

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

May be the Prime Minister is scared. That is why he even called the Chief Minister here and Shri Sharad Pawar is waiting outside. This is the sign of his fear. May be he is feeling that his time is over and that is why he has called all people here. When a person is ill and his end is near, all the relatives are called to see him for the last time. It appears to me that a thing like that is taken place. Are the people being called to pay their last tributes?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is enough prelude to the Prime Minister's speech.

[Translation]

SHRI RAMSAGAR (Barabanki): Sir, on behalf of the Samajwadi Party, I have not spoken yet. Please give me an opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

[English]

We have given time. You will speak on something else. Please sit down now. Please cooperate with the Chair Thank you.

Well, I think, Mr. Nitish Kumar wanted to raise this issue. I have full sympathy for Mr. Nitish Kumar. We are in a situation in which we find ourselves that we are likely to put a strict interpretation on the constitutional provisions. The Presiding Officer is not in a position to preclude Mr. K Vijaya Bhaskara Reddy from attending this House or doing anything else which he can do as per the Constitution.

SHRI RAMNAIK (Bombay North): How can you deny Shri Sharad Pawar? Should we go and invite him? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, this is enough. Let us come to the seriousness of the business of the House.

The hon. Prime Minister please.

✓ THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, you called is as a prelude before my speech. What a prelude!

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to all the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and evidently made very valuable contributions.

The President's Address has a particular connotation in our parliamentary system. The beginning of the Address in particular brings out the upper-most concern of the nation and the Government. For instance, in last year's Address we find that the president, after a few preliminaries, straight went to the question of economic recovery and the economic programme. That was the first concern of the nation last year and rightly so, because we had been landed in an extremely difficult situation from which Government's efforts made us come out bit by bit, inch by inch. And therefore at the time of last year's Address, the economic agenda loomed larger than anything else; and that is what the President started with more or less.

This year, Sir, unfortunately, I do not say that the economic agenda has been completely closed or given the go by, but the first concern of the President is on the survival of the nation and the survival of the secular credentials of India. It is also a deliberate expression of what we should attend to first and foremost in this country as a result of what all has happened during the year or in the past two or three months. So, I would like to say in the first instance that this is our very important and perhaps the first concern which we have to attend to.

Sir, it is not for the first time that the need to avoid bringing religion into politicals has figured in our discussions, in our thoughts in this country. After independence this has been figuring time and again. During the debates in the Constituent Assembly again this figured very prominently and since then it has been figuring from time to time. We have tackled it to some extent. We have not

tackled it to some extent. The extent it has not been tackled, it has raised its head again and created complications from time to time.

I submit to the House and to the nation that the time has come when we cannot afford any further tinkering with this problem. We have to decide it once for all. We have to say that this country is going to be perpetually wedded to secularism and this country cannot exist, cannot survive without secularism. That is going to be the first thing we have to decide amongst ourselves, including all parties, I say.

Sir, there was, even in 1948, while the Constitution was in the anival. a resolution brought by Shri Anantasayanam Aiyangar, Member of the Constituent Assembly. The Resolution reads this:

Whereas it is essential for the proper functioning of democracy and the growth of national unity and solidarity that communalism should be eliminated from Indian life, this Assembly is of the opinion that no communal organisation which by its Constitution or by the exercise of discretionary power vested in any of its office bearers or organs, admits to or excludes from its membership, persons on grounds of religion, race and caste or any of them, should be permitted to engage in any activities other than those essential for the bonafide religions and cultural needs of the community and that all steps, legislative and administrative, necessary to prevent such activities should be taken."

Panditji, of course, in the same debate said:

" We must have it clearly in our minds and in the mind of the country that the alliance of religion and politics in the shape of communalism is a most dangerous alliance and it yields the most abnormal kind of illegitimate brood."

This is the word which he had used. So, Sir, the concern with this has been there throughout.

Unfortunately, because of circumstance as then prevailed from time to time we have been able to solve this problem partially through other means, through the ballot box, etc. But right from the beginning, 1952 onwards from the first election, I can say without any fear of contradiction that the tinge of communalism being brought into electoral politics has been there to a lesser or a larger extent the extent has been growing ever since. Still it did not become alarming in this sense that it did not relly threaten the existence of the country, the survival of the country. But within 25 years, Shrimati Indira Gandhi came to the conclusion that it is necessary now to make it absolutely clear that Indian democracy is going to be a secular democracy.

