

[Dr. Laxminarayan Pandey]

the tune of crores of rupees due to the policy of the Cotton Corporation of India. Government is, therefore, requested to set up purchase centres in the cotton producing districts of Madhya Pradesh without any delay.

**(vii) Need for steps to maintain ecological balance in the country**

SHRI RAMASHRAY PRASAD SINGH (Jahanabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to raise the following matter under Rule 377:-

There should be a uniform law throughout the country for maintenance of ecological balance and social awareness should be created among the people to abide by the law. The Government would also have to create a social awakening among the people.

The Government is, therefore, requested to set up more and more national parks to maintain ecological balance.

[English]

**(viii) Need to take measures for normalising relations between India and Pakistan**

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramulla): India did not have a favourable response in the past in its moves towards improvement in the relations with Pakistan. True, that Pakistan has not been warm to India's gestures of goodwill extended at various points of time in the past, yet the fact remains that India has to strive for friendship with Pakistan. The friendship between the two countries is decidedly mutually advantageous.

In any case, beginning has to be made in some areas to normalise relations. Protocols have been signed for cultural exchanges etc. These protocols need to be implemented and strengthened further.

Government should make a move and take up with Pakistan the question of opening Srinagar-Rawalpindi road. The passport

and visa restrictions will, of course, remain but these could be made less stringent.

What the Central Government can take notice of is that Russian Perestroika has swept the entire world, especially Europe and more particularly Eastern part of Europe. The Berlin wall is gone. Why can't a road which used to be the main link between Kashmir and the then Punjab, be opened with precautions that are necessary.

This step will go a long way to heal the wounds and normalise relation between India and Pakistan.

**(ix) Need to take necessary steps for an amicable solution of the Punjab problem**

SHRI MANDHATA SINGH (Lucknow): The healing touch given to Punjab by the present Government has probably paved the way for an amicable solution of the Punjab tangle. Now the hard task of coming to grips with concrete problems like the river water and territorial disputes, publication of Thakkar Commission Report on Indiraji's assassination and the Misra Commission Report on the 1984 riots followed by consequential action should find top priority on the Government's agenda. This is bound to assuage the hurt feelings of the brave Sikh community and usher in a new era of emotional and national integration in the country resulting in isolating the separatist tendencies.

11.46 hrs.

**MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Sir, I beg to move:

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there anybody seconding the Motion?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is not required to be seconded.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. UPENDRA): Sir, about the procedural aspects I want to make on or two submissions. Originally we thought since this motion is only meant to assess the strength enjoyed by the Government, we could straightway take up the voting without much discussion. When we made this proposal to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, he wanted a discussion and the Government is prepared for a discussion. He also suggested that one member from each party may be permitted to speak. For your approval I will submit that we may agree to the proposal and one member from each party may be asked to speak. We may allot totally four hours including the reply and the voting. Therefore we can go upto 4 O'clock with the discussion, the Prime Minister can reply at 4 O'clock and the voting may be taken at 4.30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we observe the lunch break or not?

SHRI P. UPENDRA: It is upto you Sir. If the Members want more time, we can skip the lunch break.

AN HON. MEMBER: We should have lunch break Sir.

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Those who want can go out for lunch and come back and the House may continue the discussion.

About the voting process, since there is no division number allotted to each member

and since the electronic machines cannot be operated, the other procedure is that the head counting can be taken and probably that would be better.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: That will be decided later on.

[English]

SHRI P. UPENDRA: I would also request you to keep in mind that the Hon. Members wanted a statement by the External Affairs Minister. We have scheduled it at 5 O'clock as per your orders.

For the quicker voting process I suggest that counting of heads may be taken.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has enlightened the House about the procedure that he envisages. He has made a few points. Firstly, he has said that four hours can be allotted and we can have the reply accordingly. I suggest that this should not be taken as a rigid time scheduled, because, now, we know by our experience that as the thing proceeds, the tail-enders who come last, are at a great loss. So, it should be subject to the requirement that one Member from each party must have the full time at his disposal.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: At present, it is four hours.

[English]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Secondly, in a very casual manner he said that we should forego the lunch hour and that Members can go, have the lunch and come back. (*Interruptions*) This is a serious issue. This cannot be taken in such a casual manner. We should listen to each and every Member. Therefore, such a casual attitude should not come before the House. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you making a noise he is replying to the point.

[*English*]

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Sir, it was not said in a casual manner. (*Interruptions*) To forego the lunch hour is not a new thing. I reacted to the question from that side about the lunch. Several times it happened in both the Houses. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let there be no dispute. The point is are we in favour of having lunch.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us not have lunch hour.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: At present four hours have been allotted for discussion on it. We will see later on as to what can be done. I have sensed the feelings of the House.

[*English*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI (Amethi): It is not just a question of lunch. We will decide on lunch. That is not the problem. It is the prerogative of the House to decide on the lunch. But the question is of taking the House for granted. I think, it is an insult to the House. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): The House should be taken seriously. Those who are saying this, I only hope, will actually remain in House and listen to the discussion. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

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

SHRI A.R. Antulay.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: The issue is before the House. I have called upon Mr. Antulay to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us now hear Mr. Antulay.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not permitted anyone except Mr. Antulay.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: All the Members can take their seats. I am on my legs.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

AN HON. MEMBER: He is\*\*. What about Cement. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not like to repeat what I heard. That is unparliamentary and will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not like to repeat what I heard. That is unparliamentary and will not go on record. Harishji kindly sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen to me. You are a member of the ruling party. The hon. Prime Minister has moved the Motion. Please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)\*

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

\*Not recorded.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: No. I have not given permission. Let me earnestly request the hon. Members that we should conduct ourselves in a dignified manner. Shri Antulay...

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY (Kulaba): Sir, I thank you for the ruling that you have given. Today we have a motion before this House. I do not believe nor do I know of any such motion having been tabled in the annals of the history of Parliament—surely not of this Lok Sabha.

Why was it necessary to have this motion? The very fact that such a motion had to be tabled for discussion demonstrates that the confidence that the Government should enjoy at the time of the appointment of the Prime Minister by the President was lacking or was in doubt. As a result the President directed, Sir, for the first time to ask the Prime Minister to demonstrate that he enjoys the support of the majority of the House.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Let us hear Mr. Antulay.

[Translation]

SHRI PHOOLCHAND VERMA (Shajapur): You cannot stop us from raising points of order.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Let me hear your point of order.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK (North Bombay): My point of order is that the debate has not yet started and the point being considered is as to how much time should be allotted for the

discussion. My point of order is that will he be treated as the first member to speak.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It has already started. There is no point of order.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Sir, ours is a very big country with ancient traditions. We are the biggest democracy in the world and we are proud of it.

[Translation]

SHRI BHAJAN LAL (Faridabad): You will have to hold classes.

SHRI PHOOLCHAND VERMA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, These points can be raised by him during the course of his speech.

12.00 hrs.

[English]

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: On the attainment of independence, we adopted democracy in the country under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am requesting the Members not to disturb Mr. Antulay since it is his maiden speech. It is a well-established practice in the House. I request the Members to take their seats. Yes, Mr. Antulay.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: In a country like ours, which has unity in diversity, as Panditji aptly put it, we need a very strong Centre, and we can have no quarrel about that. With the kind of federalism which is enshrined in the Constitution of India, it is ultimately the Centre which has to see that the unity and integrity, the independence and the sovereignty are ensured.

It is admittedly a minority Government. It is a minority Government supported by two other parties. Here, we are the largest single party. (Interruptions) The people of India are:

[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

soverign. The electorate have returned us...*(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: The people have thrown you out.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: No, they have not thrown out. I am coming to that. In my humble submission, it is wrong to say that the people have rejected the Government and installed some other Government instead. It is not so. It is true that the people did not give us the fullest mandate to rule the country. *(Interruptions)* The people, at the same time, have not given the Janata Dal—which comprises of only one-fourth of this House—the right to rule. Had the people so chosen, they would have returned them with the majority which could have then been construed as a mandate of the people.

SHRISOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is this? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Allow me to speak and make my point. *(Interruptions)* They have no patience to listen. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI R. GUNDU RAO (Bangalore South): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Gundu Rao, what is your point of order?

SHRI R. GUNDU RAO: The hon. Speaker has allowed Mr. Antulay to speak...*(Interruptions)*...

[*Translation*]

Please have patience.

[*English*]

The Prime Minister will reply at the end. He is the Leader of this august House and at the same time, Mr. Antulay is also a Member of this august House. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when you have called him to speak and he is on his

legs, it is not correct to disturb him while speaking. If they want us to do the same thing when the honourable leader of the House, the Prime Minister, speaks, then we can also do the same...*(Interruptions)*...

[*Translation*]

What are you going to achieve?

[*English*]

You must have some sort of decency. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Rao, speak to the Chair.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

SHRI R. GUNDU RAO: We can say these things. ...*(Interruptions)*... We have got great respect for the Chair.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you.

SHRI R. GUNDU RAO: And we have got great respect for the House. When an hon. Member from the Opposition is speaking, they think that they can disturb him. I do not know how much control their leader has got over them. When their leader speaks, we can also do the same. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Nobody will disturb Mr. Antulay. Yes Mr. Antulay.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Take your seat.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Truth is bitter but

it has to be told and also heard. As per the traditions and well established conventions of democracy, our leader, who is the leader of the largest single party could have been offered the option and could have been invited to form the government. But the President said that since the leader of the single largest party in the House has declined out of magnanimity... (*Interruptions*)... Yes, that is true, out of generosity... (*Interruptions*)... It is a historical fact which cannot be erased from the pages of history... (*Interruptions*)... Well, let them try permutations and combinations, let the people of India know that they cannot rule as they knew in 1977. In fact Sir, it was the single largest party enjoying two-thirds majority then. Today, it is just the reverse. Whatever be the opinion of the legal experts, that opinion cannot be elevated to and equated with the opinion given by the Supreme Court under Article 143. The life of the Parliament could have continued till the 14th of January, 1990 legally, constitutionally and democratically, Sir, even the Presidential election is held before the expiry of the term. And yet the new President is installed only on the expiry of the tenure of office of the outgoing President. Holding election to the office of the President earlier does not mean that the President who is incumbent at that particular point of time has to quit. He does not have to quit. Our leader Shri Rajiv Gandhi for whom we have the highest and utmost respect could have continued as the Prime Minister till 14th of January 1990, in terms of the Constitution of India, in terms of democracy and in term of well established conventions and tradition. (*Interruptions*)

There is nothing to laugh. You cannot laugh away the Constitution of India. You cannot brush aside the Constitution of India. Nor can your noise still the voice of the largest number of Indian people represented by this side. I would like the whole world to know the constitutional, democratic and factual position. (*Interruptions*)

I treat all their objections and interruptions with the contempt that they deserve. (*Interruptions*) Sir, I am afraid I would like to

be heard on this point because there is a lot of confusion about it. Let me explain again: Presidential election takes place almost two months or one and a half month in advance. But the President Elect does not assume office till the term of the outgoing President expires. The President who has been in office quits and the new President is ceremoniously installed with due and dignified in the Central Hall. If this is constitutional position true for the President of India who is the guardian of the Constitution of India, the same is more true in case of the Prime Minister of India who is his first Adviser. But our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi recommended the dissolution of the House one and a half month before his tenure ended.

So, firstly he refused to form the Government though he could have.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: How?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: They are asking me 'how'. Well, he could have gone in more dignified and in a better manner than today's executive has done. We could have formed the Government in a befitting and better manner than what they have done.

ONE HON. MEMBER: Please explain how. Is it in Shri Bhajan Lal's way?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Sir, again they are asking how. Let them ask Shri Chander Shekhar who says that this Government is born in sin and of fraud. And Shri Chandra Shekhar is no member of Congress (!) Their 'how' is answered directly by no less a person than Shri Chandra Shekhar himself. (*Interruptions*)

We could have legitimately, democratically constitutionally and of course legally attempted to form the Government and the President could have sworn our leader in as the Prime Minister and would have given him time to demonstrate his strength, just as the present Prime Minister is given time. But our leader has acted magnanimously. We have said, 'no regrets'. But they will regret the day when they formed the Government. It is

[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

going to be proved. It is going to be the most fateful and unfortunately if I can say so a very sinful day as explained by Shri Chandra Shekhar. He relinquished the high office and recommended dissolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Shri Tripathi?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Shri Chandra Shekhar is much younger than Shri Tripathi. (*Interruptions*)

They cannot still the voice of reason but the people of India know what the truth is. The sovereignty of India extends much beyond this House. The House is not sovereign. The people of India are sovereign.

So, I was making one point and that is in spite of the fact that the people in the South sent out lock, stock and barrel the Government headed by the Chairman of the Front...(*Interruptions*)

They call it a Government by the Front. But the Chairman was sent in the dustbin of history to lie there.

The Vice-President of Janata Dal also was shown the door by the people of Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka...(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Maharashtra? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: please be patient, Now it is my turn, let me speak. [*English*]

So, the entire South and then the entire North-East voted for Congress (I). If I am wrong, the Prime Minister or anybody on his behalf can correct me later on. I do not like interjections. I am not afraid of them or scared of them but it wastes my time. So, the South and the North-East ...(*Interruptions*)

So, looking to the electorate, looking to the people of India, who gave to themselves the Constitution of India, they deliberately on design, coolly on their reflection made Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the Leader of the single largest Party in the House—Congress-I as the Single largest Party, Janata Dal as the Second largest Party, BJP as the Third largest party and the Communists as the Fourth largest Party. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, Lokmanaya Tilak has said that two girls nine years of age cannot make one bride. Lokmanya Tilak has wisely said, and everybody knows about it. (*Interruptions*) So, I think the message has gone home. Now, let us look at the manifesto which was put before the people by the so-called Front, because I do not think it does exist, except for Mr. Unnikrishnan—if I am not very wrong, or Mr. Goswami...(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not a Member...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: I did not want to say that. In the manifesto of the second largest—it should be the third largest—party, viz. the BJP and the manifesto of the Communist Party, what promises were given to the people and what assurances were held out before the electorate? (*Interruptions*) In the morning when I heard that during the zero hour, various questions were being put to the Government, I was myself pitying the plight of the Government. They cannot; they cannot answer in their own a single question. If any question is to be answered, even in the Cabinet where there is supposed to be a secret discussion which will not be divulged to anyone else, the Prime Minister will have to consult the third largest party, and then the fourth largest party before hand and then make up his mind in consultation with Shri Devi Lal. I am not ranking the Deputy Prime Minister—whether he is really the fourth or the fifth...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

AN. HON MEMBER: This is not a dictatorship.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: This is not a dictatorship, but there should not be utter chaos also.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Then you admit that it was dictatorship.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Utter chaos. (Interruptions)

I am again reminded, because of that, about the alternative model of Government. They are talking about alternative model, because they cannot talk of anything else, and be still on the Government. What is the alternative model—Presidential system? Alternative model does not mean parliamentary system of Government which is the model already being practised. They wish to travel outside this model in search of an alternative. It is a model (Interruptions)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Bofors model?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Nehru model, Indira Gandhi model, Lal Bahadur Shastri model or Rajiv Gandhi model... (Interruptions)

If I were to describe this Government—with due apologies to the head of the Government and the deputy head of the Government and all others who are his colleagues—it is two-headed and three-legged. (Interruptions)

I do honestly believe that the people did not bargain for this. They deserved much better than this sort of treatment at the hands of those who are now manning the Government, supporting it and running the affairs of the country.

So, I was not surprised at all. All our friends here are saying that the Government should make its stand clear on the vital issues before the nation. Can they make their stand clear on anything, on this composition Can they? (Interruptions)

Can they? It is a very condemnable

thing; undoubtedly so, that the daughter of the Home Minister should have been kidnapped. We deplore it; we condemn it, and we are very happy that she has been recovered, but at what cost? Surrendering the sovereignty of the country, of the nation?

Leaflets are being distributed today that they are going to kidnap all others. (Interruptions) It is not a question of creating noise; it is a question of serious concern, concern for sovereignty and for the future of democracy, concern for the future of the country itself. (Interruptions) I had long passed these stages where I could be shouted down. Personal allegations and character assassination will not carry us any further. (Interruptions)

AN. HON. MEMBER: Very good.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Therefore, it is a matter of utmost concern for the nation; whether they view it as a concern I do not know, but the common man in this country does except from those who are sitting here in the temple of democracy, on their behalf, to behave properly and behave reasonably well. Now they forget that they are today in the ruling parties. They were in the opposition behaving irresponsibly. They are continuing with the same sort of things which they have been doing for the past three years or so. (Interruptions) Now can the hon. Prime Minister make his stand clear on Ram Janmabhoomi and Babri Masjid? I would like to pose a simple question. I would like to request Advaniji, who is supporting the Government from outside, to make their stand clear on this point, too. Can they together even make their stand clear on this point?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Outside.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What is your stand? (Interruptions)

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: They have no one voice unfortunately. Not only the three parties forming the Government of course,



[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

but even the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister cannot think alike. What is their stand on vital issues the country is entitled to know?

You have been in the saddle for the past two-three weeks. Each day counts. As he rightly said, the statement can be made on Monday or Tuesday, but unfortunately, the ugly things are happening; they cannot wait; you are not in a position to stop them because you are thinking with different minds, seeing from different angles speaking with different voices. You have not different ideologies. You cannot run a country like this. (*Interruptions*) You can talk of national reconciliation and national consensus. Yesterday, I happened to go through the President's Address cursorily. Now I will not make a reference to it because the special debate is there. National consensus is repeated *ad nauseam* as also national reconciliation. What is that? What does that mean? How many votes are polled by this side? How many people have voted for Janata Dal which itself was a sort of coalition of the parties before it became Janata Dal from Janata Party and other parties and splinter groups and Morchas. Let me make it clear that even for the so-called ruling Conglomeration, they have to from Congress (I) instal somebody as Prime Minister who is repelled or you have to import somebody from this side. (*Interruptions*) The hon. members who did owe two years ago-allegiance and loyalty to our Leader. Shri Rajiv Gandhi, are there.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: I would like to say that this was the solemn promise then given by Vishwanathji, the Prime Minister to the whole country that he shall hold aloft the standard and the banner of Congress-I even if he is an ordinary Congress man; even if he is turned out of every organ of the party, and yet he shall still remain a Congress man. "Nobody can snatch that right away from me

to be a Congressman" he had said. Now, does he claim to be a Congressman? I would like to put that question to him. Or. does he claim to be the President of the Janata Dal? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

AN. HON. MEMBER: What happened to the Antulay Congress?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Antulay Congress was not separate from the Congress (I).

