibhit)

Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar (Bareilly)	Mallikarjunaiah, Shri S. (Tumkur)
Gautam, Shri Sheela (Aligarh)	Maurya, Shri Anand Ratna (Chandauli)
Gohil, Dr. Mahavirsinh Harisinhji (Bhavnagar)	Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina (Padrauna)
Gowde, Shri K. Venkatgiri (Bangalore South)	Misra, Shri Janardan (Sitapur)
Jai Prakash, Shri (Hardoi)	Misra, Shri Shyam Bihari (Bilhaur)
Jaswant Singh, Shri (Chittorgarh)	Munda, Shri Kariya (Khunti)
Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan (Ujjain)	Naik, Shri Ram (Bombay-North)
Jeswani, Dr. K. D. (Kheda)	Oraon, Shri Lalit (Lohardaga)
Joshi, Shri Anna (Pune)	Pandeya, Dr. Laxmi Narayan (Mand-saur)
Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal (Kota)	Passi, Shri Balraj (Naini-Tal)
Kalka Das, Shri (Karolbagh)	Patel, Dr. Amrit Lal Kalidas (Mehsana)
Kamal, Shri Shyam Lal (Basti)	Patel, Shri Haribhai (Porbander)
Kanaujia, Dr. G. L. (Lakhimpur Kheri)	Patel, Shri Somabhai, (Surendranagar)
Kanodia, Shri Mahesh Kumar (Patan)	Pathak, Shri Harin (Ahmedabad)
Kapse, Shri Ram (Thane)	Pathak, Shri Surendra Pal (Shahabad)
Kashwan, Shri Ram Singh (Churu)	Patidar, Shri Rameshwar (Khargone)
Katheria, Shri Prabhu Dayal (Firozabad)	Prem, Shri B. L. Sharma (East-Delhi)
Khandelwal, Shri Tara Chand (Chandni Chowk)	Premi, Shri Mangal Ram (Bijnor)
Khanduri, Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Bhuwan Chandra (Garhwal)	Purkayasth, Shri Kabindra (Silchar)
Khanoria, Shri D. D. (Kangra)	Raje, Shrimati Vasundhara (Jhalawar)
Khurana, Shri Madan Lal (South Delhi)	Rajnarain, Shri (Basgaon)
Koli, Shri Ganga Ram (Bayana)	Ramdew Ram, Shri (Palamau)
Kordia, Shri Chandresh Patel (Jamnagar)	Rawal, Dr. Lal Bahadur (Hathras)
Kori, Shri Gaya Prasad (Jalaun)	Rawat, Shri Bhagwan Shankar (Agra)
Krishendra Kaur (Deepa) Shrimati (Bharatpur)	Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh (Ajmer)
Kumar, Shri V. Dhananjaya (Mangalore)	Rongpi, Dr. Jayanta (Autonomous District)
Kusmaria, Shri Ramkrishna (Dantoh)	Sakshiji, Shri Swamy (Mathura)
Lodha, Shri Guman Mal (Pali)	Sanghani, Shri Dileep Shai (Amreli)
Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra (Indore)	Saraswati, Shri Yoga Nand (Bhind)
Mahendra Kumari, Smt. (Alwar)	Sarode, Dr. Gunvant Rambahau (Jalgaon)
	Shah, Shri Manabendra (Tehri-Garhwal)
	Sharma, Shri Jeewan (Almora)
	Sharma, Shri Rajendra Kumar (Rampur)

Sharma, Shri V. N. (Hamirpur)
 Shastri, Shri Vishwanath (Ghazipur)
 Shukla, Shri Ashte Bhuja Prasad
 (Khalifabad)
 Singh, Shri Brijbhushan Sharan (Gonda)
 Singh, Shri Devi Bux (Unnao)
 Singh, Shri Mahadeepak (Etah)
 Singh, Shri Rajveer (Aonla)
 Singh, Shri Ram (Haridwar)
 Singh, Shri Ram Pal (Domariaganj)
 Singh, Shri Satya Deo (Balrampur)
 Swami, Shri Chinmayanand (Badaun)
 Swami, Sureshanand (Jalesar)
 Tandel, Shri D. J. (Daman & Diu)
 Thakore, Shri Gabhaji Mangaji (Kapad-
 wanj)
 Tomar, Shri Ramesh Chand (Hapur)
 Tripathi, Shri Lakshmi Narain Mani
 (Kaiserganj)
 Tripathi, Shri Prakash Narain (Banda)
 Trivedi, Shri Arvind (Sabarkantha)
 Uma Bharati, Kumar (Khajuraho)
 Vaghela, Shri Shankarji Laxamanji
 (Godhra)
 Varma, Shri Ratilal (Dhanduka)
 Vekaria, Shri S. N. (Rajkot)
 Verma, Shrimati Rita (Dhanbad)
 Virendra Singh, Shri (Mirzapur)

19.00 hrs.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : May I request the Members to please be seated in their seats to facilitate the collection of slips ?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Members, please take your seats, please take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : May I request the Members to take their seats ? Please take your seats.

MR. SPEAKER : Subject to correction*, the result of the Division is :

Ayes : 241

Noes : 111

The motion was adopted.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What is the number of abstentions ?

MR. SPEAKER : There are 112 abstentions.

The House stands adjourned to meet on 16th July, 1991 at 11.00 hours.
 19.07 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, July 16, 1991/Asadha 25, 1913 (Saka).

As Corrected

*One slip for Ayes has allegedly been filled by Shri Akber B. Pasta, IC No. 396 an elected member from Vellore Constituency of Tamil Nadu. He has not so far taken oath and therefore he is not entitled to take part in the proceedings of the House.

On rechecking of the slips in the Branch, it has been found that slips for Noes are actually 109.