The word ' secular' was used in the Forty-second Amendment. It took 25 years. Until then the urgency of adding this word, or making it abundantly clear that it is secular and nothing else, did not arise. It arose at the time of the Forty-second Amendment. The Forty-second Amendment makes it very clear that the kind of democracy, the brand of democracy in this country is going to be secular democracy. It could be any other democracy, non-secular also, if the nation wants it. But this nation in particular wants secular democracy. And this is what was clarified.

In a secular democracy, it is very clear that those parties who participate should have a secular content, a secular programme, a secular outlook and everything secular. There should be nothing non-secular about this. This is something axiomatic. This need not be proved or argued about too much. Therefore, it is necessary to go into this particular aspect of secularism and its functioning in a secular democracy.

Sir, after the recent tragic events, number of jurists in this country, constitutional experts, intellectuals have been writing to me and I know that his fermentation has

[Sh. P.V. Narsimha Rao]

been going on throughout the country, because this is a thinking country, after all. It has been so for thousands of years.

So, as a result of all this cogitation, I got some of the aspects examined in the Government. We have several provisions by which, to some extent to a large extent let us say—the bringing of religion into politics could be avoided, but it could not be eliminated. That is the position today. But avoidance merely is not enough. It has to be eliminated. It has to be eliminated from the minds of the people, of course. That is a long drawn process. But at the same time, it has to be eliminated from the constitutional and legal framework on which the functioning of this democracy is based. This is important.

After having got it examined and the Forty-second Amendment, if I may say so, was a step in that particular direction; adding that particular word 'secular' in the Preamble was in that particular direction and, therefore it supplied an important missing link. Today the situation is that after full examination of the matter, the conclusion is as under. Shri Madhu Limaye was one of the very thoughtful leaders who wrote to me about it and we had the matter fully examined. We find—

From the foregoing it is clear that the present provisions in the Constitution, electoral law and other enactments are not adequate to meet a situation in which a political party takes upon itself, directly or indirectly to take up specific or general religious issues, though the use of such issues during the time of elections is specifically prohibited by a definition of 'corrupt practice' incorporated in the Representation of the People's Act"

So, it is only partially effective in the functioning of the party, in the entire gamut of its activities. It is not possible to prohibit it. We have to do it if this democracy is to be secular democracy. Therefore, whether the

amendment of the Representation of the People's Act, the Election Symbols Order, would meet the requirements of isolating and debarring political parties drawing strength or exploiting the religious sentiments or sectarian feelings, the answer is 'No'. Because we have not tried that. That has not been put to test. Therefore, we have to devise some very special means and this Government has been on the look out to find out those means. I want a full debate on this House and outside and after a full debate we will come up with whatever is found to be most effective which human ingenuity in this country can devise. This is a commitment from the Government. I would like this subject to be brought here. This concerns the very existence of the State, and this has to be taken as our first priority. As I said, priority has had to be changed as a result of what happened last year and this I submit will come before the House, before the nation in whatever form it can come. I again pledge this Government to any constitutional legal amendment that may be needed to correct its framework so as to bring it entirely in line with the secular democratic ideal, which we have espoused in the Constitution. This is on the political side.

We cannot accept a religious device for political means. If there is a religious body, we have no objection at all. That is the essence of secularism. If someone wants to have a Hindu body or a Muslim body for their rights, for education, for things like that, we have absolutely no objection; the Constitution is fully open to that, it allows it. But, we cannot this to be brought in electoral politics because it is to a level ground when it comes to electoral politics. The play has to be at level ground. For both sides it has to be the same advantage or disadvantage. If being a Hindu itself is a qualification and a party says it is for all Hindus and another party becomes Muslims, then why do we have elections in this country. Eighty five per cent are Hindus. Even before the elections, the results are out. Therefore, unless the vast majority of the people in this country get divided on ideological grounds, not on religious grounds, so also the minority, there can be no secular democracy, if the divider

of the people is religious grounds. Therefore, there must be something to stop this. There must be something to make it illegal just as it is illegal to preach sedition. For instance, in the Punjab elections, some leader said, 'I am going to take these elections as a referendum for Khalistan. We stopped the elections. This cannot be allowed.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): In Mizoram, the Congress Manifesto stated that if voted to power the Congress Party will form Christian Government in the State.