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): He had left the Ministry but you were ousted. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): He is moralising. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: I am not moralising. Do not take it that way. I am stating facts which are very hurting to you.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What a maiden you have chosen!

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Sir, I can understand the pun of the hon. Member. But it is not befitting him.

AN. HON. MEMBER: He is constrained to support Janata Dal—what to do unfortunately.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Sir, what are they going to do about the Tamilians. Who are in Sri Lanka?

Now, something was said here with regard to the kidnapping of Tamilians. That also is not clear. The Government should have thought about all these answers. The Government's reaction should have been spontaneous even in regard to invasion of Panama. I have not, at least, read anything, what the reaction was. I do not know. I do not know whether the leftists and the BJP and

the Janata Dal have made some sort of a hotchpotch arrangement with regard to the invasion of Panama. I do not know.

So, Sir, it is neither known in matters of approach and policies at home that they are going to pursue nor their attitude to international issues. Because to be very honest, — and I can claim to have at least an average intelligence—I did not find any policy pertaining to nation or in the sphere of international affairs clearly spelt out in the Presidential Address. It is all—with due respect—bla, bla, bla no concrete approach, all vague, confused thinking. Almost, I was reminded of either the Fundamental Duties in the Constitution of India which are enumerated there, or the Directive Principles of State Policy which are also enshrined in the Constitution of India. Almost a few of them have been verbatim reproduced in this Address barring a coma here and a semicolon there and a word here and a word there. Now it is there. You did not have to repeat them in the Presidential Address. These things are there. I have studied it. It is there in the Directive Principles of State Policy in the Constitution of India. It is there in the Fundamental Duties. What you need to do is to say how you are going to implement them, in what manner you are going to go about it, in what manner, what type of government, what type of policy, what type of economic programme, what type of political programme you are going to give to the people, with this sort of Government that is running the country today.

Sir, I am not saying this out of pride. I am saying this in anguish. But I am greatly concerned. None of them personally on the other side is inimical to me and I do not think that they think so. Nor am I! They are all good friends and they should also treat all those here also as good friends and I hope that they will. But when my leader, and our leader and the Leader of the Opposition said "constructive co-operation" he only meant that co-operation within the policy, within the principles, within the framework of the Indian National Congress as enunciated by Ma-

hatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi.

Sir, I cannot resist the temptation of only bringing one thing to your notice. I was a little flattered when I saw in the Presidential Address something having been quoted out of the amendment which we brought in and got passed in 1976, though Address does not make even an acknowledgement of it. I am flattered. I say this because not only you have had to draw upon the people going from this side to that side to head your Government but I think even the Deputy was once upon a time on this side. The true opposition Government will come when either the Leftist or the BJP attain the strength enough to do so. Till that time, it is going to be a disaster. I think the Prime Minister had before he became the Prime Minister said: "if at all I become Prime Minister, it will be a disaster". He had said it. Newspapers carried it. Sir, I did not know that his words would prove so prophetic. He said: "I did not want any office, but the office was thrust by Mr. Devi Lalji"... (*Interruptions*) Devi Lalji was made the leader of the party, properly proposed and seconded and applauded. He thanked the people and said: "Thank you for having reposed confidence in me". And he was declared to be the leader. Now you are talking about democracy. I am answering that. Now, Mr. Devi Lal, in his own personal individual right said: I appoint so and so.. (*Interruptions*) What a concensus'. What a democracy! What kind of democracy!... (*Interruptions*) On the next day, the Prime Minister was to be sworn in. Since we happened to be colleagues some time ago, I was watching the TV to see the swearing-in. It surprised his friends and the people of India when Mr. Devi Lal became the Deputy Prime Minister...(*Interruptions*)

Regarding taking Oath—Sir, you have given a ruling but the fact remains that the Oaths prescribed under the Constitution are only of two types, not of three; whether Shri Sardar Vallabhabhai Patel, Mr. Morarji Bhai or any other, was or was not happen to be the Deputy Prime Minister is irrelevant to the issue. The things is, they took Oath as a

[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

Minister and not as the Deputy Prime Minister. If you go through or consult the records—I have already tried to at the Rashtrapathi Bhavan—even Shri Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel took the Oath as a Minister and thereafter he was appointed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the Deputy Prime Minister. So was the case with Mr. Morarji Bhai when Shrimati Indira Gandhi appointed him as the Deputy Prime Minister; he had taken the Oath as a Minister and then he was appointed as the Deputy Prime Minister. ... (Interruptions) This may be pending in the Court. We have the hon. Members here, elected by the people. The Court may decide ultimately one way or the other. But what does propriety demand? The Court will go by legality or constitutionality, but democracy cannot run only by the Constitution and the law. It can also run by conventions. And conventions are not part of the Constitution. What is the convention? He was flouting the dictate of the President of India three times. I was watching on the TV. The President of India said: "recite this way". And the number two today here... (Interruptions)

AN. HON. MEMBER: "Tau"... (Interruptions)

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: That is a good name and I like it. I wish he behaves like that. But he flouted the order of the President of India. Because perhaps Devi Lalji thought that if he did not take his oath as Deputy Prime Minister, perhaps Vishwanath Pratap Singhji might change his mind because the Prime Minister of this country, Vishwanath Pratap Singhji, a very good old friend of mine, is known to be indecisive. He cannot grapple with the issues. He is in two minds—to make Deputy Prime Minister or not to make, to be himself Prime Minister or not to be, would it be a disaster or would it not be. I think, Devi Lalji to that extent must be complimented. He thought: "If I do not take the oath as Deputy Prime Minister and by the time I go home from Rashtrapati Bhawan, the Prime Minister of this country may change his mind and say, no, you have taken the

oath as Minister, so you be a Minister." He wanted to be doubly sure. Not only that. In the same evening, his own son had been sworn as the Chief Minister of Haryana. They are talking of dynastic rule too much. Who nominated him? They are talking of democracy. They are talking of dictatorship... (Interruptions) They are talking of Rajivji. Any stick is good enough to beat him with. Any falsehood is good enough to heap upon his head. I have myself heard, seen and read that Rajivji was being elevated to the level above that of Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi by the then opposition, by "The Indian Express" Goenkaji said: "Rajiv's India". Rajivji never claimed India to be under him. Rajivji always said: Mahatma Gandhi's India. Thank God that the Prime Minister did not forget Mahatma Gandhi when he prepared the draft of the President's Address. Let me be honest about it. I felt sad. From Vishwanathji I did not expect this. In this first broadcast which I heard with rept attention, he had forgotten the Father of the Nation—One should not forget the Father. Why? Because he felt that it might hurt some of his supporters. Even BJP, after all, had to claim for some time that it believes in Gandhian philosophy. All of them had gone to the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi in 1977 and took their oath administered by Jayaprakashji. He administered the oath. Now they are also not talking of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of modern India, a person who was solely responsible for giving right to vote to the common man. There were intellectuals even at that time who said that unless a person is having property or a person is literate or educated, he should not be given the right of franchise. I need not name the intellectuals. It is not good. Most of them are dead by now. But in this very Central Hall in the Constituent Assembly, Panditji stood up like a rock and said: "I have got more faith in the wisdom and patriotism of the common man of this country." And he gave them the right to vote. You are forgetting him, a great socialist, who, in 1936 under the direction of Mahatma Gandhi when the AICC Committee was formed, said that socialism is the only path for this country.

[*Translation*]

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI DEVI LAL): What a socialism they brought!

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: One should have wisdom to be able to understand whether socialism is good or bad. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Sir, I was happy that the Prime Minister referred to Jaya Prakashji, Ram Manohar Lal Lohiaji. But I should have expected him also to refer to the Father of the Nation and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhash Chandra Boseji as also Lal Bahadur Shastriji to whom... (*Interruptions*) Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is no monopoly of Rajivji. He belongs to the nation and we all owe him our gratitude (*Interruptions*) And it is not dynasty, let me tell you. When he died, it was not Smt. Indira Gandhi who became the Prime Minister. There was an intervention. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru never appointed his own people for life-time like Chautalaji. (*Interruptions*) After the assassination of it Indiraji, when Rajiv Gandhiji was appointed by the then President on the advice of the Congress Parliamentary Party, he sought the mandate and he got the massive mandate of the people. He was the Prime Minister of the people of India unlike today's Prime Minister (*Interruptions*).

So, Sir, with regard to the Punjab Anandpur Sahib Accord, the weapons that are being smuggled in, the Weapons that are being smuggled in from across the border, threats to close down shops that are being given in the vicinity, what is the stand of the Government on all the issues, the country wants to know? (*Interruptions*)

AN. HON'BLE MEMBER: They are helpless.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: If they are helpless to rule, we are prepared to help them. If you people are helpless to rule the country, we are prepared to help you. So, Sir, we want

to know what the Government's stand is. If that is the stand of the Government, if that is known to the people... (*Interruptions*)

AN. HON. MEMBER: What happened in Punjab during your rule?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Much worse has happened now. (*Interruptions*) Sir, the Resolution is passed based on Cripp's Mission. Out of that Cripp's Mission, a formula was published. The late, Mr. Jinnah had then said, "I see the seeds of Pakistan in this". Like that with the seeds of what you know, the Resolution was passed recently. I do not know what the stand of the Government is about that.

Now, Sir, they are talking of integrity of the country. What will happen to the country, they ask? The country will remain in tact. We have handed over to you, under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, a united country, the united India. (*Interruptions*) And you, unfortunately are presiding over the liquidation of it. I hope not and I pray to God not for liquidation of that. Sir, my concern is, that it is no good only of making references to the integrity, national consensus, national reconciliation and go about keeping silent or the inconvenient posers put up by the people of one religion or the other.

Sir, I want only the Government to answer. Not that we are going to oppose the motion, we are not going to oppose the motion, we abstain because unless the Prime Minister and his colleagues demonstrate that what they are going to do is within the framework of the Congress to which he belonged as Member till recently, we are not going to support. Nobody should take this entire party which is the largest single party in the House for granted. You cannot prepare a draft and bring it before our leaders and say 'Well, this is consensus'. (*Interruptions*). That is the consensus you are talking about in this Presidential Address. What is consensus? (*Interruptions*) Consensus is evolved after discussion, consensus is not prepared to be handed over on a platter. Therefore, Sir, I am not going to take more

[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

time, but I am certainly going to highlight the point that needs to be highlighted which I have done to the best of my ability as a patriotic citizen of this country. (*Interruptions*). Abdul Rahman Antulay can be as patriotic as Atmaram Ramchandra Antulay. That is the fact you cannot not deny. These are anti-nationals who doubt loyalty of. There is the saying of the holy Prophet Mohammed. (*Interruptions*). The meaning of the saying is that the love of the country is a part of the Faith, is a part of Islam. Unless you love your country, you cannot be a true Muslim. What are they talking about? By merely saying that I am...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: Sir, I ask him to sit down because let him not be under the wrong impression, under the wrong notion that because this is my maiden speech I can be shouted down and the speech can be drowned in the din that they are creating. I am speaking not for the first time and have never opened my mouth earlier. So I was saying that this is my conviction—the integrity of the nation, the unity of the nation have to be safeguarded and upheld. The country is the first priority, topmost priority but unfortunately I see is, of late, but since the new government come it in is going to dogs so far as homogeneity and its sovereignty is concerned. And then, neither socialism, that is, the economic democracy nor secularism, the Sarva Dharma Sambhav, nor political democracy meaning the will of the majority of the electorate shall survive. Sir, you are a known socialist. You know, Sir, I have respect and affection for you because we had been together in Parliament 10 years ago or 12 years ago. Your views on the economic policies are to be complimented and need to be emulated. Sir, I have respect for you thoughts for your own ideology and your secular and economically ideological bent of your mind. But if Vishwanathji is helpless in giving that particular orientation to his pro-

gramme because he wants to keep himself in the saddle by dint of majority support to somehow continue the facade of democracy. Even so, I think there is very little difference. With the support of diametrically opposite parties like BJP and the Communists I really don't know what will happen to the future of this country at the hands of this minority may minor government. I do not say this so that the Government should collapse. No, We are last persons to think so. We wish it well. If any of us were to think that this Government should collapse we would not have allowed it to be formed, we would ourselves have framed. Did not Rajivji says: "All right, go and form the Government." He gave it on a platter, you should not deny the fact. Under the traditions and conventions of this democracy he did it when he said 'No, I don't stake my claim'. Earlier, Yashwantraoji Chavan was invited—let us not forget that our memories are short—Yashwantrao Chavan was the leader of the largest single party when the Government of Morarjibhai fell. He was first asked to form the Government. He took seven days and thereafter he declined. So, the convention of our own country is there, I am not talking of only the British convention, I am talking of the convention in our own country and as to what took place only a few years ago in this very House. So, it was the right, and to my mind, the duty of the President, with due respect, to call Rajiv Gandhi and it was his right to form the Government and to be given the time to demonstrate the strength, I am 200 per cent sure that he would have demonstrated the strength of majority, had he accepted to be the Prime Minister of the country. (*Interruptions*)

Everything is known and nothing is secret since it is an open Government. I do not know really what exactly do they mean by open Government. If the Government is open, I would like to know, at what cost. I call upon the Prime Minister himself to say and not Advaniji or anybody else on his behalf as to what cost has been paid for the support that they have sought to keep themselves in the saddle, from the BJP and the Communists. The BJP has given a very critical support, as

per Advaniji. Critical and constructive, I think, both means the same, if I know a little bit of English. While our leader said that we are offering constructive cooperation, Advaniji said that they are giving critical support. To my mind, it is "Tweedledum and Tweedle-dee". So, Advaniji has reserved certain things to himself. If the Government wants to say something which runs counter to whatever is spelt out in their manifesto, I do not think they will compromise through Vishwanathji would wish. That is why they did not allow their persons to occupy the Treasury Benches here. My friend Mr. Unnikrishnan is there, who is a good friend of mine. (*Interruptions*)

*Ibtidaye ishk hai rota hai Kya, aage aage dekhiye hota hai kya*

They can only scream what they dream. I do not blame them. Having got the assurance from my leader for constructive cooperation, if they do not allow even the parliamentary debate from the level which is expected, I really do not know how are they going to run the country. My leader has not said that we are going to oppose whatever you say, but he only said that it has to be within the Congress party's policies, programmes and the principles as enunciated by the AICC and in the constitution of the Congress to which we are wedded. I do not have to say that the Government does not enjoy the confidence. The Government enjoys the confidence, because it is turning to its Left and Right. (*Interruptions*)

I do not know what exactly they are, but sometimes they have to turn to this side, sometimes to the other. Somebody jokingly said that those who are on the left side of Viswanathji are the Leftists and those who are on the right side of him are the Rightists and the Government should have been in between. Never anywhere in the history except in times of war and national crisis, has there been such a situation as we are faced with today in this country.

**13.00 hrs.**

It was never. Let a single illustration be given

where in peace time. the Government was there on the mercy—excuse me, I have to use the word "mercy" because I cannot find a better word—of the Rightists and on the charity of the Leftists.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, it is one O'clock. Do you want to take more time?

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: I will conclude. I think, I have made my points.

We, in this House, should be greatly, exercised over the future of democracy, over the future of independent, India over the future of the coming generation of this country itself. I have done it and I thank you, because in spite of the noises that were made you were good enough to rule in favour of the sanity and against insanity.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we adjourn for Lunch to meet again at 2.00 p.m.

**13.01 hrs.**

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock*

**14.00 hrs.**

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock*

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTTAMAN *in the Chair*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri L.K. Advani.

SHRI INDERJIT (Darjeeling): I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no subject before the House. There is no scope for any point of order.

SHRI INDERJIT: The subject is the motion of confidence...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Inderjit, you please read the rules. You cannot raise a

point of order without a subject before the House.

SHRI INDERJIT: The Constitution has been misquoted and I want to put the record straight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, no point of order. Prof. Madhu Dandavate to present Supplementary Demands for Grants (General).

14.01 hrs.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL)

[English]

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): I beg to present a statement (Hindi and English versions) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of Budget (General) for 1989-90.

#### MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*CONTD*

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri L.K. Advani.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, with the Ninth General Elections, a new chapter has begun in the politics of the country. A new Government has been installed, a new Prime Minister has taken over the reigns of the country and only yesterday the Government has presented its policy statement in the House in the form of President's address. Normally, the first thing to be taken up in Parliament in such a situation is to hold discussion on the President's Address or on the Motion of thanks moved by the Government. It is correct as Shri Antulay said that it is a unique debate because another motion has been moved in the House before the House could take up

discussion on President's Address. The Motion has been taken up for discussion. Although we put a proposal before our Congress friends yesterday that if they were prepared for voting without the discussion on this motion, the ruling party, my party and our marxist friends would also be ready to vote without discussion, but the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has informed us today that the Congress Party desired a discussion, it may be short, inviting at least one member from each party to speak. This debate is taking place for this reason only. We never meant in our proposal to put any sort of restrictions on the debate. We simply wanted to carry out the direction given by the President. I have got the communique which was issued by the Hon. President on 1st December. I am quoting from its English text:

[English]

"Since the Congress (I), elected to the Ninth Lok Sabha with the largest Membership, has opted not to stake its claim for forming a Government, I have invited Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, leader of the second largest party viz. the Janata Dal/ National Front, to form a Government and take a vote of confidence in the Lok Sabha within 30 days of assuming office."

[Translation]

I am purposely quoting words because the spokesman of the Congress Party, Shri Antulay, said today morning that their leader declined to form a Government...

[English]

"He declined to form a Government as if he had been invited to form a Government, which he declined and thus he handed over this Government to you on a platter..."

[Translation]

It has been established in the communique that the congress party, even though it was the largest party in the House....

[English]

It did not even stake its claim to forming a Government. It realised its limitations. I would put it charitably.

[Translation]

I had accepted it and I was prepared to give this interpretation before and after Shri Antulay's submission and I am not ready for any kind of charitable interpretation whatsoever. Otherwise, I had accepted that the Congress Party, which had won the last elections with an unprecedented mandate of more than 400 seats, something which had never happened even during Pandit Nehru's and Shrimati Indira Gandhi's rule, goes for the polls...

[English]

it goes for a renewed mandate.

[Translation]

It attempts to win 450 seats in the next elections keeping in view that it had won 400 seats in the previous one and on that basis it can decide whether the people are happy or not with their Government, whether they accept it or reject it. I was surprised to hear Shri Antulay, while speaking on this motion, say that:

[English]

"It would be wrong to think that the people of India have rejected the Congress."