[English]

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Wherever this is done it is wrong. It is constitutionally incorrect. (Interruptions). We are talking of something serious. In this discussion lungs are not going to really determine success.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: In Mizoram, was it there in your manifesto?

[English]

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I agree. In Mizoram, there was a wrong paragraph inserted in the State's Congress manifesto. We removed it. We disapproved of it. We completely disassociated from it. That is what happened. That was wrong. Absolutely that was wrong. There are cases in this country where even a small pamphlet appealing to religious sentiments was taken by the Supreme Court as violative of the principle of secularism or the Representation of People's Act and elections have been its aside. There have been decisions of the Bombay High Court where this principle has been upheld. It is only a question of consolidating the existing law, the existing case law, and wherever there is a lacuna, to close that lacuna, to remove that lacuna to see that secular democracy in this country becomes foolproof, inviolable in all senses of

the term.... (Interruptions). So, I am very clear on that. That is going to be our first priority.

Now, this debate is going overlap with two other debates. One is the Railway debate. About some Railways, some friends have raised some points here. They will have to be dealt with by the Railway Minister. Then there is a whole lot of economic material in the Presidential Address. He has given us the main thrust of the economic policy which, has been endorsed last year also and in pursuance of which, lot of progress has been made in this country. But I would not go into any great elaboration of that because during the Budget debate, all those things are going to come up. So, I shall leave those points to be dealt with during the Budget debate.

Only one point which has not been well brought out in our debate so far, I would like to mention here, that is, the importance of agriculture. It has been only said as a matter of slogan maybe, but this has not been elaborated I would like to bring to the notice of the House that the Budget of 1993-94 intends to give a major push to our policy of reducing poverty and increasing employment, uplift of the poor is an article of faith with us. As the Government moves away from regulation and direct involvement in industry, etc. it must focus more strongly on those services only which it can provide. The Budget has demonstrated our commitment to these vital principles. It will give a major push to afford to reduce poverty and increase employment, to increase allocations in agriculture and rural development. In agriculture, there is a sixteen per cent increase and in rural development there is a very major, thirty-six per cent, increase, bringing it to Rs. 5,000 crores. Rural development in the Five-Year Plan has got something like more than a 110 per cent increase or 120 per cent increase. Starting with Rs. 14,000 crores, it has jumped to Rs. 30,000 crores, because we thought that this is necessary. In the next five years it is necessary to make a real quantum jump in rural development which mostly consists of rural employment the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana.

[Sh. P.V. Narsimha Rav]

This being the case, Education has received a jump of twenty-nine per cent, Health and Family Welfare has received a jump of 17.6 per cent. These increases were not there in the previous Budgets. Therefore, this is the special package that has been devised. On the one hand, there has been liberalisation, deregulation, making the people free to come up with their own enterprise, own initiative, no curbs on them, at the same time, on the rural side, so that this change may not increase differences, increase disparities, a big chunk of money is being given to the rural sector so that the balance is maintained, the relationship between the rural and the urban sector is not completely distorted.

16.00 hrs.

We have recently evolved a progressive agricultural policy after detailed consultation with the States, agricultural universities and farmers. The Agricultural Policy Resolution was discussed on 5th March, 1993 in a conference of Chief Ministers who have broadly approved it. The Agricultural Policy Resolution will be brought before Parliament also for eliciting the views of the Members. This policy lays emphasis on infrastructure development, balanced regional growth, greater public investment, better provision of credit and other inputs and developing a favourable price, trade and investment environment for agriculture.

This is the real thrust now. It is not just only production. It is also trade and investment environment in agriculture. For the first time a massive investment has been made in this year's Budget on agriculture. It was not so earlier. In fact the investment on agriculture was steadily going down.

Therefore, I would like to say that this a turning point in the policy of the Government in regard to agricultural investment and this is going to be all to the because unless agriculture is strengthened whatever else do, the economy is not going to really come up. This has been the experience in the past.

Whenever we had a good harvest, everything else was good. Whenever we had a drought, everything else—even if it was good—it did not make any impact on the economy of the nation. Therefore, this is one point which I wanted specially to stress.

Sir, in agriculture there is one difficulty that has come and I would like to share the Government's thinking with the hon. Members. About fertilizers there has been some complaint from some sections of agriculturists. So far nitrogenous fertilizers are concerned, there is no complaint because the prices have come down. Coming to the phosphate fertilizers, particularly DAP, there has been a complaint. The complaint is two-fold. On the one side we have our own factories producing the DAP at as high a price at Rs. 9,200 per tonne while you can import the same DAP at Rs. 6,000-Rs. 6,500. Now what is in the national interest? What is in the interest of the farmer? This is where the dilemma come I would like to submit..

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): What will happen to the indigenous factories? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Why do you not listen?

Sir, this is the dilemma. You can get something at two-thirds the price. Ask any farmer what would he like to do. Would he like to get it at Rs. 6,000 or Rs. 9,000 because he is patriotic enough to see that our own factories should flourish and give him at Rs. 9,000 *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): Why the cost of production has not come down? *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: What is the reason of production being too costly in our factories?..... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Why do you not listen.... *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is where a sectional approach will never do. Our friends who are raising their voices from the other side are unnecessarily straining their throats. They stand for one section, that is the industry and the labour. If the industry tries to make it much more modern, labour will be thrown out. That is their very legitimate concern. I can understand. But there is another concern and that is of the farmer. He wants it at Rs. 6,000 if you can give him. Is it not possible for us to have a buffer stock when the prices are down? The idea is to have a buffer stock; make it possible for us to even out the price at some point which is neither Rs. 6,000 nor Rs. 9,000, but still within the reach of the farmer. This is approach we have to take, not to shut out imports. This is the best policy which could be devised for the farmer and this is what we are thinking. On the other hand, there is the whole industry of fertilisers. We have built it at great cost. It is producing between 40 and 45 per cent of our requirements. We cannot let it go down the drain. Therefore, we have to do something for keeping it afloat and that is also what we are planning. So, this is a two-pronged approach where whenever imports bring you at lower price you build a stock and at the same time, you help the local industry also to flourish in the sense that they become competitive.

[Translation]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This does not happen.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: This does happen and that too does happen. There is a single package for the both. (Interruptions)

[English]

I would also like to submit for Mr. Chatterjee that without the one the other cannot succeed. If you do not import and if you go on insisting on Rs. 9,000 per tonne, the entire economy will go away. You have

to do it. That is where the subsidy is not available. The subsidy, next year, is going to come to Rs. 12,000 crores. Is it possible for the taxpayer of this country, for the poor man of this country to be able to produce Rs. 12,000 crores only because some industries have become so inefficient that we have to go on feeding them? This is not possible.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Why should you need import to make the Government sector competitive?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: You need import because you do not have the fertiliser being produced in this country. Coming to potash, you do not have even one *tola* of fertiliser produced in this country; every *tola* has to come from outside.

Sir, now these are the constraints of agriculture and if we do not understand and try to solve them, agricultural problems will remain where they are. This is what we are trying to do. This is the package which I would like to bring to the notice of the House. We will go into greater detail later. When the agriculture demand comes, naturally we will go into the details. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

DR. S.P. YADAV (Sambhal): Please tell us why wheat imported from America while it was available case at Rupees 300 a quintal? (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: On fertiliser, we had a Joint Parliamentary Committee to go into it in great detail. We have accepted the recommendations of the Committee. We are implementing the recommendations of the Committee and there are voices being raised here. I can only say that the hon. Members have not read their own JPC's report and therefore, all this is going on. It is better to go into the JP report, find out what the points were and to what extent they are being implemented.