I am flabbergasted to hear a statement of this kind.

(Interruptions)

Agarwalji, I am not yielding.

14.08 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[Translation]

Had Shri Antulay been present here, I would have been prepared to argue the matter with him. Perhaps, I might agree with some of his points because as he has stated that it has not been a mandate for the Janata Dal. He may have read my letter addressed to the leaders of the Janata Dal or the National Front in which I had assured them of my party's support. In that letter also, I mentioned that the people's verdict was against the Congress Party and was in favour of a change, but it was not in favour of any single party. Therefore, I fully agree with him in this regard and I am confident that even the hon. Members of the ruling party will not disagree on this point. We must make efforts to comprehend the facts. If it is really necessary to hold a discussion on this issue, it could be held when the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address is taken up. This directive of the President could have been followed even without holding a discussion in this regard. But if a discussion is to be held in spite of it, the scope will be limited. The limitation relates to the nature of the verdict given by the people of India during the 1989 elections.

[English]

What is the nature of the mandate which has been given by the people in the Ninth General Election?

[Translation]

The context is limited. To digress would be going out of context at least for today's discussion. Shri Antulay has raised several points. He mentioned Punjab. He referred to the abduction of the Hon. Minister's daughter. He also referred to the Anandpur Sahib Resolution and raised several other matters. I think that when the House takes up the Motion of Thanks on President's Address, all these matters will become relevant. That will be the appropriate occasion. Therefore, I would like to present a vivid account of the doings of the Congress Party vis-a-vis Anandpur Sahib resolution. I can also de-



[Sh. L.K. Adwani]

scribe in detail the policy which the Congress party had adopted on Ayodhya issue since the very beginning. While referring to the situation prevailing in Kashmir at present, the hon. Member had commented sarcastically that Shri Rajiv Gandhi had handed over a well integrated country but

[English]

today the country is going to the dogs.

[Translation]

When Shri Rajiv Gandhi had taken over the charge of the Government the position was much better. There were the words he used.

[English]

If the country is going to the dogs, it is not the result of ten days or fourteen days rule by this Government. It is the result of five years rule.

[Translation]

They ruled for 5 years and now their spokesman says that the country.

[English]

is today going to the dogs. Is this a statement? Is it a confession? Is it a self-indictment? At least, about this Government, I am willing to judge it after some time and not today.

[Translation]

He has taken over the charge of the Government very recently...*(Interruptions)*... You may satisfy yourself with this...*(Interruptions)*... But Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to explain the attitude of our party on every issue.

Sir, firstly it should be made clear that at the time when the National Front led by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh has staked its claim for the formation of the Government,

there were no other claimants in the field. This issue could have been relevant, had there been more than one claimant and the President would have had to satisfy himself about the majority support. I have got the report on the Centre-State relations with me. It says:

[English]

"However, where no single party or group commands absolute majority, the Governor has to exercise his discretion in the selection of Chief Minister."

[Translation]

The President can exercise his discretion and not call the largest party to form the Government.

[English]

"In such a situation, the leader of the party or group which in so far as the Governor is able to ascertain has the largest support in the legislative assembly may be called upon to form the Government."

[Translation]

At that time you could have also staked your claim on the basis of Shri Antulay's advice and approached the President in this regard and won a vote of confidence, about which Shri Antulay said confidently that he was two hundred percent sure of mustering a majority support.

Going by the attitude of the political parties present here and their interpretations of the matter, this kind of an assumption is either erroneous or it is indicative of something terrible and therefore, is a matter of concern...*(Interruptions)*... Supporting that Shri Rajiv Gandhi has heeded his advice and approached the President to stake his claim for formation of the Government, I am convinced that the President would not have allowed him to do so because he would have

said that the National Front had also staked a similar claim. He would have like to know that apart from the 193 Members of his party who else would support him, on the basis of which he could claim majority support. Even after receiving the support of the AIADMK and the Muslim League you could not have mustered the support of more than 210 or 215 Members. On the other hand, Shri V.P. Singh did not have to stake his claim... It was so because

[English]

there was no other claimant; he was the only claimant.

[Translation]

But had the question of proving his support arisen he would have produced the letter in which support of BJP was extended to him and stated that he had the support of 86 BJP Members and 52 Left Front Members which would total to more than 280 Members. In this way the number of total members extending support to the National Front is something like 285 to 290. Therefore, under the circumstances, it follows that the President would have requested the National Front to form the Government as there could be no other claimant. The President stated that the National Front could form Government and the hon. Ministers could take oath and there was no need to verify the number of elected members extending support it. It could be asked to convene the sitting of the House and seek vote of confidence within 30 days. I think that this is the right precedent set by the President. Although there are people who have objected to it, as I have read some articles in which it has been mentioned that President's saying that there were no other claimants was not necessary and the National Front could have been told to form the Government right away and if anyone wanted to bring a non-confidence motion, he was free to do so. I feel that the action taken by the Hon. President in this case will serve as a precedent for all times to come. It will never happen that a minority Government is formed

and it does not convene a session for a period 6 months after its formation. What I am emphasising is that the motion which has been moved by the leader of the House, the Hon. Prime Minister of our country is an outcome of the directive given by the Hon. President to summon the House within one month. It is not to enunciate or discuss the policies of the Government. All these things will be taken care of when we discuss these policies later on in the House. I have gone through the President's Address which enumerates the policies of the Government. I am sure that when there is a discussion on the President's Address my colleagues will explain each and every policy and will be able to tell that this newly formed Government has rightly felt the pulse of the country and a new direction has been given to the politics according to the needs of the country. I have been expressing my concern during the last 5 years. On the issues of rising prices of corruption etc., which have their direct bearing on the masses. However, the political thinkers have been chiefly concerned over degeneration of the institutions in the country. We are fully conscious of the problem and will take all the steps necessary to restore the dignity of every institution right from President to the Auditor General. I hope that all such steps will get the support of not only the C.P.I. (M) and the B.J.P. but all of you who will extend your support on the same lines as it was given by the Congress when after the period of emergency, it had realised the mistake it had committed by getting the 42nd Amendment passed during the Emergency. But when we came with a proposal to annual the amendment, they extended their support. You should think over it that the very stand which your Party had been holding on to even 15 days before the elections, that the autonomy to the Radio and Television was out of question since it was very dangerous, was suddenly changed as the Congress Party made a somersault as it was mentioned in its manifesto that it was in favour of giving autonomy to the media. Thereafter one of Ministers said that their Party was only for the functional autonomy. But I did not find any such thing in it. Instead they had proposed to form an au-

[Sh. L.K. Adwani]

onomous corporation. However, you are prepared to yield to the public opinion. You thought that since this won't remain in your hands in future, the present Government too should not gain anything out of it so it would be good if autonomy is given to them. I mention these things because I agree that in this matter it is not sufficient only to talk of constructive Opposition. Instead it should be critical support. But you are not giving any critical support but you are just opposing. I have used the words 'critical support' which I have deliberately used because I feel that the Members of the Ruling Party should extend their critical support to their Government so that this convention may continue in the Party. This convention has disappeared from your Party. There was a time when this used to happen in your party too. I never felt it that since Janata Dal, the B.J.P. and the Leftist Party have come together.

[English]

Therefore, it has become a two headed, three legged monster.

[Translation]

There is an anxiety over it. But if you apply your mind, you can very well see that this statement is a sort of assurance of our support to the Government. (*Interruptions*)

You have just mentioned that I have not said so. This echoes what Hitler used to say that democracy is nothing but the rule by a large number of people.

[English]

It is a hydra-headed monster.

[Translation]

Perhaps that is why I heard and echo of Hitler in their words. But I would like to remind you that in those days when the first Government was formed in India under the leadership of Pandit Nehru, there were people

like Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee and Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, who were a strong critic of the Congress throughout their life but Mr. Nehru never felt it that if he gave some important assignment to Dr. Mukherjee or Dr. Ambedkar, his Government would become two-headed or multi headed. You may continue with you differences and after period of six months or one year or so if you feel that the Government is not working in the right direction, you may criticise it. Do not worry, I will also do the same if I find it so. As I have told you that in that case Government will invite criticism even from our party which has extended its support to form the Government. But the people of your party had closed their eyes and that was a wrong convention...

[English]

You do not try to deflect me. I am on my small and limited objective.

[Translation]

If the people's mandate is seen in its clear perspective. The Congress Party will have to accept it.

[English]

Though this may not be a positive mandate in favour of any single party, it is a categorical mandate against the Congress Party and in favour of a change.

[Translation]

However, I regret to say that this mistake has not been committed by Shri Antulay alone but a number of political analysts as they have been taking this mandate in terms of North and south all the time. It is I who has said that the mistake has been committed by Shri Antulay alone. It behoves him to say so and therefore he is saying it. Otherwise even I could have said that the Congress Party should have thought over it 4 months back as to why it was rejected by the masses, in all the northern States and in the 4 States of the South. I can say so but I never think about it

in terms of North and South dichotomy and even today I am of the opinion that the mandate given during recent Lok Sabha elections has reflected the desire of the people for a change. But the anti-establishment factor in the non-Congress ruled States, made that desire for change mute or changed it *disputed* it or subseed it completely. In Andhra Pradesh, the Telugu Desam was in power, in Kerala it was the CPI(M) and in Tamil Nadu, the DMK Government. There may be various other reasons for their rejection in their own States but at that time the prime factor was the anti-establishment factor. Same thing happened some time back even in Karnataka where there was the Janata party Government and that is why perhaps, it is because of that factor in other States of the North like U.P., Bihar, M.P., Gujarat, Rajasthan that the results were good though they were not so good in Haryana. Realising this factor we should not think much in terms of North and South. If we are thinking all the time in terms of North and South, we do not give a right direction to the national politics. Therefore, I would like that the Congress Party should accept it, as I think that except the leader of Congress Party there was no other political leader in any democracy of the world who rose so high in people's esteem and again lost his credibility in such a short span of five years. Therefore, instead of thinking it that this is not against them, there should be some introspection and analysis within the Congress Party.

[English]

SHRI G. DEVARAYA NAIK (Kanara): He has forgotten that Congress Party is the largest party in Parliament.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have not forgotten that.

[Translation]

Therefore, I was thinking that if you did nothing else, you would certainly claim that your Party has emerged as the largest single party since it had its first claim and should be

allowed to form the Government. However, when you did not come forward with this claim, I felt that you too had understood the meaning of this mandate which was in favour of change and since the mandate was not in your favour, you said that you did not believe in it.

Shri Antulay has rightly reminded us that in 1979 when Shri Chavan moved a no-confidence motion against the government Shri Morarji had submitted his resignation before a division on that motion in the House and the President, in the new situation, did not see it that there were a total of 55 or 60 members in Shri Chavan's Party and it was not the largest single party. I do not remember its exact strength but I know that it was not the single largest party. Even at that time Shri Morarji Desai's Party was the single largest party but in view of the fact that before a division could take place on the no-confidence motion the cabinet had resigned, the President acted on the lines of British Parliament where in the similar situation, the party in opposition, irrespective of the strength of that Party, is given an opportunity to form the Government. He had said that he cannot form the Government and Charan Singhji can form it. In the meantime Jagjivan Ramji staked his claim and the then then President asked him to give a list of those who supported him. Ordinarily, in this case also the President would have decided that even though the Congress Party is the biggest party and has the majority, he would call the second largest party as the mandate was against the Congress and nobody would have objected to that. But when you said that you would not stake your claim it became all the more easier for the President to ask the National Front to form the Government. He asked them to take oath and seek vote of confidence within thirty days. I am happy that at least the Congress Party has decided not to oppose us in this matter and abstain from it. It in itself is an acceptance that Government has obtained majority. It is a good thing and puts responsibility on the Government that instead of politics of confrontation and criticism it shall have to work towards consensus. Shri Antulay has mentioned that

[Sh. L.K. Adwani

there should be consensus on issues. It was also mentioned at a meeting on Punjab which was called by the Prime Minister two three days back. I would like to mention here that I have participated in many all-party-meetings during the past few years which were called by Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi, some of them recently. On no occasion was a draft provided before hand and we used to sit and discuss matters. A draft was prepared in that meeting and if there were any objections the draft was suitably amended and finally a consensus was arrived at. This has happened for the first time that Congress party which claims of playing constructive role opposition, has said in the context of Punjab that as the draft was not shown to them beforehand they do not want to become a party to it. They said that they received it at 2 0' clock in the night. I may tell you for your information that I received it at 2 0' clock in the morning and still I made my observations on it. If this is their attitude, I cannot say whether it can be called constructive at all. I am sorry for the interruptions from our side in the maiden speech of Antulayji, which, I feel, should not have been there. He should have been given full opportunity to express his views I would like to say that the proceedings of the House should be allowed to be carried in a dignified and balanced way and argument put forward by each section of the House should be heard. But you should bear it mind that if you make uncalled for remarks and describe it as two headed and three legged. it is bound to echo—

[*English*]

People in glass houses should not throw stones at others.

[*Translation*]

I would, therefore request the Congress Party not to abstain, but instead set a new example. It would be better if they say 'a new Government has come to power and we express our confidence in you. We have not

staked our claim. You should work and show results. After 6-8 months or one year, we shall decide whether to move a no-confidence against you or reiterate confidence in you,' With this appeal, I support the motion moved the leader of the House.

---

14.35 hrs.

MEMBERS SWORN

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Secretary-General may call out the names of Members who have not yet taken the Oath or made the Affirmation.

Smt. Rajinder Kaur Bulara (Ludhiana)

Shri Rajdev Singh (Sangrur)

Shri Sucha Singh (Bhatinda)

Shri Jagdev Singh (Faridkot)

---

14.41 hrs.

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE  
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS-*CONTD.*

[*Translation*]

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA (Allahabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, till now the motion of confidence has never been moved in the history of Lok Sabha. Earlier, motions of no-confidence were used to be moved in the House and being in the opposition we used to speak in favour of the motion. Today, I am happy that we are speaking in favour of a confidence motion. It is true, as has been said by Shri Advani, that the Hon. President has directed Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh to obtain vote of confidence in the House but it is also a matter of courage that a Prime Minister, himself moves a motion of confidence in the House. In the past, we have had many great leaders who were leaders of the

House and at times their leadership was questioned but even then they never moved a motion of confidence in the House on their own. I would like to congratulate the leader of the House Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh for this. Antulayji, I regret that some of our friends raised hue and cry when your name was called...(*Interruptions*) Some of our friends made uproar just on seeing you. We, who are in the public life, should always try to have an unblemished record and if it is not so, people make hue and cry. You were getting angry and shouting at some new members. You can yourself imagine what a Member might have felt after facing numerous inquiries and passing through a number of metal detectors. Every Member who enters this House becomes an hon. Member and due regard should be paid to him but his past history used to be discussed here in the House and will continue to haunt him.

Being the single largest party, they are right in saying that they have majority. It is true that democracy is the game of numbers but the sentiments of the people are also attached with their votes. Democracy is also a game of sentiments. Had it not been so you would not have gone from treasury benches to the opposition benches. I have sympathy for you and your great leader. You are writhing in pain like a wounded bird and for this we can only sympathise with you. I will avoid using harsh words. You should note it that democracy is not the game of numbers but of sentiments. It is true that your strength in the House is about two hundred but how you have reached that figure? Till now there was not even a single case of booth capturing in the constituency of any Prime Minister....

SHRI KALPNATH RAI (Ghosi): There were instances of booth capturing in the name of Sh. Charan Singh. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIJANESHWARMISHRA: An MLA, who was a Minister in the Uttar Pradesh Government during Congress regime and was very close to Shri Rajiv Gandhi and had contributed a lot to his success in his last election, was shot at and till now he has not fully recovered from the bullet injuries which

he had received in his stomach. At least the person occupying Prime Minister's chair should protect democracy. Under his Prime-Ministership and in the State ruled by his party, incidents of shooting took place in the presence of the collector. Yet they are proud of winning 200 seats in the House. If elections are held tomorrow, this number will come down to twenty five only...(*Interruptions*)... that is why I specifically mentioned the number. ....(*Interruptions*)... You have a number of wounds in your heart. The hon. leader mentioned the names of Dr. Lohia and Shri Jai Prakash Narain in the House but he made no mention of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi. You felt shy of pointing out the omission of the name of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. You could not muster courage to mention the omission of Indiraji whom you accepted as your great leader. What can we do about it? Allegation was made against the leader of the House or against us. We have always opposed the Congress party and would continue to do so in future as well. Your allegation is that we have imported our leader. At the time of elections, people too had raised the question as to why we preferred to accept Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh as our leader than to choose someone amongst ourselves. We told them that he was not our leader. Since he was spearheading the campaign to nab the thief, that is why ...(*Interruptions*)... we accepted him to be our leader. We would be ready to accept persons like Shri Dinesh Singh, Shri Brahma Dutt, Shri Kalpnath Rai and Dr. Rajendra Kumari Bajpai as our leaders if they help us in apprehending the real culprit...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have a point of order ...(*Interruptions*)... Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav...(*Interruptions*)... I must speak...(*Interruptions*)... you may put a check if you so want ...(*Interruptions*)... How can I speak if they shout like this...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. SPEAKER: You address the Chair.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: I am addressing the Chair. But if they shout ....(Interruptions)....

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Let me listen to his point of order....(Interruptions)...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Shri Mulayam Sing Yadav ...(Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any rule of the House, is there any point of order? You sit down. No point of order. Which rule has been violated? ....(Interruptions)...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: I am speaking under the same rule under which the other hon. Member is speaking. With due respect to Shri Janeshwar Mishra, I would like to tell him that the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav...

MR. SPEAKER: Kalpnath Raiji, you cannot drag the name of a Chief Minister in this controversy. Where is the relevance? There is no point of order...(Interruptions)....

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: What are you saying? If he says such defamatory things, I can reply to it... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Please take your seats. I have permitted him.

...(Interruptions)...

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats. Please tell me if you have any point of order. I have permitted you. Nobody else will speak.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Janeshwar Mishra was referring to the corrupt practices of Dahia Trust of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh...

MR. SPEAKER: Now you sit down. There is no point of order in it. Shri Janeshwar Mishra.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Member was raising a point of order just now. He was also referring to us. Mr. Speaker, Sir, these elections were fought mainly on the issue of corruption. At present, we are discussing the issue of majority. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, who is now the leader of the House, was formerly the Finance Minister and Defence Minister also. When he resigned from these offices, the issue of corruption made headlines in the newspapers all over the country. CAG also mentioned it. Later on, allegations were made against Shri Amitabh Bachchan also, who was very close to Shri Rajiv Gandhi....(Interruptions).... It was a serious matter of corruption. You are a newly elected Speaker. Allegations of receiving commission in the purchase of fodder machines were levelled against the former Speaker. At that time, we, the people of rural areas were perplexed as to what was happening and how democracy would function. What would happen to a country where the Speaker of the Legislature, the Judiciary and the Executive come under cloud. People all over the country were stunned to hear such allegations. Had the rulers administered the country properly, they would not have met this fate. That would not have had to sit in the Opposition...(Interruptions).... Today, they claim that they were in a position to form a run the Government. We would come to know of their actual strength after the coming elections in the month of January. All will come to this side. We know that it would be difficult for them to remain in the opposition for long after enjoying power. We know how many of members would be left on their side....(Interruptions)...

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a serious matter was raised by Shri Antulay. He submitted that the Hon. Prime Minister was being aided by the leftist and rightist parties, but both cannot go together. It is true that the Congress culture has been to encourage confrontation between the rightist forces and the leftist forces and thereby rule the country. But the National Front joined hands with the leftist parties and the rightist parties to prove that a body cannot function properly unless all the or-

gans work unitedly. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh contested the Parliamentary by-election from Allahabad constituency, one of the Congressmen had expressed his doubt whether Shri Advani, Shri Vajpayee on one side and Shri Shahabuddin on the other side would give their support to Shri V.P. Singh. At that time I had said...

SHRI R.N. RAKESH (Chail): Haji Mastan was also there.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: You may ask Shri Antulay about Haji Mastan's whereabouts. (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: Your leader is speaking and you get up.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: My assertion was that credit must go to the master mind of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, the Janata Dal and the opposition that Shri Vajpayee and Shri Shahabuddin would share the same platform. Mr. Speaker, Sir, they have levelled many allegations. One of them relates to the kidnapping of the daughter of the Home Minister. It is astonishing that...

SHRI J.P. AGGARWAL (Chandni Chowk): Would you rule the country by creating a rift between the Hindus and the Muslims...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: When the Punjab problem had become very critical, the leader of the Congress party had withdrawn the names of his children from the rolls of St. Columbus schools and he himself began wearing a bullet proof jacket for this personal safety. The car in which he travelled was preceded and followed by 20 to 25 cars to provide security cover. I went through the statement of a former Minister just now. He has stated that although he owns three houses in Delhi, he would like to vacate the official bungalow because the which he owns are not safe from the security angle. For how long can he occupy this bungalow? Besides, it is one's conduct that

provides the real security cover. I would like to congratulate Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh for his visit to Amritsar in an open jeep. Their leader did not ever have the courage to visit Amritsar and even stopped sending his children to school out of fear. It is necessary to bring openness in character. If you are constantly trying to protect yourself, the threat to your life will increase ... (*Interruptions*) ... He has referred to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs and his daughter. Shri Antulay has said that this Government will not be able to function. We may recall that when Shri Sanjay Singh was in the hospital and the then Prime Minister wanted to pay him a visit, but he could not do so because four or five hundred people had surrounded the hospital. The nation's Prime Minister could not go to see a patient on account of security reasons. But such a kind of law and order situation cannot continue for ever. So far as the abduction of the hon. Minister's daughter is concerned, I would like to submit that during the Congress rule, the daughters of the common people were kidnapped. The National Front Government deserves to be congratulated for checking the kidnapping the daughters of ordinary people even at the cost of the Hon. Home Minister's daughter being kidnapped. The day the people running the Government... (*Interruptions*) ...Let it not be presumed that there can be no solution to this problem. A solution to the Babri Masjid and Ram Janambhoomi issue will be found out and the Communist Party of India, our Muslim brothers and the B.J.P. are also lending their support to us to solve it. A solution will be found out through dialogue and not by use of force. I would like to make this clear to them.

15.00 hrs.

Sir, a point with regard to the question of reservation has been raised here. In this connection, I would like to say that this issue has been a matter of discussion from the time when we were not even born. Their leader was also born much later. Gandhiji had launched a movement for this and a pact was signed at Pune. At that time were not even born. The backward community com-



[Sh. Janeshwar Mishra]

prises of the downtrodden the exploited and the oppressed people. They have their own agonies. It is just like a disease of leprosy that has afflicted our society. There are some other social maladies also plaguing our society. Capitalism is one of them which has afflicted our society like dermatitis in the body. None of the present big industrial houses in our country had been prosperous for more than 4 to 5 generation back. Prosperity of some of the big industrialists such as the Birlas or the Tatas could not be traced beyond their 5 generations. But the terms Brahmin, Thakur, Baniya and Harijan have been in existence for a considerable long time. It is a disease of leprosy with which our society is afflicted. Some formula were worked out under the leadership of Gandhiji and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya for curing this malady. Later on when the Constitution of India was framed, some seats in the State Assemblies and the Lok Sabha were reserved for Harijans so as to provide them special opportunity..... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI J.P. AGARWAL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has termed Harijans as the disease of leprosy, which is wrong.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. Please make your point.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the word " Harijan" referred to by the hon. Member has not been used in the Constitution. The words " Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes " are there in the Constitution but not the word "Harijan".

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order, Please take your seat.

SHRI J.P. AGARWAL : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I object to his comparison of Harijans and Baniyas with leprosy in the country. He should withdraw these words. Please ask him to withdraw these words.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Please take your seat.

SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA : The law given by 'Manu' was vertical whereas the constitution drafted by Dr. Ambedkar is horizontal in character . By the term vertical I mean that it classified the people as high castes and low castes and by the term horizontal I mean that all are equal under the Constitution. According to Manu, one section is high and the other is low, whereas according to Ambedkar, all are equal. But the Constitution of India is a horizontal one and the law of Manu has been rejected. So it was a decided fact that we were to change the entire society into a horizontal one. It is not a question related to the Congress Party or the National Front or the Janata Dal. It is a question of social reform. It is a question for which not only leaders such as Lohiaji, Jai Prakashji and Shri Karpooori Thakur struggled but many other great leaders have also waged war on this issue. As such, this matter needs not only to be discussed in the House but it should be discussed leaving aside political considerations. We may hold a discussion here and satisfy ourselves, but what about the discussion that is taking place in the villages. If the tension witnessing the House is reflected also in the villages, it will have a very adverse effect. Please try to think about this problem with a broader outlook. Whenever we take steps to uplift the down trodden people by providing special opportunities to them, interests of the various sections clash. The people have some vested interest in it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, people often say that reservation should be provided on the basis of economic condition of the people and why not a formula could be evolved under which equal opportunities would be made available to all irrespective of the fact one belongs to a Harijan community or a Brahmin community. If one could become a Collector, why not the other? Sometimes people come up with a proposal that when one member of a family becomes a Collector, other member of that family should be debarred from becoming a Collector. But nobody dares to put it into practice. I know that it is not at all an economic problem.

There are so many maladies in our society and confrontation is bound to take place if corrective measures are not taken. There are large scale disparities. For Example, there are people for whom there are no restrictions to accumulate wealth in enormous proportions and there are people who are required to seek permission to earn even one rupee as daily wages for their livelihood. It is a social problem and you will have to find some way out to provide some special opportunities to people who are socially backward, who are oppressed and way to this has been found out after so many years. Why agitation was not launched when reservation provision was extended during Congress rule? When a son of an Ahir becomes the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, agitations take place. When a barber's son becomes the Chief Minister of Bihar, reservation issue hots up. All of us know as to why these things take place. We also know that today agitations have been launched in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The boys belonging to the youth wing of the Congress Party fuddle whenever they visit foreign countries and these boys misbehaved with us in a drunken state. The agitation that is taking place these days ... (*Interruptions*) ..

With these words, I would like to request the entire House, through you, to adopt this motion unanimously.

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we fully support the Motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister and on behalf of my party, I wish to reiterate on the floor of the House what was communicated to the hon'ble Rashtrapathiji that we extend our unconditional support to the Government formed by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh.

Sir, the results of the last elections clearly show that the people have voted for a change and they have given an unequivocal mandate against the previous Government. We congratulate the people of this country for their conscious decision to free themselves

from the shackles of a corrupt and oppressive Government.

Sir, let me make my party position clear. We consider the defeat of the Congress party in the last elections as an outstanding achievement of the common people of this country, who had been groaning under misery because of the various anti-people policies of the Government and of the corrupt administration with which they had been running this country. We are extremely happy and satisfied that the previous regime of Rajiv Gandhi has been removed by the will of the people and the National Front Government has been installed at the Centre. The last elections saw violence on an unprecedented scale. There have been serious reports—not only reports but it has been proved—that there were a large number of booths in the then Prime Minister's constituency which were captured necessitating for the first time, I believe, in the removal of the Returning Officer of the whole constituency and removal of the District Magistrate and the Superintendent of Police of the area because the Election Commission satisfied itself that those officers had indulged in booth capturing and rigging on behalf of the then Prime Minister of this country. And not one word of regret has been expressed. In spite of massive booth capturing, rigging and terror tactics which had been adopted by the Congress Party, they have not been successful to secure a favourable verdict from the people of this country which shows the people's anger and contempt for the then Government. The people are today celebrating their deliverance from the clutches of a corrupt and rotten regime. The people in this country have been fighting for quite some time for the removal of the Rajiv Gandhi's Government.

15.13 hrs.

[SHRI NIRMAL CHATERJEE *in the Chair*]

And you will recall the magnificent public response that was given to the call of all the then opposition parties for a Bharat bandh on 30th August. That was the day when

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

history was created and a clear signal was issued that the people were against the Government of Rajiv Gandhi. It was a Government which became synonymous with corruption, with hunger for power, with communal divide, with rise of fundamentalism in this country. That Government has now been unceremoniously disposed of to the dustbin of history. And we must not do anything which will in any way undo the clear verdict of the people of this country against the Congress Party.

Many things will have to be done by the present Government to clear the mess that has been left behind by the old Government. And the present Government should be given opportunity to implement their manifesto which is the condition we have imposed.

We heard earlier in the day the peroration of the new Rajiv loyalist. I am reminded of an observation which appeared in the newspapers on 8th December, 1984 which said:

"Can Mr. Antulay be a loyalist when he left the party after the Congress (I) Parliamentary Board denied him a ticket to contest the election."

This is the statement of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Naturally, when he was denied a ticket he went and formed his own party and criticised and castigated his present leader. However, in the present situation he has again chosen him as his own leader. But one thing is very clear. In his long speech he referred to so many things but never uttered the word 'corruption' during his one-hour speech, and it is very clear that the Congress people do not believe in self-introspection. Not one word has been said why a party which enjoyed such massive mandate, of which we are reminded of almost everyday *ad nauseam* on the floor of the House, was reduced to 191 or 192 within five years..... (*Interruptions*) ..

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil) : What

about the CPI (M) ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: CPI (M) has increased the strength.. (*Interruptions*)... Sir, I have not yielded.

Sir, the present Government has been described as a two-headed and three-legged monster, or I do not know what he said. But I would choose a two-headed or a three-legged monster than one-headed confused man with two bow-legs and 191 tails.

Reference was made to the unique Motion that has been moved today on the floor of the House. We have seen in this country several occasion when their favourite Governors had indulged in head counting inside the Raj Bhawans. But I must congratulate our Rashtrapati Ji that he has taken up the right attitude and directed the present Government to obtain a Vote of Confidence on the floor of the House itself without indulging in head counting.

Mr. Antulay said that Prime Minister did not enjoy majority support. Before saying that, he should have waited till the end of this debate when he would have found out whether the Prime Minister enjoyed the majority support or not. It has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Advani that they have not got the courage to call for a Division, as they have indicated already, because they know what would be the fate of that Division.

Mr. Antulay said that they want a strong Centre. Does the strong Centre mean that only one person in this country will be the arbiter of the fate of the 750 million people of this country? Does it mean that different parties, may be having their different manifestoes, should not respond positively to the verdict of the people, which has been against the Congress Party and in favour of, what one may say, a government by the Janata Dal to be supported by others? A strong Centre does not mean that the Janata Dal, with the support of others, cannot form a government and that the country will go to dogs, which has been the comment made by Mr. Antulay. We also want a strong Centre

with strong States where the federal concept and the federal structure of this country would have its due role to play. It has been said that the minority government is being supported by the BJP and the Communists. Sir, we have said even earlier, before the results of the election—because the people's prime concern has been, as we understood from their response during the Bharat Bandh and from the people's mood, that they are out to dislodge this Government—that if Janata Dal is in a position to form the Government, we shall support them from outside, and we have kept our commitment.

It has been said that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi has shown magnanimity and generosity in not staking his claim for the Government. I believe that is the howler of the century. I am sure he would have staked his claim to form a Government and probably today, he is repenting to have passed that Anti-Defection Bill because the money that was available with them cannot be utilised for ulterior purposes. Then, something extraordinary was said.....

SHRI A.C. CHARLES: (Trivandrum): How much did you get?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, something extraordinary was said that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi could have continued till 14th January 1990. Look at his generosity. He gave up his right to continue in Government till 14th January 1990 and it was his sinful day when Mr. V.P. Singh was sworn in as the Prime Minister of India. Sir, kindly consider that the Congress people can even think that their Government, after having been beaten thoroughly and having lost the people's support could even dream of continuing till 14th January 1990, only to take advantage of the constitutional provision in this country. Sir, this is the way the Congress people have been conducting themselves.

Sir, what they have said is that they would give constructive cooperation to the Government. The wonderful system of constructive cooperation is that it must be ac-

ording to their own policies and programmes which have been rejected by the people of this country. Sir, we have got the sample of their cooperation during the all-Party meet on Punjab. Even during the Speaker's election what they have indicated clearly shows that there is no cooperation forthcoming from them and the very fact that today they have insisted on a debate only on the issue of vote of confidence of this Government clearly shows they believe in destructive criticism and not constructive cooperation. Nobody will yield to anyone in our concern for the maintenance of unity and integrity of the country.

Sir, we have seen how the unity and the integrity of the country were under the greatest strain during the last Government. We have seen how perversions and distortions had crept in the body politic of the country. We have seen how our constitutional institutions were denigrated and how they had interfered with in the discharge of their functions and how the people's respect was brought to the dust in this country. And now we say we believe in the unity and integrity of the country which has been under the greatest strain under the Rajiv Gandhi's Government and it will be restored back to its proper position under the present Government with the support of the people. I must congratulate the Prime Minister for having visited Amritsar soon after he assumed the office the other day. Sir, probably a fortnight or three weeks have elapsed since this Government has taken charge of the administration of this country and the Congress Party wants that all the ills and all the problems that have been created by them during their five-year misrule will be solved overnight. This shows an irresponsible attitude and a criticism for the sake of criticism and I find those hon. Members on the other side who had been most vocal in the other House in the earlier House against the Congress Party now having joined them recently, are most vocal in their support for the Congress Party now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about you, Sir?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, Mr. Antulay asked what would be the price paid. Price paid by whom? Would it be the price paid by the Congress people? They will realise soon that the people of this country will not tolerate an attitude of confrontation with the present Government so soon. I want them safely ensconced on that side with greater and greater reduced number in the future.

Sir, our country is passing through very serious multidimensional crises and these are to be solved, crisis created and inherited, created by the previous government and inherited by the present Government. Now, it is necessary that there should be national effort to solve these problems and it is our bounden duty support this Government to solve these serious problems so that the economic crisis which has engulfed the people, so that the problems of unity and integrity of this country which are under serious strain, these important issues, are solved, for which I pledge my party's support to the present Government.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, before I come to the subject of this motion, with your permission I would like to make three brief observations. One is that for the last 3 to 3 1/2 hours we have been listening to this debate and I think you will have noticed that the Members belonging to the parties which are supporting this Government have generally been listening quietly... (*Interruptions*). You don't understand my words? Did you see the Communists or the BJP Members shouting and yelling and heckling people? (*Interruptions*).

I am appealing, Sir, to all Members in this House, I don't want to sound sanctimonious about it. But any way, only a few days ago or a few hours ago hopes were being expressed on various sides that this new House, the Ninth Lok Sabha under the custodianship of the new Speaker would at least try to ensure that debates which are held here are serious, meaningful and conducted in a way which enables everybody to have

his say without interruption. Occasional interruption here and there does not matter, that is part of the parliamentary game. (*Interruptions*).

But, Sir, unfortunately, what we have seen today belies those hopes. I know that there are some passions and feelings running high because we are meeting just after the elections and having a debate on a subject which arouses a controversy here in the House. Nevertheless, everybody on all sides of the House should try seriously the leaders of these parties including the Leaders of the House and the Leader of the Opposition and the Leaders of other parties; it is their bounden responsibility to see that Members observe the minimum decorum of this House in the sense that everybody should be allowed to have his say without obstruction and interruption because that is a two-way street, that is a game which can be played by all sides and ultimately it will not help anybody.

Secondly, Sir, I wish to say that at some stage I leave it to the Government, but at some stage, not as part of this discussion, but perhaps at the end of it or tomorrow this House should not disperse without expressing its sorrow or its condolences to all the people—I do not know their numbers—who have lost their lives either in the wave of communal disturbances which preceded the election, or those who have lost their lives during the election campaign itself. We all of us, have come here after those unfortunate incidents have taken place. We, should remember those people. It is not enough to make obituary references only to our former Members and colleagues. Of course, we have already done that. But let us also pay some homage to those innocent people belonging to different communities who have lost their lives who have been killed in the course of the election campaign itself. Thirdly, I am very happy on behalf of my party, that at least some Members from Punjab who were staying aloof have rejoined us today and have come here to support this Motion of Confidence. As far as the subject is concerned, I do not wish to repeat what my

colleagues on this side have side. Shri Antulay's laboured argument about how unanimous Shri Rajiv Gandhi has been in giving up his claim to form the Government and all that has already been punctured here. It is a technical matter and a constitutional matter also. If Shri Rajiv Gandhi had been really convinced that there was any possibility of his party managing to get adequate support from other parties and groups which would give them a majority in the House, I am sure he would not have shown any magnanimity whatever. It was a total loss of confidence in them.

Sir, I do not know whether it is permissible to refer to the Rashtrapathiji. The night before Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh was sworn in as Prime Minister, the Left parties had gone jointly to the Rashtrapathi Bhawan to tell the Rashtrapathi that for the purpose of forming this Government he should send for Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and our parties were prepared to support unconditionally the formation of such a Government. The Rashtrapathi said, "I know that, I am waiting for him, why doesn't he come?; I am sending a message for him." So, it was all decided by the Rashtrapathi much earlier. He understood what the position was. If Anti-Defection Law was not in operation and if the days of the "Aaya Rams and Gaya Rams" were still there... (*Interruptions*).