[Sh. P.V. Narsimha Rav]

Sir, coming to import, this year if I am not mistaken there will be no imports. Our crops has been no food and our prospect of the Rabi crop has been equally good. There will be no import or wheat this year and I hope next year also, if our buffer stock is good enough, then we may not have to import. But, this, I must say again and again that the country, in spite of all the agricultural progress that we have made, is still dependent on rains and if you have God forbid, a really bad drought in this country, the country will not be able to stand it. We can stand a drought here or there, sway in one or two States or one-and-a-half States or a few districts here and there. Sometimes, extensive droughts are not uncommon in this country. I hope they will not recur, because we have rely established the irrigation system to the extent possible and we do not have recurring very extensive droughts these days. But if such a drought comes we will not be able to stand it. Therefore, the importance of agriculture still remains and agricultural extension still happens to be very important. But where is this extension still happens to be very important. But where is this extension to take place? In Punjab there is nothing more to do, in Haryana there is nothing more to do.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Have you chalked out a plan to tackle drought.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Please try to understand (*Interruptions*)

[English]

It is only in the Gangetic plain, it is only in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, it is only in Bihar, it is in areas which are endowed naturally, but at the same time do not have the where-withal, those are the areas where this investment has to be made. I have heard agricultural experts say, just one State of Bihar can feed the whole of India. The kind of yield that you have today is nothing to be proud of. It is about one-tenth or one-eighth of Haryana

or Punjab. So, the entire scope of increasing the per acre yield is in the Eastern Area. That is where Ayodhya also is. If everyone is thinking only of Ayodhya and nobody will think of agriculture, nothing is going to happen. That is where the agenda of the nation has to change from religion, from obscurantism, from outdated, slogans, from going to past to going to the 21st century. This is what is the essence of the whole thing. The entire scope lies there. Therefore, I would like to put an end. I would like the House to endorse the idea of putting an end to this controversy. We have given it to the Supreme Court: a temple will come; a mosque will come. Now you do not have to, we do not have to lose our head particularly Members of Parliament. There is no need. The decision taken is a right one. It will be implemented. Once the Supreme Court says, "This is the answer to the question that you have referred to us", that answer will be acted upon. And that will be implemented. We have a lot of cynicism already; we have a lot of scepticism already which has brought us to this pass. Let us give it a chance. In any case, let us change the agenda of the nation. I am appealing everyone, let us change the agenda of the nation. Back to economic recovery, back to economic progress where it was last year, from where it has strayed a little but it has to go back on the rails and those are the real rails on which the agenda of the nation has to run from now. This is my appeal.

For the weaker sections, we have already taken steps. We have initiated action for implementation of the Supreme Court judgment. The time frame specified is being strictly adhered to. An expert committee has been constituted to advise the Government for specifying the basis, applying the relevant and requisite socio-economic criteria to exclude to socially advanced persons and sections, creamy layers from other Backward Classes. And a permanent body for entertaining, examining and recommending upon request for inclusion and complaints of over-inclusion and under-inclusion in the list of Other Backward Classes of citizens is being constituted.

Again, there is a very elaborate judgment of the Supreme Court. There has to be an end to this matter somewhere and this is where we have to end it by implementing the Supreme Court decision. That is what the Government is determined to do. Steps are being taken exactly according to the time frame which has been laid down by the Supreme Court.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: There is no reservation for the backward classes in the I.A.S and I.P.S. examinations being conducted at present.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: What is there?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Why has the provision of 27 per cent reservation for backward classes not been implemented for I.A.S. and I.P.S. examinations?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Ram Vilas ji, you have come to me many times with many people bringing a number of representatives. You know, when you say something, I take you a bit seriously. If you point out any anomaly, corrective measures would be taken to remove that. Very recently Shri Buta Singh and some colleagues has come to me and point out a certain anomaly and I promise that we would go into all the matters, examine them and would do everything possible within the framework of the Supreme Court's verdict. Whatever is possible, will definitely be done I assure you... (Interruptions)

[English]

Sir, I had said just now that the Agenda of the nation had strayed a little from where it was to a different and totally unnecessary area. Fortunately for us, the strain has not been very serious. I know we have lost about Rs. 4,000 crores to Rs. 5,000 crores according to the Finance Minister-income to the Government as a result of the Bombay riots. May be it is a little more. But things are picking up. Things are coming back to normal fast coming back to normal. The figures of January and February clearly indicate

that there is again an upward trend in the economy, in everything including exports and, therefore, this is a hopeful feature, this is a healthy feature with which we should consolidate.