SHR! G. DEVARAYA NAIK: (Kanara) : Sir, he is directly insulting our hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Shri Antulay made much of the fact that people in the four southern states have given a big majority to the Congress. I also, like Shri Advani, do not want to discuss the subject on the basis of North versus South. That would not be correct, but the fact remains that in these four southern states, the Congress party, out of 139 seats, has won—I say not be absolutely accurate—about 125 seats. Out of these 193 people sitting here, 125 seats have been won in the four southern states and some seats in the north-east. So, what do you mean to say because of that? I would rather

have said, "Yes, the people of the South, for whatever reason—it is their democratic right to vote as they wish—have saved the Congress party from a total oblivion. They have saved your party from a total oblivion and the least you could not was to make a gesture to the people of the South.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN (Alleppey): Do you think the people of Kerala... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, I am not yielding.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN: I put a simple question to you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: What a gesture they could make to the South, I will leave it to you, to think.

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN: Do you agree that the people of Kerala are more literate ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Let us not go into the pattern of voting in Kerala and all that. We will go into that later as to who are the people who helped you and in your votes. We will go into that.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are ready for that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I was very interested to find Mr. Antulay—I had noted it down while he was speaking—making two statements which appear to me to be absolutely contradictory to each other. On the one hand, he said, "we have handed over a united country to you. At the time of going, we have handed over to you, a United country." And in the next breath he said, "The unity of the country is going to the dogs" I do not understand it. That means, within 15 days, during these 15 days, the unity of the country is going to the dogs? Then, what has happens during the last 5 years? What has enabled all these divisive forces to grow throughout the country in such a threatening

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

manner? That has not happened now—after this Government has come to power.

You have lost one of your top leaders, the Prime Minister of this country because of these divisive forces. For years and years, you refused even to take the country and Parliament into confidence about the enquiry into the forces which might have been behind that killing. A Supreme Court Judge was appointed under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. He gave a report and then you said that report would not be made public. Ultimately you were compelled to lay that on the Table of the House. In that report we found—the Supreme Court Judge was not chosen by us, he was selected by your leader—the Judge saying, "I have not found very conclusive proof about the conspiracy. But there is a certain individual against whom the needle of suspicion is pointed."

15.37 hrs.

[DR. THAMBI DURAI *in the Chair*]

I need not name him. Here you all know it—a person who was named in that report as being the prime suspect in the conspiracy behind the murder. But what did your leader do the next day? He reinstated that gentleman in his own secretariat Prime Minister's Secretariat. That is the respect and honour you show to the memory of your leader!

I have been howling and shouting in this House for years saying that it is your duty to reveal to the people of this country, what was the conspiracy behind this murder. But to this day, it has not been revealed.

What standards are you going by? People cannot trust you if you behave like this. Therefore, I want to say, it is completely wrong to say that the unity of the country has gone to the dogs now, after Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh took over. I think, unity of the country has been going to the dogs for the last several years and the ruling Party at that time had an active hand in it, by helping to

appease and compromise with these forces. I am surprised that the leader of the ruling Party at that time launched his election campaign from Faizabad. He did not find any other place to launch his election campaign. His first speech was made at Faizabad, adjacent to Ayodhya. What did he say there? If you return me to power again, I promise you that Ram Raj will be established in this country." "Ram Raj" I do not know, what it means. Please define for us. There was a certain type of crowd there, in the Ayodhya region. Naturally they were very much enthused by hearing the Prime Minister giving this assurance, and started shouting, "Har Har Mahadev, Bajrang Bali Ki Jai." And you say, your hands are innocent. You have not contributed for the sake of an opportunistic advantage, you wanted to get in the elections. You wanted to appease and compromise with various kinds of forces and ultimately you brought about your own disaster. Ultimately you brought about your own disaster, and we say, it is good riddance. It is a good riddance because, with another 5 years of this Government, the country would really have gone to the dogs, would have been finished.

Therefore, Sir, now I only want to say in conclusion that not to support this Government at this stage not to support this Government means, leaving the country without a Government. Is that an alternative? Is that an option? Since no single party has been given an absolute majority in the House, these friends are implying that we should not support such a Government. Then there should be no government.

SHRI G.DEVARAYA NAIK: We never said that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If you never said that, then please support this motion of confidence. The fact that you are refusing to support this motion means that you are against this government. So, naturally you are also against our supporting this government. Naturally that means that you want the country to go without any government; because you cannot form the government, no

government should be allowed to be formed; Let the country go down in chaos. That is what you want.

SHRI T. BASHEER: Is everybody anybody?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Everybody else is anybody and you are not anybody. You are also anybody. Who are you? You are also as anybody as any of us are. You are not some super human figure. Everybody else is anybody and you are everybody. We do not agree with that.

Let me make it clear. As far as we are concerned, we gave unconditional support and conveyed it to the President in respect of the formation of this government because the alternative is no government at all.

SHRI A.R. ANTULAY: This is a new situation.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: This is a new situation, I agree, to which we are not accustomed, any of us. We have always been accustomed in the history of this country to find elections producing a majority, sometimes massive majority, for one single party. For so many years, nine elections, eight elections, have been held to the Parliament. We have never been accustomed to a situation in which no single party gets a majority and, therefore, a government has to be formed and functioned with a different equation of forces. It happened in many other countries. But we are not accustomed to it. Therefore, we find it difficult to reconcile to it. In many other countries which are supposed to be more advanced than ours, this kind of situation arises frequently. There are countries where during the course of a year, four or five governments have changed without any election being held every time. There are many countries in which Prime Ministers are changed every few months, not the Chief Ministers, who used to be changed every two or three months, and no members of the ruling legislative assembly parties were ever allowed to elect their own Chief Ministers, their leaders. It was all decided from Delhi.

This is one of the causes of your debacle. It happened because people do not want to be treated as second class citizens.

SHRI G. DEVARAYA NAIK: What happened in Haryana?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Your methods of defection are learnt by other people to form a majority.

SHRI T. BASHEER: You keep these things in your mind and you do not forget it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: So, we decided and we conveyed it to the President that this government must be formed and we shall support it from outside. (*Interruptions*) Why do we say that? We have a manifesto. Our Communist parties have got their own programme, their manifesto. The National Front has got its own manifesto. The two are not the same. In fact, our manifesto and programme of the Left parties is naturally from our point of view much more radical and much more comprehensive than perhaps the programme of the National Front can be. But National Front programme and manifesto contains, in our opinion, adequate items and issues in it which, if implemented, which this government has pledged to implement and we do not doubt the sincerity of their purpose, if they carry out that programme, their own programme and manifesto, we think it will take the country forward. It will be an advancement. It may not be fully in keeping with the ideology of the programme of the Leftists but it does not matter. We cannot in one jump hope to pass over several stages and reach some other place. We are advancing slowly, step by step. That is what the people wanted. They wanted a change and the change will be brought about. We are confident that the National Front, with our support, will be implementing this programme seriously and in a sustained manner. Our support need not be taken for granted...(*Interruptions*) Every Congress friend I talked to outside this Chamber, in the Lobby or in the Central Hall, is so cocksure, confident that the whole thing will break down. (*Interruptions*)



SHRI G. DEVARAYA NAIK: No, we never said it. Don't misquote. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Do you want me to mention the names? I have not quoted anybody. Although I mentioned some persons, but I could not mention the names of persons. They say: "They are standing in the middle. You are holding on to one hand. The BJP is holding on to another hand. How can this last? This will break down.." Please don't live in this hope because for the time being at least your party has forfeited completely the confidence of the people of this country. They are not going to bring you back. Don't worry and rightly so.

SHRI G. DEVARAYA NAIK: That is left to the people, not to you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Yes, not to you either. Therefore, Sir, we are supporting this Government on the basis of its own programme and manifesto. We will help it in every possible way to implement that programme and manifesto. We welcome above all the declarations of this Government that some issues which have become vital for the future of this country, life and death, questions like Punjab, like Kashmir, like the dispute over the Babri Masjid-Ram Janambhoomi issue will be solved by national consensus. There are not party questions. They should not be dealt with as party issues. This Government has stated that broadest possible national consensus will be built in order to find ways and means of tackling these issues and solving them. It is a very difficult task, no doubt...(*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We support.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That is not the path which your Government ever took. Your party, while in power, never even called an All-Party meeting to discuss Punjab question. Here, on the Floor of this House, it was repeatedly assured by the Home Minister, by the Prime Minister: "Very soon, we are going to call the meeting; we are going to call the National Integration Council meeting. We are going to do this; we are going to do

that..." But nothing was done. National Integration Council consensus was not there. It did not function at all. Therefore, we welcome this Government's sincere approach and their attempts. Consensus will include everybody, including the Congress Party. That is the only way that we can now get together and save this very country from ominous developments which are taking place. Even if we forget about the past, who is responsible, how much they are responsible; now there is no time to be lost. So, I appeal to the Government, I appeal to the Prime Minister and I appeal to my friends of the Opposition also that with this outlook and orientation towards a national consensus on those instances at least, let us get together, support the Government and try to save the country and the people and safeguard its freedom and its integrity.

SHRI R. MUTHIAH (Periyakulam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first of all on behalf of my Party, the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) and our beloved Leader Puratchi Thalaivi Jayalalitha I express my hearty congratulations to the hon. Prime Minister for having risen to this highest office of Democratic India. Also, we and our leader have got some highest opinion personally about our Prime Minister. But at the same time we are unable to support his Motion of seeking confidence in his Council of Ministers because of the simple reason that his Government does not represent the entire country and particularly it does not reflect the minds of the people of Tamil Nadu. His party and his colleagues in the whole of South and particularly in Tamil Nadu have totally been rejected by the people in this election. Even though they have not been getting the people's majority verdict they might be respecting the majority verdict of the people of Tamil Nadu. Now this Government is acting against the wishes and verdict of the people of Tamil Nadu, I want to point out certain instances that are taking place after this Government has assumed office. In particular, I would like to mention that the hon. Deputy Prime Minister, as soon as he assumed office, rushed to Madras in a special flight, that too I am told, against all the

procedures of Protocol to be followed, to attend one Marriage function. In Madras, as the first announcement, he said that his Government would effectively implement the three-language formula. But all of you know that Tamil Nadu is a State which has got a unique linguistic formula, that is, two-language formula which has been formulated by our political mentor Dr. Annadurai who was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. In such a State, the Deputy Prime Minister declares that he will certainly introduce and effectively implement the three-language formula, which means, that this Government is going to impose Hindi on the people of Tamil Nadu. This speech of the Deputy Prime Minister has injured the minds of the people. Thus fear has been amounting in the minds of the people of Tamil Nadu, for the past ten or fifteen days. Moreover, the hon. Prime Minister is supporting the Government in Tamil Nadu which has been totally rejected by the people there. In the morning some of the Members of the ruling party and their colleagues shouted for the dismissal of certain State Governments in North. If at all this Government wants to dissolve or dismiss a Government, the Government of Tamil Nadu which does not enjoy the confidence of even one-fourth of the electorate, should be dissolved or dismissed immediately. This Government can say: "How can we dismiss the Tamil Nadu Government when we ourselves are a minority Government here." But at least they can try to implement the verdict of the people of Tamil Nadu.

In this election, the AIADMK and the Congress (I) had put forth the candidates before the electorate of Tamil Nadu in order to take our beloved Rajiv Gandhi as the Prime Minister and Madam Jayalitha as the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. For this, the people of Tamil Nadu have voted for us and they have given a clear mandate. As we have got this mandate from the people, we are unable to support this Government and this Motion.

[Translation]

\*SHRIMATI RAJINDER KAUR BULARA (Ludhiana): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I extend my support to the National Front Government headed by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. When Baba Sucha Singh was going to take oath, voices were raised from Congress (I) benches that he was father of the assailant of Smt. Indira Gandhi. May I ask as to who is the killer. I think that the assailant..when Beant Singh...Indira Gandhi...Beant Singh was made a martyr. When people were massacred in 1984, the killers were not apprehended and punished. One of my brothers-in law, who was at captain in the army and was married only 28 days back, was on his way to Ahmednagar for undergoing a course. Though he was in military uniform, the goondas of Indira Congress killed him in 1984 at Mathura. The Congress is responsible for the riots that took place in Delhi and Bokaro in 1984. Thereafter thousands of Sikh youths were massacred in Punjab. Who is to be held responsible for that? My husband Prof. Rajinder Singh was working in Horticulture Department of the Agriculture University. The Government of Punjab branded every Sikh in Punjab as a terrorist. Even if some one visited somebody's house for a dinner, the host was charged with harbouring the terrorists. Raids were conducted on the premises of an intellectual and he was forced to flee his home. As regards the events that took place in 1987, I would like to narrate my own woes and thereafter narrate the agonies which other people suffered during Congress Rule. I was tortured like any thing. Police officers known for their brutality were deployed after me, who treated Sikhs as their enemies. Brute officers were deployed with a view to killing more and more people so that sikhs were wiped out. When the police conducted raids on 4 April 1987, people were forced to leave their homes and go underground. I was living alone in my house. If any of my relatives came to my house, police took them away. The police personnel did not

[Smt. Rajinder Kaur Bulara]

spare even my teenager son. They interrogated him to extract information, though he was totally ignorant as I had not exposed her to the events taking place. They did not spare even my daughter and took her to the police station. Women constables who are supposed to do this work were never seen there. Inspectors notorious for using brute force were deployed in that Police Station. The C.R.P.F. was thrust upon Punjab. They used to send as many as 10 vehicles at a time. Ludhiana was nothing less than a slaughter house. I was beaten by 15 police personnel. May I ask as to who is the enemy of the community and who is the dreaded enemy of the humanity. Mine is not the lone case. My husband, Prof. Rajinder Singh had to run for life and hide himself by taking shelter in turn in houses of relatives so that he could save his self respect. He was a professor and had inherited property worth crores of rupees. He was branded as a terrorist and forced to leave his home.

He was arrested in sector 15 in Chandigarh on 25th December, 1988 and brought to Ludhiana the same day. He was last seen with the C.S. Staff at 9 P.M. Nobody knows what happened thereafter. He was beaten to death and it was said that he was killed in an encounter. I was a fake police encounter. Nowhere else in the world is the number of fake police encounters so high during Rajiv Gandhi's regime in the last five years. On 26th January we adopted the Constitution. But unfortunately, it was on 26th January 1989 that Rajiv Gandhi's Government murdered the Constitution. Prof. Rajinder Pal Singh and two of his colleagues were shown to have been killed in a police encounter. I would like to know as to who is the assassin? The Congress Government or we? We have taken oath in the name of the Constitution of India. We want to live in a democratic way. But Indira and Rajiv's Governments called us terrorists. They gave the slogan of Khalistan and later attributed it to us. The term Khalistan means purity. The place where 'khalsa' lives is called Khalistan. Nobody demanded Khalistan. But Rajiv's Govern-

ment, the Congress Government branded us as secessionists. We have also a status. The Sikhs who came from Punjab to see the Asiad were stopped mid way. They were told that the Sikhs were terrorists and therefore they could witness the games. Will anybody tell me where it is written? A number of learned hon. Members are sitting here. The hon. Speaker is also sitting here. Can anybody tell me what type of Constitution is this?

The widow of Sardar Beant Singh has since been elected as an M.P. Mr. Dhian Singh Mand, whose three bothers were killed by that butcher Government, has also become an M.P. I am the wife of Prof. Rajinder Pal Singh who has been killed. Please tell us today who are terrorists and who are secessionists? The people elected me. People returned me from Ludhiana, which is considered to be a strong-hold of the Congress, with a margin of 1,34,000 votes. Today the people have given a mandate that not sikhs but Rajiv's Government was terrorist and separatist. Mine is not the lone case of agony. It was the agony of every woman in Punjab. The Government had become enemy of all children between the ages of 15 and 25 years. They were arrested without any reason and beaten up. Whenever an encounter took place as many as 20 of their men were killed. But this was never reported in the Press. A sikh is neither a terrorist nor a secessionist. He is a true and righteous human being. He is the offspring of Guru Gobind Singh who followed the tenets of truth. He cannot tolerate molestation of anybody's daughter or daughter-in-law. But that Government raped our womenfolk in the police stations. May I ask as to who is the murder? We have full faith in Shri V.P. Singh who is our Prime Minister. I would request him to prepare a list of all those children who were killed and also those who were lodged in jails. There were kept in jails for over 9 to 10 months, but no case was registered against them. They were tortured in such a way that they have lost their mental balance. Now I hope the National Front Government would provide the healing touch to the sikh psyche which was wounded by the Congress Government. I shall remain grateful to

this Government if this is done. The Sikh knows how to revolt because he neither tolerates atrocities nor himself commits any. This is all what I want to submit.

[English]

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have already conveyed our support to the formation of the National Front Government to the President. Not only the RSP but also all the constituents of the Left Front operating on an all-India level have conveyed their decision in support of Shri V.P. Singh who was asked to form the Government. Everyone of us knows under what circumstances this vote of confidence in the Council of Ministers has come up. I on behalf of our party fully support the motion placed here by Shri V.P. Singh and express full confidence in the Council of Ministers.

It would have been better had there been no debate at all on this issue. It was simple thing to convey our acceptance or otherwise regarding this motion. We previously thought that there would not be any debate over this issue but because of the wanting of the Congress we have to undertake this debate.

Everyone of us should know that we are passing through a critical phase of our history and we also agree that such a situation has emerged after the Lok Sabha poll. Through that poll the people of India have given a clear verdict against the out-gone Congress (I) rule. Rather they have rejected the Congress (I) as a ruling party. In such a situation after the election was over the formation of a new Government had to be done as no country can go without a government, on that occasion we came forward to give our support on the basis of their manifesto. We have our own manifesto. I know there are points of difference in that also. But even then there are national issues and national problems over which we must unite. We have to solve all those problems and National Front Government is pledged to do that. I would not like to dilate on that topic

now. In course of discussion on thanks giving motion on the President's Address we will elaborate those points. I would also like to mention that the present government has come into existence not even for a month and the government is actually entangled in the mesh created by the outgone regime headed by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. But we see that within a very short period, this Government has taken some forward-looking decisions.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH (Chail): What are those?

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA: You know about the autonomy for the media. Then, there is the question of reservation for the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes. Some forward-looking steps towards solving the problem of Punjab have been taken. Our Prime Minister has already visited Amritsar in a very exemplary manner. This Government has already taken forward-looking steps in many other directions, regarding corruption, particularly the Bofors scandal which is identified with Shri Rajiv Gandhi's administration—personally Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

In short, on behalf of our party, we again fully support this Council of Ministers and the motion placed by Shri V.P. Singh.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion of confidence moved by the leader of the House and the Prime Minister of the nation.

In the early hours of today's session, the House had the misfortune to listen to a roving speech from a frustrated politician representing some constituency in Maharashtra. I am sorry that the Congress (I) Party, as a whole, has not realised the true meaning and significance of the mandate that the people of our country have given during the elections to the Ninth Lok Sabha. The mandate was clear. The clear verdict was that the people do not want the continuance of the Government under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. The people have unequivocally

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

cally decided to remove them from power, vanish them from power. The people of our country have unmistakably expressed their keen desire to have a change. That is the significance. That is the clear mandate. Unfortunately the Members sitting opposite to me have not understood this clearest possible mandate or the verdict given by the ultimate sovereign people of our country.

The people decided to remove them from power because the former Government led by Shri Rajiv Gandhi had pursued the anti-people and anti-democratic policies. The people decided to remove them from power because they had wanted to rule and not to govern. They wanted to rule. They wanted to rule and as a matter of fact, they ruled ruthlessly by resorting to repressive measures and by resorting to distortion of democratic institutions of our country including Parliament. They have sought to remain in power by subverting the judiciary of our country. They sought to remain in power by denigrating other important democratic institutions of our country. Our people are democratic people. Our people are nature. In the course of their nature thinking, they have given the clearest possible verdict. Because of this electoral system which is prevalent in our country, there has not been the clearest indication of the party in which the people have reposed their faith. That has created a unique situation in Indian politics. People have rejected the governments. It is equally true that people, in their verdict, have not been able to identify a particular instrument to bring about, to translate into action the hopes and desires of our country. And this absence of the clearest indication, as to the choice of instrumentality, has created this new situation in our country with which we are not quite acquainted. Even now they claim that still people have faith on them. I would like to quote one figure for my friend, Mr. Sathe. Is it not a fact that Congress (I) Party as a whole has secured 40 per cent or above 40 per cent of the total votes? I correct myself. I can say above 41 per cent. It is more than 41 per cent. But 41 per cent is not

51 per cent and if you want to raise it to 51 per cent by your own arithmetical ways, I am helpless. But the fact is that they got only 41 per cent of the total votes... (*Interruptions*)... I have already made a statement saying clearly that there has not been the clearest indication of the instrument for the realisation of the hopes and desires of the people. Therefore, a new situation has been created in this country and we are faced with the situation. More than 60 per cent people have not voted for you. They have voted against you... (*Interruptions*)... Their claim is not valid. They have been rejected. Therefore, they had no right to form the government or to have the claim to form the government. Now, the question remains as to who will form the government. (*Interruptions*)

DR. RAJENDRA KUMARI BAJPAI (Sitapur): You explain as to what is the justification for the 18 per cent ruling.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I think you have not been able to understand my point.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Their leader does not allow them to understand.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: It is better to remain ignorant. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Otherwise, they cannot accept him as their leader.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: The concept of a minority government is not a new one in the concept of democracy. In democratic foreign countries, minority governments did exist and it is a frequent phenomenon. Of course, we have not got the example of that kind of minority government here. But my statement is also not completely true because Mrs. Gandhi had a minority government in this country. Therefore, I am very sorry to say that only because of your ignorance, you are taking this posture. The Government of the National Front is a minority government. Nobody disagrees with the fact that the National Front by itself does not command the majority of the House. It is known to all and it is very clear. But today, the situation

demands, the democratic polity of the country demands that there should be a government—even if it were a minority government in itself—enjoying the majority of the House.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Even at the cost of principles?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: No please. It is very much on the basis of principles. If you are patient enough to hear me, I will properly educate you about principles.

Therefore, it is a question whether the Prime Minister of the country enjoys the majority of the House or not. That is the only consideration. And in his wisdom, the President has given a direction and we are giving effect to that direction given by the President.

Now, my friend has raised the question of policy. The National Front has got an election manifesto as you have. You rely on your election manifesto as your basic programme and basic policy. Why don't you accept the election manifesto of the National Front as the declaration or enunciation of the policies and programmes of their Government? I say this because they have formed the Government. So far as my party, Forward Bloc is concerned, we extended our support unconditionally. The only condition is we have expressed a desire that the National Front would implement sincerely and fully, to the extent possible, the electoral promises made to the people. That is a condition applicable for all. I think even the members of the parties constituting the National Front owe it to the electorate.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): That is our own condition also!

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That is what I wanted to say. You see, that is a condition of the hon. Finance Minister of this country. Therefore, our support is unconditional.

We want and believe that at this very critical juncture of our country, the Govern-

ment formed by the National Front will do its best to implement the electoral promises made to the people. The election manifesto of the National Front seeks to tackle the economic, political and social problems created by you during your uninterrupted rule. You have created certain problems—very big national problems, political, economic and social. People have given their verdict that those problems created by you, should be solved by the National Front Government. Therefore the task is very big. Yet, with the support and cooperation of the people at large, we hope that this Government will be able to fulfil their electoral promises. I believe, the implementation of these policies enunciated by the National Front would ensure the democratic advance of our people and pave new paths for the realisation of the hopes and aspirations of the people. In this context, we should particularly mention about the correlation of the class forces existing today.

A question has been raised about the stability of this Government. You are still holding a suspicion about the stability of the Government. I want to remind you that stability of a government does not depend on the count of heads. You have the largest number of Members in the House and you have the largest number of Members in several State Legislatures. Does it appear to you that those State Governments which are run by the Congress had political stability? Had there been political stability, there would have been no necessity of changing the Chief Ministers as the calendar pages are changed. Therefore, the political stability does not depend entirely on the number of Members present in the Parliament or the Legislatures. I would urge upon the National Front Government and particularly the Prime Minister that the stability of the Government depends upon the implementation of the programmes. That is the political aspect. I hope, it has not occurred to you. You did not believe in the political aspect. You believed in ruthless ruling. I hope, there is a change in the attitude. The change in attitude is reflected by emphasising the need of implementation of the programmes. The change

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

of the outlook of the Government is demonstrated and has been demonstrated by the new Government. They do not want to take to the methods of confrontation but consensus. The situation that you have created can be solved only by national consensus. The new Government has understood the meaning of the verdict of the people. Therefore, the stability of the Government is assured and that can be assured further, if the National Front Government emphasises upon the implementation aspect of the Election Manifesto.

So far as my party is concerned, as I have stated earlier, our support is unconditional. Our support is based on the verdict of the people and the verdict of the people is to remove the Congress (I) from power. In the days to come, I think the Congress Party would be further in trouble and will be brittle like anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I request the hon. Members to be very brief because the Prime Minister is going to reply to the debate at 5 o'clock.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjiri): As far as possible, you allow one Member from each Party to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am doing. I would request you to be very brief in putting forth your points.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): You ought to have made that request earlier. Now, we are the sufferers.

SHRI PIYARE LAL HANDOO (Anantnag): Hon. Chairman, Sir, it is very unfortunate that before my name came to be called I stood warned that I must be brief. In fact that should have been the word of caution a little earlier and perhaps the heat that was generated during the course of the discussion might not have been there. Anyway, I will try to be as brief as I possibly can. But with reference to some of the points

which were touched here, normally those references should not have become necessary for me to take notice of. Because our esteemed friend Shri Advani said that the genesis of the present Motion is the direction from the President of the republic. That itself sets certain limitations, prescribes certain parameters within which we can make our observations, for or against. But even at the risk of being slightly impertinent, I must say and place on record certain things. Mr. Inderjit Gupta has rightly echoed the feelings nursed by a beginner like me who has entered the Parliament for the first time. What I saw from the morning did not perhaps entertain me, but slightly frightened and upset me. We are trying to bring a part of the muscular politics which we are experiencing in the streets of the country into the Parliament House once again. I would join Mr. Indrajit Gupta: Let us not interrupt each other when we debate over the matter, a matter of serious magnitude, a matter, the kind of which perhaps the Indian Parliament is experiencing for the first time viz. that this 8-day old Government is coming forth and seeking a Vote of Confidence from Parliament. This, in itself, should have set us thinking: how did it become necessary for the President of the Republic to prescribe a condition which was not there any time since 1950 when the Constitution came to be adopted. It has its own genesis, and we will have to deal with that subject when we come to the discussion on the President's Address. Right now I will only say that there was a unique situation which led to prescribing of this condition. And a condition has been prescribed. The present Raja Sahib as the Prime Minister is, of course, right in taking the first opportunity of fulfilling the obligation placed upon him by the President of the Republic.

Having done so, it is everybody's right to say that we support the Motion, to say that we do not say anything about the Motion or to say that we oppose the Motion. But in between, perhaps, a misgiving started, and it took birth along with the birth of the Government; and that is agitating us.

Right now, we heard a theoretical discussion, a theoretical dissertation from my esteemed colleague from the Forward Bloc saying that a minority Government is not a new phenomenon; it is neither a new phenomenon in the country, nor in the world. But what is new in our country, is a minority Government with its own manifesto, with the manifesto of the National Front, with the manifesto of the Communist Party, with the manifesto of the BJP, each party seeking fulfilment of its manifesto, fulfilment of the pledges to the people. What was surprising for me today, was to hear Comrade Gupta saying that the vote against this Motion will mean vote for no Government. That is not so. A vote against the Motion will mean that if that decision is taken, we would refer it back to the people, seek their verdict—whether they have a positive verdict in favour of this party, or of other parties.

For instance, simultaneously with the swearing in of the Raja Sahib as the Prime Minister of the country, I heard a very esteemed leader of the Janata Dal saying that the future of the country is very bleak. It set a man like me coming from the northern State of Kashmir thinking: "How is it that the leader or the President of the party is being sworn in as the Prime Minister of the country, and the Vice President of the party says: 'A decision might have been taken, but what I foresee is the bleak future of the country.' Believe me, the people who are not yet used to parliamentary life, started thinking: 'What has happened?' If that is so, then the Janata Dal owes it to the nation, owes it to the country to reply to the question: 'Do we inaugurate a Prime Minister by ensuring a bleak future for the country?'

Forget that. Immediately thereafter came the incident, a very unfortunate incident i.e. the kidnapping of the daughter of the Home Minister. The Home Minister is my personal friend. We come from the same district, and the same constituency though, unfortunately, he did not choose to contest from Kashmir. He came to contest, upto Banihal. He went to contest in Poonch, but he did not dare enter the Banihal tunnel to reach Anantnag dis-

trict, his home district, to contest the elections. I can tell you about it chapter by chapter, but when occasion comes. But right now, his daughter was kidnapped. Very sad; but, then, to fling the accusation that the Central Government did not take the decision, the kind and quality of which is known to the country, is something which does not behove a new Raja Sahib Government so soon after its formation. I will refer to that, because it is my bounden duty to make the facts known to this august House. I would like even the members of the Janata Dal to try to collect all the facts from the Home Minister. One thing should be regarded as sacred: the facts. Inferences can be your own. You can draw any inference, inference against the Kashmir Government, inferences against the Kashmir Ministers. All right. But in determining facts, for God's sake be fair to Kashmir. Be fair to the Kashmir Ministry. Be fair to Dr. Farooq Abdullah. We will tell you the whole story, and we would like the Home Minister also to tell the whole story. Unfortunately, today when I sought an intervention, a reference was made by my esteemed friend from Himachal Pradesh to Pakistani flags being unfurled in some parts of the State.

Not that it is not a fact; it is a fact.  
(Interruptions)

MR CHAIRMAN: Order, order please.

SHRI PIYARE LAL HANDOO: I repeat it with full sense of responsibility that Pakistan Flag not once but a number of times has been unfurled in the streets of Kashmir. All persons know about it. I take objection to it, they are saying that it is an offshoot of the Punjab problem. What is Kashmir problem? What is the Punjab problem? I have found that even one word about it has not been used by the present Government since its inception. They failed to use a word about terrorism in Kashmir. They failed to make use of the word 'terrorism' in respect of Punjab. What is Kashmir problem? (Interruptions) For the last 3-4 years terrorism has been going on there. Why do you not talk of



[Sh. Piyare Lal Handoo]

terrorism there? Why do you not talk of terrorism in Punjab? If you are really interested in solving the problem, the real problem is the communalism in the country. Unless you recognise that communalism is dangerous to the country, don't have any misconception that you can solve Kashmir problem or that you can solve the Punjab problem. If you want to consider all the national problems, I can give you chapters one by one during the course of the debate on the President's Address. Kashmir State has been so much injured, so much hurt. Decisions had been taken in Delhi not today but right from 1952. You will have to take stock of those decisions and find out how much you have gone forward and how much you have come back.

You talk repeatedly of Article 370 knowing full well that the days have gone when one could deal with it, when one could consider it. Nobody can touch Article 370 if you love, if you respect your own Indian Constitution. That job had to be done by the Constituent Assembly. Having not done that job nobody can do that job now. So, when you talk of Kashmir problem, you talk of terrorism in Kashmir. When you talk of Punjab problem, you talk of terrorism in Punjab. I have heard my beloved sister from Punjab today. It is sad to know all these stories. But I don't think the entire gamut of the speech explains clearly about them. How do I explain the death of 18 young men in a hostel's room. Was it Congress role? Was it police role? Was it police excess? Why do you people ignore that side of Punjab? In this way, solution to the Punjab problem will run away. It will not be solved. You tell us their solution and we will welcome it; we will be happy to be with you. But if you ignore the problem of terror-stricken people, then you will not be able to solve the Punjab problem. You may feel happy for some time but a streak of opportunism will start entering into your politics right now, and who knows what will be its consequences. With these words, I request all members that whenever a reference to Kashmir is to be made, kindly make

it through a Substantive Motion; don't be casual-minded for raising those matters during Zero Hour.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SHIBU SOREN (Dumka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, while extending support on behalf of the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha to Shri V.P. Singh's Government I would like to submit that we are the elected representatives of the people and we feel that the people expressed their choice while electing us to this House. Today we are having a discussion on the vote of confidence. The earlier Government was the Government of the Congress Party. It is crystal clear that the people do not consider this largest party i.e. the Congress Party as the party of the people, the downtrodden and the oppressed. We come from that section of the society on whom huge Government funds are spent. The present Government in Bihar and the earlier Government in the Centre did never take up the development of the areas predominantly inhabited by the Harijans, the Adivasis and the minorities, which are rich in minerals and have potential for industries. That is why the people of this country, were pricked by their conscience and they decided to choose a Government which would provide an opportunity to the common man to express their grievances and instal Ministers of their choice who will listen to them.

When we talk of unity and the integrity we are face to face with truth. Today Shri V.P. Singh's Government has the support of small parties. Why? It is because all these parties, whether it is a small party or their allies like the Left Front or the B.J.P., all speak in one voice. Are all of them fools? Why do they extend their support? It is because the people of the country want them to do so. The people wanted a change. They wanted justice. People were fed up of price rise particularly of food items. Sir, that is why we contested the election and now the people heaved a sigh of relief. People felt that the Government under which they were living was not democratic and the State was no good than a police state. People were sub-

jected to checkings at rifle point. When they said that they were hon. citizens, the authorities never paid heed and persisted with the checking. This happened everywhere in Delhi as well as in other states. But a wave of change has swept the country. The people belonging to the Congress Party, who were in power, should now realise that the people are supreme. Governments come and go. The party which is occupying the treasury benches today may have to sit in the opposition tomorrow. It is a matter of 5 years. The Government should be run in accordance with the wishes of the people. There is a big challenge before us today and that is of dividing the big states into smaller ones. The Janata Dal, the B.J.P. and many other parties have demanded a separate Jharkhand. It is an open fact that I got elected with this objective. I hope that this Government will seriously consider this demand. I feel that it is not a big problem. These are small problems. Today we think that the Punjab problem is a major problem. I also feel that it has become a serious problem. I was also an M.P. those days. I do feel that had government entered into dialogue with them from time to time, they would have felt assured that their problems were being taken up seriously and such a situation would never have arisen. We have seen how they have been maltreated. Atrocities were committed on them. Their condition is highly deplorable in Bokaro.

Sir, when say that the people of this country are supreme, we should act according to their wishes and implement their command. We have demanded a separate State. I am confident that our demand will be seriously considered. This will help in completing the very task of reservation for backward classes, Adivasis and Harijans which is still incomplete.

We are confident that this Government will march on the path of development and succeed.

16.46 hrs.

[English]

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT

(Manjeri): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Government of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh has been formed under a very strange situation, unprecedented in the history of independent India. This Government has got its own problems and has got its own drawbacks. The solution of those problems will lead to the continuation of this Government. If they fail to solve the problems, then there is very little chance for the Government to be able to run for a long time.

One thing I must tell you very frankly, Sir, is that the electorate during the recent election to Parliament which has given a decision. The first and foremost fact is that the electorate has not given mandate in the last elections to any Single party. It has not given mandate to any Party in the country. The second thing that has been established is that the Congress is the first single largest party led by Shri Rajiv Gandhi today. Now Shri Rajiv Gandhi has opted out from the race to the Prime Ministership of the country. Then it was Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, leader of the National Front and the Janata Dal who has formed the Government. After the formation of the Government by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, the President asked him to prove his majority in this august House. Therefore, it is under these circumstances, we find that the Vote of Confidence has been moved in this House. We must not forget at this Juncture that today our country is passing through a very critical period. We have got important national problems shouting for solution. We have Punjab problem, Kashmir problem, as has already been pointed out. And together with these we have got the most provocative, the most serious problem, i.e. Ramjanam Bhoomi Babri Masjid. All these problems are there.

According to the thinking of my party, the Muslim league, the most important, the most serious and the most disturbing problem facing our country is communal violence. Sir, somebody has said here that communalism is the danger. What is communalism? Nobody has so far defined it. And without defining what communalism is, to condemn minority party is something which

[Sh. Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait]

cannot be tolerated. If we want to condemn anybody, we must define what communalism is. Without defining communalism, we have no right whatsoever to condemn minority organisations in this country. What is the situation in the country today? The Muslim minority has no security for life and property in this country. What has happened at Bhagalpur? I do not have to explain here. I would only say that thousands and thousands of people have been killed over there. Even today dead bodies in a decomposed form are being dug out. Today 50,000 people have been rendered homeless. This very grave problem has to be tackled. The people should feel secure. They must have security of life and property. I therefore say that this is the most important problem of the country today. I am conscious of the fact that the present Government of Shri V.P. Singh is a minority Government. It depends for the majority on two parties which are ideologically and temperamentally two extremes viz. BJP and the Communists, with BJP believing in fascist ideas. That is a matter of serious concern to one and all. I know that these parties have divergent views, divergent policies and divergent manifestoes. The fact is that this Government depends on the mercy of BJP and charity of communists. But despite all this, I must concede that a party forming Government with support of those outside the Government, is a perfect parliamentary model.