Sir, this is also proved by the fact that within the last one month alone or five weeks, we have been able to receive the countries from which we expect foreign investment on a large scale. Immediately after Ayodhya for about a fortnight or a month, there was a tendency to pause. They asked themselves whether India will again come back to normal. After one month, it stated with a derizzle, but now it is becoming a torrent. I have no doubt that we are already back on the rails. National Agenda has been picked up, has been accepted by us and our friends in other countries. The visit of President Yeltsin has proved beyond doubt that our relations with that part of the world are going to be as close as they have ever been, in wherever situation those countries are. We have settle many outstanding problems. Some Members were just asking, before I started, about what is happening with Russia. Now, we have more or less settled all the outstanding questions with Russia.

Many farmers from Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and other States had come with long complaints, bitter complaints, that what they were producing is not moving. "Why does not the Government of India find markets for us?" It is not easy to find markets. We had only one established market of the former Soviet Union and that market was completely out of function. Now that market has started. Only three days back, several people came and told me that their goods have started moving. LCs have been opened. A new chapter has started, This has happened very recently and we have to be happy about it because Russia has been a very important factor in our economic programme. That importance we should never give up. There have been economists who think that we should go in for alternative markets. This Government will not give up the established, traditional markets that it has got. We will continue. We will bring them even closer and I am glad to say that



[Sh. P.V. Narsimha Rav]

President Yeltsin was much more forthcoming than what we expected because, before that, at the official level, things were not moving. They were not rely on the same wave length, but at the submits level, when he came here, I am glad to say that all these cobwebs have been removed. So also have been the visits of other countries which only means that the Agenda has changed. We will have to go ahead with the original Agenda and there should be no hesitation on this, no looking back on this. (*Interruptions*).....

Sir, the other question raise by the hon. Members would have to be dealt with in the other debates that are coming. So, I have placed before the House the main thrust on the political side on the side of the nation's secular credentials being saved, on the nation's survival, and on the other side the most important aspect, on the economic side. Only these two, I have placed before the House. The other matters will come in their own good time during the other debates. So, I have done it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, kindly allow me. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the hon. Members had an opportunity to discuss these matters not for 12 hours, which were allotted, but of 17 hours. I am allowing one or two Members and not more than that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a very important speech coming from the head of the Government. We have raised the important issues. We expected that the hon. Prime Minister would deal with them, with most of them, at least. But passing the buck on to Shri Manmohan Singh and to Shri Jafar Sharief will not solve the problem. There are some very basic issues. I must say that I welcome today's forthright statement on the question of communalism. It is a better late than never. He has become wise after the tragic events. I welcome that statement. I only hope that it will be translated into action. There is noth-

ing but interalia in their party. Nobody is doing anything except coming with some statements. But there are some very basic issues. I am sure, the hon. Prime Minister would respond. Probably Shri Kumaramangalam has misled him; he has not given him the information. What about Tripura? The House, for two or three days, could not function. We were assured that some statement will come about Tripura.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, Sir, About Tripura, Somnath ji had no time to find out from outside because nothing is happening in the House!

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Yes, I give priority to the House.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes, very good. I am trying to supply you the information from outside. In Tripura, the care-taker Government has resigned. And evidently, the President's Rule is going to come. (*Interruptions*). President's Rule is going to come. We have recommended to the President. The decision, of course, is his. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I am thankful. I find these are delayed good senses. One or two things are there. Kindly clarify about the position of the riot victims and their families of those who died during the recent riots. A large number of people died during the most unfortunate riots which took place in this country. Not even one word you have spoken on that. People have been driven away from Bombay.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: They are returning.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: People who have been driven away from Bombay are belonging to the majority community. That is the brilliant performance of the Shiv Shena and the BJP. We have been demanding that Article 138 (2) should have

been taken recourse to for the purpose of resolving all the outstanding questions on the Ayodhya issue. Why have you kept things alive? Only one issue will be decided there. That will mean that you are keeping the question of Ayodhya alive to be agitated and cogitated. Some people, whom you know, are mixing politics with religion for their own ends. Now, you are giving them the handle to do that. The hon. Prime Minister has not said anything. On Dunkel, when the whole country is agitated, the House is agitated, he should have spoken. Mr. Prime Minister, you have not spoken about the principle of self-reliance of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Somnath Chatterjee, we are going to discuss the economic matters.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He said about the dilemma in the Fertilizer industry. But connected with this is the indigenous industries' survival. He should have said about it.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have already told you, I have already dealt with that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We have raised another very vital issue, that is, about the Centre-State relations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prime Minister, you should have said something.

[*English*]

On very vital issues, you have kept quiet.

[*Translation*]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: If you

have brought it in writing then please read it out thoroughly. Many questions have already been answered. Even if you want to read, then please read it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What would you read?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I want a clarification from the Hon. Prime Minister when Mizoram issues has raised here, the hon. Prime Minister had said that it was written in the Congress Manifesto that we wanted to make Mizoram a christian state... That was not condemned either at party level or at any other level. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had paid a visit to Mozoram after that elections. I had studied that manifesto and the entire situation there. I had put that manifesto before the people of Delhi. I had challenged congress party at that in and asked it why it had made such a statement but I have never received any response. Now that the Prime Minister has raised the issue, I want that the Prime Minister may condemn it with the proof.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: What is the proof in this? The same day Mr. Rajeev Gandhi had said that we disassociated with it. This is wrong. This has nothing to do with the All India Congress. Our Party President had said.. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): After the elections.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We had said so at the time of election itself.... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Without my permission, nothing will go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): We had made one point about referring the Ayodhya matter to the Supreme Court under Article 138 (2). You have not given any reply to that. That will be binding on everybody. That is very important. (Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I really refer to this one point? I thought it was not necessary. But since it has been raised so persistently, I better really come out with my reply. It is true that when the BJP Government was in U.P., we wanted the BJP Government to agree to Article 138(2). It makes sense because when the State Government and the Central Government agree which is necessary under Article 138(2), there will be no problem at all, both will agree that the courts will finally decide the matter and everybody would be happy. There will be nothing meanwhile to agitate about. That is the central point, the centre-piece of the entire thing. But now when the U.P. Government does not agree, did not agree, what were we left with? And in the case of agreement from the U.P. Government, the time frame did not matter - whether it took ten years or twenty years, the normal litigation would go on. We would come back with the national agenda. We will forget about Ayodhya because someone else is looking into it. That was the idea. It was not with any evil intention against the BJP or anything. We only wanted this, the matter should be finally decided. Everything should be finally decided. And for that we need the consent of both. If we do not get the consent of both, it will be a one way affair. If they do not agree to Article 138(2), they will be still in the streets agitating. We will be facing an agitation year after year, month after month, day after day. And what is the situation we are getting into. We do not want to get into that situation. Either we want both to agree even today. Today, Sir, I am giving this open offer. We have gone under Article 143. We are again prepared to go under Article 138 if the BJP agrees that they will abide by that. This is what I am saying. (Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : How does the

BJP come in?

(Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Please wait. (Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: You forget about them. (Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Please sit down. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

Shahbuddin ji, please sit down. I have a separate reply for you. (Interruptions)

[English]

Please sit down. Please understand. Please appreciate what I am saying.

To me, Sir, it is not the Central Government and the State Government that matters because, the State Government is also mine today. I am agreeing with myself and people will laugh at 138, if I take recourse to that (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: No.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Have you consulted with other parties?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have consulted everybody. (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): From this we understand that the veto is not with the Prime Minister. The veto lies with Shri Advani and not with the Prime Minister. We understand this now. (Interruptions).

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The time frame which I am talking about... (Interruptions); Shri Ahamed, please sit down.