Here I would like to refer to Sarkaria Commission's report. Even Sarkaria Commission envisaged such possibilities. He may have referred to States but it is valid also for the Centre. The Report says at page 135 of Part I that the Governor can allow such a situation. Stating the order of preference, it visualises:

"A post electoral alliance of parties, with some of the parties in the alliance forming a government and the remaining parties, including "Independents",

supporting the Government from outside."

This situation is exactly prevailing here today in the House. We will, therefore, not quarrel with the form of the government though we have our own apprehensions. We would like to extend our issue-based cooperation to the Government. We will watch the behaviour, the attitude and the policy of Shri V.P. Singh's Government in days to come. Therefore, we will judge every issue on its merits. To allow time to the Government to prove its credentials we will, for the present, support the Motion of Confidence. We have our serious reservations but we will say that the Government is on trial and will be continuously judged by us according to its performance. Therefore, we will see how the Government performs, how the Government solves the basic national problems and how the Government comes forward with a national consensus. Our support will depend basically on the performance and the solution they bring about with regard to the national problem. Till then I wish the Government well.

[*Translation*]

\*SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK (Bombay South Central): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my party Shiv Sena, I rise to lend my support to the motion expressing confidence in the Government. I have been allowed by my party chief to support this motion. For the past 40 years Congress party was ruling this country. The people of this country were thoroughly frustrated with this rule. We wanted to end this rule. Therefore without any second thought we are expressing our support to this Government. The verdict of the people which has gone in favour of other parties than Congress (I) is itself indicative of the fact that the people were fed up with Congress rule which amounted to monopoly of single political party.

Sir, there is a need to have national reconstruction on secular lines which im-

plies that appearing minorities has no place in our national policies. Gandhiji himself suffered on this account—of this butting of minorities—because publication of one of his books by Shri Apte supported because of the Supreme Court decision. Gandhiji felt that the decision of the Supreme Court was running counter to our avowed policies. National reconstruction on secular lines has not been possible so far. They are taking steps in this direction and it was with this purpose in view that Shri Antulay, Chief Minister of Maharashtra, set up a 'Sarva Dharmo Sabha'. He is acting as a messenger sent by God. I do not know as to how he agreed to take over the charge of the Minorities Protection cell on the directive of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He may or may not be an acceptable leader within the Congress (I). We have heard his criticism of the Congress (I) when he was expelled from the party. Yet, we know that he was not sincere even to what he said. He also spoke of mass welfare and maintained that secularism is to be protected by the Government and that is why he had pleaded for the protection of humanity. But he was not sincere even to that. Today the majority in our country gets nothing while the minorities get all facilities. Our leader Shri Bal Thackeray of Shri Sena had said in Shivaji Park that the Prime Minister should go to Amritsar and apologise for the army operations in Amritsar by the Government of the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi. This the present hon. Prime Minister did. This created a good atmosphere there. We are not going to support the element which has been creating trouble in Punjab for the last 5-6 years but we will certainly support the present Government as it has taken a firm step towards solving the Punjab problem. We will work with the Bhartiya Janata Party. Since they have extended their support we are reciprocating. I do not want to raise the issue of Bofors...*(Interruptions)* When the hon. ex-Prime Minister visited Bombay he said that his Government had given crores of rupees for the welfare of the poor but in the last 40 years, 85% of the funds allocated for them did not reach the poor. The poor have not been able to get proper food, clothing, shelter and drinking water. Unemployment

among the poor has also increased. The Finance Minister of the new Government has said that steps would be taken to check rising prices. This means that the present Government is conscious of the problems being faced by the poor and would like to alleviate their sufferings. The erstwhile Government made no efforts to bring down the price index. The Belgaum border problem has been pending for the past 30 years. The Congress(I) is in power in Karnataka as well as Maharashtra. The Chief Ministers of both these States can sit together and solve this problem. But they will not do so. Even Shri Antulay, who is a good lawyer, has not done anything about it. But I don't mind. Although he is a good barrister yet he did not make any reference to it here in this House. I request him to do something in this direction. He wanted to know the stand on the Ram Janam-bhoomi issue. The Supreme Court has given a decision regarding Ram Janam-bhoomi. The Congress(I) should be consulted on what is to be done if anyone acts against that decision.

17.00 hrs.

Secondly, there should be uniform law for all the people. No reference has been made about the necessity of having a uniform civil code. In the Shah Bano case the Supreme Court decided in favour of 'maintenance' but the Congress(I) amended the law and conformed to Shariat. It was not appropriate for the Congress Government to take such an action. Our Government will try to work according to law. All problems will be solved within the legal framework. This will help the country to survive. They have taught us that our country is great. We also believe that our country, India, is great. This Government is not interested in money making. *(Interruptions)* we have to take care of everyone. This is my submission.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, a statement to be made by the hon. Minister of External Affairs, Shri I.K. Gujral.

SHRIDINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, before you ask the hon. Foreign Minister to make a statement, I should like to draw your attention to the statement made by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs this morning. In regard to Panama question, he had said that the Government has taken note of the US action in Panama. The Government has already issued its reaction. Now, when the Parliament is in session, it is customary for the Government that any statement of this kind is to be made in Parliament first and not made outside. I should like to know whether that statement has been made outside and where it has been made and whether it is the same statement that the Minister is making here or it is a different one.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): The hon. Member has drawn my attention to this point. No statement has been made outside the House as yet. It is for the first time that the Government is making an authorised statement. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He denies it and that is all.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has said that Government has already issued its reaction. I thought we heard it. We have got the transcript now. The transcript says exactly what we heard in this House that the Government has already issued its reaction. If it has not issued its reaction, then has he misled the House or is he not aware of what the Government is doing? If he has issued it outside the House, it is a breach of privilege and if he has not issued it outside, it is misleading the House.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: In the morning when the Statement was being prepared I brought it to the notice of the House and I would state it now and with your permission, I submit.

17.05 hrs.

### STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Re: U.S. Intervention in Panama**

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Around 1130 hrs. Indian Standard Time on December 20, the US troops commenced military action in Panama. According to an official US Government spokesman, President Bush ordered the US military forces into Panama in order to "protect American lives, restore the democratic process, preserve the integrity of the Panama Canal treaties and apprehend General Manuel Antonio Noriega."

According to reports available until now, US military action in Panama is continuing and fighting has not as yet ended.

The Government of India has been deeply concerned at US armed intervention in Panama and deplores the action. We also regret that the action has led to loss innocent lives in Panama.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SANTOSH MOHANDEV (Tripura West): What is all this public speech? What is he talking? We have not got any copy. (*Interruptions*) How can you allow it, Sir? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora): Mr. Chairman, I am on a point of order, Sir. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: After the Statement is over, copies will be distributed.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: As the House is aware, India is fully committed to uphold the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and non-use of force for settlement of disputes. India has always maintained that negotiation is the best way for arriving at peaceful settlement of dis-

putes and that applies equally to the situation in Panama and problems in Central America. Our position is also consistent with the United Nations Charter to which all members of the US have subscribed.

It is the hope of the Government of India that the US armed intervention will end soon and American forces will be withdrawn quickly.

I am sure the House will wish that in Panama it will be possible for the people to establish the democratic process.

The internal situation in Panama is confusing and we are in touch with our Ambassador.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga): The Government is setting up a new practice, Sir.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): *Never... (Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: When last reports were received from him, fighting was still going on in the streets near our Chancery. I am pleased to inform the House that all members of the Mission are safe. Our Mission has so far received no report of any loss of life as far as Indian nationals in Panama are concerned.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Sir. ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not allowed here.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I want to make a submission. I am aware that...

[*Translation*]

According to the convention no clarifications are allowed after the hon. Minister makes a statement. I am a junior Member in this House. But I have been a Member of the Upper House for many years and I feel that the convention followed there should be started in the Lower House also. This will be

a good beginning.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: If all of you agree, let the Rules Committee decide all these matters.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I suggest that the Rule Committee should consider this matter. When the hon. Minister makes a statement all hon. Members should be given an opportunity to seek clarifications on any point.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Advaniji, your point is well taken. This can be placed before the Rules Committee where we decide. If you all accept, no objection.

We shall now resume the discussion on Vote of Confidence.

---

17.08 hrs.

MOTION RE: CONFIDENCE IN THE  
COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—*CONTD.*

[*English*]

SHRIGOPAL RAO MAYEKAR (Panaji): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as solitary Member of the smallest State Goa and the smallest party, Maharashtra Gomatantak party. I rise not to add any arguments in the debate, but only to express my sentiments on behalf of my people and the Party.

I have heard with rapt attention the speeches made by the senior Members belonging to various parties. I was very happy to note that the parties whose bona fides were doubted by the Opposition benches have in unequivocal terms expressed their full support to the Prime Minister and his party, especially because the political cynics generally create an atmosphere of, what

[Sh. Gopal Rao Mayekar]

should I say, no-confidence outside having a wishful thinking that this coalition or this consensus or whatever it is called, will break out. After listening to the speeches by the senior Members and especially the sister from Punjab, it was heartening to note that the Government has started on a very firm ground.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, as a Member from Goa, I would like to express the sentiments of Goan people to say that as members of the Maharashtra Gomantak Party though we had regional issues at stake in the election campaign, we have towed the line taken by the National Front in almost all the fields, economic, social and political and therefore, it is my duty to express my full support as a Member of Parliament, as a representative of the people, to the new Government that is formed at the Centre.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, it has created a new hope in the minds of the people. I had the occasion to talk to the common man in the street. The man who has no political education has full faith in the new comer at the helm of affairs. He has expressed his love, full faith and confidence in our new Prime Minister and I think this is very significant as far as the people of India are concerned.

Sir, I heard with rapt attention what Shri Antulay had said in the morning. I am surprised to know at what loss he was, if Opposition parties come together and support the minority Government. Is it not a constitutional obligation on the part of the parties concerned in the interest of the nation? If at all we call at an experiment, perhaps it is a historical occasion in the democratic life of the country and I think it may perhaps become an example for all other countries internationally for solving the international issues. The argument put forth by Shri Antulay is not new to the House. I remember the two-page long advertisement published by the Congress-I for the publicity as an election campaign they contained all that Shri Antulay had said. It was totally rejected by

the people and there was no substance in that. The mockery made on the personalities like Shri Devi Lal and Shri V.P. Singh was not auguring well to the House.

Sir, It is the new hope that is created in the heart of the people and I hope that the Opposition benches will take it in a democratic sense. I also hope that they will always give—as they have said—constructive support to the Government. As a Member from Goa, I would like to reiterate my faith in Gandhiji's principles of non-violence, truth and love. I was very much amused when Shri Antulay referred to the Congress, glorifying it as Gandhi and Nehru's Congress. If you go to Goa, you will find bars and liquor shops opened everywhere by this Congress-I Ministry. There are more liquor shops and less coffee and tea shops opened by this Congress-I Government and therefore I think they have no legal as well as moral right to utter the name of Mahatma Gandhi. Shri Vamanrao Mahadik quoted the problem of Maharashtra-Karnataka border. For the last 30 years, they are expressing their desire through democratic process to merge with Maharashtra. I hope this new Government will have full faith in democracy and will give proper attention to this problem to give solace to the aspirations of the people of the border region of Maharashtra.

Sir; at the wish of my people, I invoke a very great prayer of a great spiritual leader of Maharashtra Shri Dhianeshwar. He said in his Dhaneshwary, the exposition on Gita as follows:-

"Duritathe timir javo, Vishwa Swardhar-  
masurye Paho,  
Jo ji vachheel to te laho Pranijaat."

What a great prayer it is for the entire universe! He says. "Let the darkness of sin or let the darkness of evil disappear from our life; let there be the sun of righteousness shining all the time; let there be fulfilment of the desire of every being, not only human being, but of every being." Perhaps, I think, that is the motto of our coming together in this august House. I once again reiterate my

full faith in the Government and I express full support to the Motion of Confidence put forth by the Prime Minister.

**SHRI P.C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Kerala Congress party, though it has got only one seat, has won all the seats which it has contested. We contested only one and we have won that seat. I am sorry to submit that I do not support the Motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister. Now, the ruling party has a Government, as admitted and reiterated by their leaders, which is a minority government, supported by a majority. Though that is admitted, accepted and recognised by our Constitution, here we have a Government which is supported by mutually contradictory and mutually destructive forces. In fact, we have the BJP which accuses the Communists as foreign agents. I do not think that our Prime Minister would like to get the support of "foreign agents" to rule this country. Similarly, the Communists would in turn say that the BJP represents a communal force. I do not think that my learned friends sitting there would like to rule this country, with the support of communal force. Then, with the support of these Parties how come the Government face the burning problems of this country? Now, we see that the Government has brought forward this Motion of Confidence, as stated by others, before the President's Address was to be discussed. I do not know why the Government was very particular to bring this motion first, though the President only said, "Prove your majority." The majority could be proved while passing the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address also, which the House would be taking up very shortly. But probably our Prime Minister and the Government want to ascertain and want to further get it ascertained that BJP and Left Front Parties are supporting them. It is done so because it is doubtful as it has been stated by some of the learned friends that when issues come up, whether the Communists and the BJP will be able to support such issues together. (*Interruptions*)

I only said, they cannot support each other on such vital issues. I do not know what

is the difficulty for them to hear me. (*Interruptions*)

I am really doubtful whether this Council of Ministers would be able to deliver goods because it is being supported by forces who cannot come together on vital issues which are facing this country. For example, even at this stage when the burning problem which are now at hand cannot be discussed together and cannot be resolved because both the supporting Parties will not take a common view on very many matters.

I would submit that the Government has taken the view that they would arrive at consensus. But how is it consensus to be arrived at? Consensus will be arrived only if all the parties come together, all the different groups come together and come to a common view. Here, we are sure that they cannot come to a common consensus on very vital problems. They were not able to face the electorate with a common programme suggesting that all of us vouch for such a policy, all of us can stand together for such and such policy. We have absolutely no confidence in this Council of Ministers and that they will be able to give a good rule to this country. I am not adding further because of lack of time. I would say that I would like to abstain from voting in favour of this motion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shri A.K. Roy.

**SHRI A.K. ROY (Dhanbad):** Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my party, I extend my support to this motion.

By moving this motion for confidence, our Prime Minister has put many of us into difficulties. In the past we have seen good government, bad government, majority government, strong government but, against every government they used to be some people or party who used to vote either for or against. But this is a minority government and I am very much surprised to see that nobody has the courage to vote against this government. They should have at least the courage to vote against it, but even the party which was ruling and now in opposition, has



[Sh. A.K. Roy]

not the courage to vote against it and decided to abstain. There are certain compulsions which have forced the people from the other side to accept this position. This election has definitely shown an opinion against the previous ruling party. They did not give confidence to any of the parties but the verdict was for the change, and the compulsion of that verdict for change is such that nobody has the courage to oppose this government and this is the inherent strength of this allegedly weak and minority government.

Many problems have been raised by mover of the opposition party and I have only to say that the Congress-I party should have less controversial men to represent them. At present, the Congress-I has started being the representative of only such controversial persons, to which they have got no answer. It has also been stated that we have borrowed a Congressman to head an opposition government, the Janata Dal government. I have been told everywhere that Congress is the alternative to the Congress. Where are the Congressmen? From that side, there is no Congress. But there is only Congress-I. The person have changed, their character has changed, their symbol has changed and their have and Manifesto have changed. They cannot claim the heritage of the other old Congress. Except a few here and there, they cannot claim the heritage of the Congress party which has worked for independence. The freedom fighters and sufferers for freedom are more on this side (government side) now, than on that side, the opposition.

Sir, I hope that those problems like the Babri Masjid-Ram Janam-bhoomi, like the Punjab problem, like the problem of communalism and many other things like that which have been mentioned in the President's Address are not so easy things to be solved. They cannot be solved overnight. I understand it. But I do not put that much hope on those people also. I want to emphasise that point also. But I would like to say that these

problems have been inherited from the past and they require a Caesarean operation in our body-political to implement all those socio-political goals for the uplift of the people. But this Government met with an unlimited company but they have one limited purpose. I do not praise our Prime Minister as a very able Administrator or imaginative leader and all these things. I definitely welcome his pursuit of value-based politics. If this Government does nothing else but tries to restore the value-based politics, that is welcome. I would finally like to say that this Government would have to take extreme steps to implement any good social and political schemes.

With these words, I extend my support to this Government.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, first I thank all the leaders of those parties and the Members who have participated in this debate on the Motion before the House. I thank the parties which have expressed their support on the Floor of this House and also at the time of the formation of the Government.

Before I proceed, Sir, I am quite in consonance with the feelings expressed by Shri Indrajit Gupta about the dignity and decorum of the House. It was in this House that perhaps in some haste Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made some comments regarding Shyama Prasad-ji. But it was Nehru himself, after some time, who stoop up on the Floor of the House and said: "Perhaps I should not have made those comments and in the proceedings that portion may be expunged." It was then that Shyama Prasad-ji stood up and said: "The very fact that this thought has cruised in the mind of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, there is no need for expunction of the remarks." In fact, it was a battle of courtesy. We do not have the luxury of scoring debating points. What we are facing today before the country is far more serious and this time of the House - I think we all owe it to the people who have sent us here to use every minute of it to address ourselves to those major

issues that the country is facing and the people, particularly the toiling masses, are facing.

Sir, some remarks have been made about the Oath-taking of the Deputy Prime Minister Ch. Devi Lal-ji. It was in this very House that while taking Oath here, some extraneous remarks were made. Then the Speaker gave a ruling. Point of objections were raised. He gave the ruling if some extraneous things come while taking the Oath, that does not necessarily vitiate the Oath." The matter went to the High Court and the High Court also upheld the ruling of the Chair.

17.30 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

In so far as the President himself has issued the notification that all the oaths are in order, I think, the debate is closed. There is not much to debate upon it.

Shri Antulayji, I know his talents and all the expertise he has in this matter of cementing the arguments of his party, the Congress Party. I find that it has been more of sand and less of cement. And the arguments do not hold just like grains of sand.

About the magnanimity of the Leader of the Opposition of offering this Government on a platter, I do not know why the magnanimity was missing with Antulayji while he was cribbling all the way about how this Government has been formed. In fact, I think, the point why this is so is, you have said that I have been borrowed. Certainly, have no hope that if you borrow you can take back. But I have some understanding of the psyche—that psyche should have been there—and the psyche is that the opposition can never unite and whenever elections came, the party in opposition was always sure, let the elections come, let the distribution of tickets come and everybody will fall apart. In fact, what has happened today with the support of the left parties and the BJP and other parties—whoever have expressed

themselves—is that this psyche has been hurt and precisely that is why the cribbling and complaint as to why this Government. There was a hope. Earlier we were told when the National Front was formed that it would never hold, that it is a national affront. That was our Front. Let there be introspection why people affronted to send the National Front. And it was then said: "Well, let the distribution of tickets come, Janata Dal will fall out." I think it was this philosophy which also persuaded the party in opposition to conclude that it will not be possible to elect a leader; then it will not be possible to get the support of both the left parties and the BJP and even if all this happened, they will not be able to form the Cabinet. And then it will be a grand time to tell the people why they were saying so. In fact, the game plan has gone awry and sour. That is why, the sourness and bitterness.

But now, the point is about a minority Government. Yes, it is a minority Government. And it has its limitations. Let us frankly accept it.

But let us not see it only in this context. Let us see it in the broader political scenario of the country and the political processes that have been taking place. After independence Congress emerged, as a result of the freedom movement, as the central focal point of political power and it also was the large mass of political gravitation which pulled everything in. Other parties were at the periphery—may be for a developing country for its stability, that situation after a freedom movement which is cut of a mass movement may be the right thing.

But after decades and decades the situation remained and there was an aspiration of the people. I am not making any argument of numbers. When we address ourselves to the political situation of the country, it is not confined to numbers. Numbers are important in the procedure; but the stability of the country is more important than numbers.

It was the aspiration of the people that it does have real political alternatives. And this

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

evolution of real political options did not fructify. Yes, in 1977 it did; but then again I think it is still in a process of development. I don't see that it is absent. It is in the process of development and at this stage for the decision of the other parties who have after very considered thought in the whole context of the country taken a decision in the political process that is happening to support the National Front Government, I am thankful and grateful to them. They are very candid about it, because as Indrajji Guptaji said, people did want, do want a Government Advaniji said it is on certain policies and implementation, on issues. Somnathji also said it and just now certain Members have expressed the same thinking I think this is very very significant. I think this is the happiest thing that can occur to Indian politics. Therefore, once on a national scale the commitment to issues has arisen, implementation of the programme has arisen and not blind support in any case, whatever may come.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: To one person.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, we are very clear. From personalised politics we want the Indian democracy to mature to issue based politics. I think today in my heart I am the happiest man to see it beyond numbers and beyond parties who are here and who are on that side. An issue and a debate has been raised in this country that political support will depend on policies, programmes and their actual implementation on the ground. In the country, the future of the country and its destiny is not hung on the spelling of a name, but on what actually happens to the people. Because, Sir, I know there are many people who have fought all through their lives for the working people, for the country. I know they are not interested in simple names. If the spelling of the Prime Minister has changed, I do not think that akes the difference; or if the spelling of the Minister has changed, I do not think that makes any difference. The question is not

whether the Government has changed or the Prime Minister has changed or the Minister has changed or not. But the question is those who work and toil, whether those who live in huts their lives will change or not. I think, the parties who are lending support, have made this very clear and I think this is the biggest guarantee for the people who are outside Parliament, who think that in this House, it is not some remark to remark exchanges, but something which really affects their lives on daily basis, will be decided and to them, we give some ray of hope. So, what looks today as a delicate balance of political forces may turn out to be the most glorious occasion for the maturity of our democracy, from personalised politics to issue-based politics.

Yes, there are problems. There are differences of stance, opinions and perspectives. When the socio-economic system is heterogeneous, the political system cannot be homogenous. Let us not look for homogeneity in the political system when the socio-economic system is heterogeneous. These contradictions of the socio-economic system have to be and should, in a democratic process get reflected, get voiced, but while these differences are voiced, it is part of political management and the sagacity of political management is tested, whether between heterogeneity, commonality can be found or not. That commonality we found. This is our effort and collective effort and it is a very serious effort, when we talk of consensus, when we talk of reconciliation, because there is the ruling party, there is the opposition, but beyond the ruling party and the opposition, is the country and it is here, on those issues, that we are finding a consensus and reconciliation. It is not a process of giving up one's ideals or principles. It is not a question of bargaining or any exchange, I think it was very uncharitable to have an oblique reference to the BJP and the Left parties, as to what price has been fixed. I think, for maintaining the national integrity,—the country's integrity—any price can be fixed and that is this.

So, it is not the numbers we have seen

that generates the credibility of the Government. The last Government had the largest number on its side ever in the history, since independence. But the numbers could not help. The dialogue in this House is not confined to the walls of this House; it extends to the 80 crores of people; that is the real House and the political power is generated from there. It is the confidence and credibility there—that is the guarantor of any Government and nothing else, and I think, we shall strive for it. We are not ostentatious; we do not want to boast. We come to it with humility. And that will be our goal and that will be our endeavour. And about opinions there has been a mention. Well, I think, democracy is dead the day there is no debate. Democracy by nature is argumentative. We must realise the character of it. Clash of opinions is not its weakness but its strength and we have seen when this clash of opinions was killed democracy was killed. Not only democracy but national interest was jeopardised. Let us not put such unity on such a high pedestal that under it democracy is crushed. Many a tomb-stone of democracy has the inscription 'unity'. So political vibrancy of democracy has to be maintained while there has to be unity on national issues. This will be our perspective and this will be our broad guiding light of management of politics of this government.

Now Antulayji has asked me several question. He has asked me about Punjab. He has asked me about Jammu and Kashmir. He has asked me about Ram Janambhoomi and Babri Masjid. But Antulayji, you have not exhausted the whole list of question which we have inherited. Perhaps you joined a little late, otherwise you would have been aware of the whole list of questions. Yes, these are the questions. These are the questions that as soon as we have entered office and not even when we entered office but when we were in public, we were aware of them. We also partake to address ourselves to those questions. There are many burning problems. As has been said, many a time or all the time I am asked, what is your view? But if they are burning problems today let it not be forgotten that the

fires had been stoked much earlier and today they are the burning problems.

There is also a need of re-conciliation because it is said in times of war only, such an attempt is there. It is a situation of war-not external. If you see the situation in Jammu and Kashmir, to what levels it has been allowed to deteriorate or in Punjab or on the economic side, if you see the balance of payments; if you see the deficit and also the foreign debt—I do not want to apportion any blame on the Opposition but I extend the invitation to that side. I extend the invitation to the benches opposite that let us come together and grapple with them together. I extend the invitation from any side.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: (Amethi) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I accept that invitation to sit together with the hon. Prime Minister and grapple with these questions and we will work constructively to grapple with them. But we do need a certain understanding, an understanding, for example, that those people who demand Khalistan will be arrested or some action taken against them. We do need to know whether the Government is going to soft-pedal on the Anandpur Sahib resolution or not.

Sir, we do need to know whether fundamentalism which is once more on the rise, when meat shops and liquor shops have been closed, when Hindus have been asked to leave hostels and other things in Punjab, how is that going to be tackled? It has started in the last two weeks. We would like to know what the Government is doing to prevent weapons and secessionists from entering religious institutions. There are a number of other questions like this which I could ask which I will perhaps ask on another occasion—but the hon. Prime Minister has dodged these questions and not answered them.

In the President's Address, the word 'secessionist' has not been used in Punjab. It is extremely sad. ( *Interruptions* ) We will talk about that. I am just mentioning it.

Again, the Prime Minister has said that

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

national integration and national unity is of utmost importance. But in Kashmir, they were willing to let go five terrorists when the price could have been much less. It is a pity that the Prime Minister has avoided answering these questions today.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** With all respect, I have been prejudged on my answer before even I have completed it.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:** He has interpreted your speech.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** No, I will not say this. I am addressing myself to these issues and we have addressed ourselves to them earlier also.

Recently, we had an all-party meeting and on these very issues, we made ourselves very clear. We made ourselves clear that there is no question of compromise with the secessionists. We made ourselves clear....

*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI RAJIV GANDHI:** But you have not taken action against them, Sir.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** I will appeal, Sir, that the leader of the Opposition at least is not giving me even five days while he had five years.

**SHRI RAJIV GANDHI:** With your permission, Sir, when an antinational statement is made, it is not a question of five days, it is perhaps a question of five minutes. If I may continue, the ex-Governor of Punjab was not allowed to apprehend those people who called for Khalistan. The Prime Minister vacillated. The ex-Governor sent message after message. He did not get a response from the Prime Minister. The ex-Governor even spoke to the prime Minister on the phone. The Prime Minister promised to telephone him back and then he did not call him back. And the result was that the person,

who was calling for Khalistan, could not be arrested because of vacillation on the part of this Government.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** Sir, let me make myself clear. I am not answerable to the Governor. I am answerable to this House. And it would not have been even five minutes, Sir, but for the intervention in between. On Punjab, our first attempt is to generate an atmosphere... *(Interruptions)*.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Vacillation !

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** Let it not be known of any vacillation. We were 104 when we walked out of this House and you all said: "Get out.: "It is we who told you then our decision." : You will get out." And that has come true. *(Interruptions)* So, don't talk in those terms. There is no question of compromising on the land of the country. We stand for the security of every person in Punjab. We also stand for justice and fairness and if there has been injustice anywhere, that has to be removed. On Jammu & Kashmir... *(Interruptions)*.

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS:** No answer! .. *(Interruptions)*.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:** I am ready..... *(Interruptions)*. Just a moment.... *(Interruptions)*. I have no problem Sir. We are in the very first initiative. We went to Punjab and what Punjab needed most was not bayonets but a message of trust. And that is the difference. If there is a difference of perception. I stand by that perception and we stand by that perception.... *(Interruptions)*.... And there cannot be a solution of Punjab unless confidence is built and by confidence, I see to every section of the society and everyone who is in Punjab ..... *(Interruptions)*.... Sir, regarding hostels etc., the Governor has been instructed to take fullest precaution and provide security. There is no compromise on that. A direction has been given and there has not been a single minute of delay also. At the same time, I think ... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: (Amethi): Just a tiny clarification.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I do not want to be interrupted after every sentence... ( *Interruptions* )

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please take your seats.

( *Interruptions* )

[ *Translation* ]

MR. SPEAKER: When the hon. Prime Minister is speaking..... ( *Interruptions* ).

[ *English* ]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be seated.

[ *Translation* ]

Please take your seat.

( *Interruptions* )

[ *English* ]

MR. SPEAKER: Are you yielding ?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi.

( *Interruptions* )

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats. I am for orderly debate. The Prime Minister has yielded. Now, I am calling Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. You can put your question.

( *Interruptions* ).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I understood that the hon. Prime Minister has said that there was no delay in responding to the requests and telegrams of the ex-Governor of Punjab. Is it correct?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

No. It was about hostels... ( *Interruptions* ).

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats. This is not proper. When the Prime Minister is replying, you must hear him with rapt attention. Yes, Mr. Prime Minister.

( *Interruptions* )

MR. SPEAKER: You must obey your leader. Please take your seat.

( *Interruptions* )

18.00 hrs.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I think it is an achievement of the democratic process today that our elected members of Punjab, the Mann Group, have come and joined Parliament. They have taken oath and they will be participating in the debates. I welcome their decision.

We have also said that no innocent life should be lost. But there is no compromise with regard to land, our territory. At the same time, if there is injustice, that should be removed. We have decided that in regard to the enactment under which the right to life can be suspended, the constitution 59th Amendment Act, we will come before this House and seek to repeal it because we cannot have a statute in this country where the right to life can be suspended. There is only one place where the right to life can be suspended and that is the butchery and no other place ! But we have it on the Statute Book and we have made this commitment to repeal it.

We have also committed that we would take action against the atrocities that had been committed in the riots of 1984. But ours is a straight and fair path and a firm path.

On Jammu and Kashmir, I want to say that there the issues are such where we do spend some extra time.

It is of maximum importance that these issues are addressed to. On that we are very

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

clear. Again, anything that is against the country is not going to be tolerated. But at the same time, the problem of the youth there the problems of development not reaching the village level, etc. have to be addressed to. And I look forward to the participation of youth in this whole process. The people of Jammu and Kashmir had fought for the freedom of this country. There is no reason why they should feel distant or hurt in any way.

At this juncture, it will be the fundamental effort of the Government to bring the issue of equity as the focal point of national debate and attention. So is economic equity an issue, which we have to address ourselves to directly. I think this has gone out of focus of national debate. Development alone has been in focus. But I think, along with development the issue of equity has to be brought into focus. It cannot be put under the carpet. It will be the effort of the present Government to bring into focus. For this there is need for democratisation-political, economic and social.

In the process of political democratisation, the chasm that has developed between the people and the bureaucracy, between the masses and the state, government has to be bridged. How to bridge this chasm and how to reduce this contradiction? For this thinkers like Jaya Prakashji, Vinobaji, Gandhiji and Lohiaji had very concretely laid down the parameters and to involve the people not only to give them something from the treasury—they are not to be mere recipients—but make them participants in shaping and fashioning the destiny of this country. Not by treasury but sharing of power that will be our attempt. For quite a long time, we said, we will remove poverty but poverty remains. Let the poor have a share in managing themselves and they will either remove poverty or will be content with their position. But let them have a share in managing the affairs. That is why, we will be a bringing decentralisation to the village level, not the decentralisation that affects the federal structure but decentralisation that will

keep the federal structure intact and bring power to the people below. Same way, we cannot have political democracy without economic democracy. I think, if there is going to be economic centralisation, we cannot think of political decentralisation because both are incongruous. And in the process of economic decentralisation, the concept of involving the labour in participation of management as an ethos—not a union demand—has to permeate the country's labour relations.

So, that is the process of industrial democratisation and decentralised production in which the scientists have to play a major role. It is here that the invitation to scientists to the new technologies is there where there can be decentralisation of economic production, it is these centralised technologies that lead to social and economic imbalances. Our modern technology can decentralise it. It will lead to the social and economic justice that we are thinking of. And my invitation to the scientists is on this ground and they will be given the fullest role for self-reliance and for serving the people of India.

A point was made about reservations. We are bringing in a Bill for extending the reservations for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for ten years more. I have no apologies for it. I firmly stand by it and if the Members on the benches opposite have any reservation about it, they can express it...

SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF (Bangalore North): Why are you posing this question? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I think on this issue also, we have to think very deeply. If we see the socio-economic structure, it is an exploitive structure. Those who produce the wealth of the country—the farmer, the labourer, the youth, the artisan, the weaver—do not get the full benefits of their labour. (*Interruptions*)

I am coming to it. (*Interruptions*)

In this system when a member of the Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe takes the plough and works for fourteen hours or sixteen hours a day, it is a reality. I think Kalpanathji, it is a reality of your village also. (*Interruptions*) This is the role reserved for him. There is a reservation in the system, economic and social reservation for certain sections. They have no other right, but the right to work. They have no other right. Even that they are deprived of. (*Interruptions*)

Let me complete my idea. It is very difficult: this interruption sentence after sentence that is going on. (*Interruptions*) Let me complete the concept.

Now, in the present system that we have in the socio-economic structure, the child of the Scheduled Caste or Scheduled Tribe landless labourer cannot attend the school. After some time, he has to be brought to help the family, for livelihood. This is the system which condemns him to it, and then this very system asks him to complete and be equal to others. Unless this inequitous system is changed—and it has to be changed—there is need for support to the weaker sections, to the people of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, and the backward classes. And I make myself very clear, and I stand by it. (*Interruptions*) It was this; and here I am coming to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: What about reservation in Services?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, for reservation. You are talking much about it.

It was Dr. Ambedkar who was the giver of this Constitution, who framed this Constitution in this very building; and he does not have a place here. That is your commitment to reservation. It is true; it is. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats. I have not permitted you. Please take your seats.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It is a reflection of the whole social order. Even that person who shapes the idol for the temple, after the idol is installed, is not allowed to go in. In the same way, Dr. Ambedkar may have framed this Constitution; but he does not have a place in the Central Hall. It is not the Government's jurisdiction. Sir, it is your jurisdiction, and I take this occasion to appeal to you to have his portrait installed in the Central Hall. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I fully agree with you, Mr. Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Again, as has been said by several Members—and Advani Ji specially has criticised it, and every Member reflected it. We all share that view. There is the question of restoration of democratic institutions, and we commit ourselves, on the floor of the House, to the restoration of the dignity of the House, of the judiciary, of the Comptroller and Auditor General and the various institutions of democracy, and the Planning Commission. We are coming up with a Lokpal Bill for probity in public life, and the Bill for the right to information. People should have the right to know. Political battles are not fought in any battle-field; but they are fought in the minds of the people. That is where the political battles are fought. And in this, the media are very important. People have to have a right to know every aspect of a political issue. We commit ourselves to properly and duly inform the people, and they have a right to it.

We have seen that under the cover of official secrecy, many a national interest has been jeopardised. We will ensure transparency, safeguarding the security of the country as also where our foreign relations may be concerned, ensure that there is transparency in the Government's functioning; and the more the transparency, I think the more democratic it is, and lesser the chances of the Government going astray.

While the economic issue might not



[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

have come into focus today, but I must put it on record that it as much a burning issue as any other. And our economic independence, we have to protect today, and for this sake if we have to give a call to the country, we should have the guts to tell the people as to what the situation is. We will not accept any economic bondage but will protect the economic independence of the country. But we are in a situation, may I say, where there is need for urgent action, not only urgent action but collective action.

With these words, I again thank all the Members of the House and the Parties, who have lent support and also those who have not and reiterate our commitment that we will face the challenges collectively.

MR. SPEAKER: Now I shall put the motion moved by the Prime Minister to the vote of the House. The question is:

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

*The motion was adopted.*

18.17 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now the Secretary-General.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:-

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of procedure and conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Constitution (Sixty-second Amendment) Bill, 1989, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha, in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution of India, at its sitting held on the 21st December, 1989."

CONSTITUTION (SIXTY-SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir I lay on the Table the Constitution (Sixty-second Amendment) Bill, 1989, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11 A.M.

18.18 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 22, 1989 Pausa 1, 1911 (Saka)*