Sir, I am absolutely clear in my mind that I do not want this matter to be pending for the next 20 years, leading to agitations. I want it to be settled; within the next few

months, it has to be settled. It can be done only under 143 and not under 138. It has to be settled. I want to settle it one way or the other. It has to be settled. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, the Prime Minister said that even now he is agreeable.. Therefore, the reason which he has given, is no reason at all. The country demands that 138(2) should be taken recourse to.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The country does not demand that. To me the concerned parties are not the Central Government and the State Government. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Prime Minister, please do not compromise. Please do not show any weakness on this. You have to be firm on 138(2) . You must finish all this for ever.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am absolutely firm on this. In the next six months or eight months, the opinion of the Supreme Court will come. It will be implemented in spirit and letter. And, no one in this country will be able to oppose it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, what will be the effect of its finding? It is a very serious matter.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Nitish Kumar, you may speak after Shri Ram Naik. (*Interruptions*) We have discussed this matter for a pretty long time. We have the opportunity to discuss certain other matters, when we discuss the Budget and the Demands. I have given you the opportunity to be very brief and succinct. I would request hon. Prime Minister to reply to all the questions together so that we can avoid all this.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: They are not asking any other questions.

SHRI RAM NAIK: During the last year's discussion on Appropriation Bill, we have

made a demand that for each Lok Sabha constituency, a fund of Rs. 2 crore should be allocated.

MR. SPEAKER: This can be raised during the Budget discussion.

SHRI RAM NAIK: This issue was raised by Shri Anna Joshi, today in the Parliament and Prime Minister was here. At that time, he did not reply to that.

MR. SPEAKER: At the time of Budget discussion, it can be discussed. Now, Shri Nitish Kumar.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: The reply given by the Hon. Prime Minister just now state that until and unless the Bhartiya Janata Party agreed on this issue, he was not in a position to refer the Ayodhya issue to the Supreme court under Article 138(2) . It means the attitude of the Union Government is still not clear on the Ayodhya issue and on this issue it is taking full support of those powers who demolished the mosque. The second point is that in its judgement delivered on the 16th November the Supreme Court clearly declared the notification of V.P.Singh Government about the Mandal Commission recommendations valid. After this date there should have 27 per cent reservation for the candidates of other backward classes in the Central Government services but ignoring it this time too the U.P.S.C. has deprived the candidates of other backward classes from this facility and in this regard the Hon. Prime Minister has not said anything clearly. We are not satisfied with the reply of the Hon. Prime Minister.....(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I want this to go on record. I am of the firm view that any reference under 138(2) without proper consent would mean twenty years of further

[Sh. P.V. Narsimha Rav]

litigation and agitation in the country. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This is most unsatisfactory. We cannot accept this and in protest we are walking out.

16.35 1/2 hrs.

*At this stage, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and some other hon. Members left the House.*

SHRI P. G. NARAYANAN (Gobichettipalayam): The Prime Minister's reply is not satisfactory. He failed to settle the Ayodhya issue permanently. So, on behalf of AIADMK we are walking out.

16.36 hrs

*At this stage, Shri P.G.Narayanan and some other hon. Members left the House.*

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps the Hon. Prime Minister must remember that when there was a dialogue between the Hon. Prime Minister and me on 18th November, we had discussed the same issue on which today, several hon. Members of the opposition left the House expressing their displeasure at the statement made by the Hon. Prime Minister. The irony is that at that time I was saying him that he is fully authorised to refer this issue to the Supreme Court under Article 143, while the hon. Prime Minister was explaining to me that to refer this issue under Article 143 is meaningless. If the Government of Uttar Pradesh gives its consent to refer this issue under Article 138, then it has some meaning otherwise not. I rise here to ask from the Hon. Prime Minister whether all the constitution experts of the country agreeable to the Ayodhya issue or not but almost all of them have said that the Union Government has no right to dismiss the Government of Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh using Article

356. Even it has no moral right to do so.....*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to say anything but the resonance of the statement of the Hon. Prime Minister reminds me the situation of 1975, when it appeared that the Government would not remain in power under the law of this country.....*(Interruptions)*

Therefore, I would like to ask the Government whether it has decided to extend the President's rule for further 6 months, after completion of 6 months or it is ready to assure us that whatever right or wrong has happened at that time but the Government will arrange to form Government again in these four States within six months where there is no elected Government and elected representatives at present. Is the Hon. Prime Minister ready to assure it.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The decision will be taken after consulting Governors.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: And the Governor will consult you as to what report should they give, as they had done so earlier.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: You know, there is nothing like this.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Prime Minister I hope you would say boldly that whatever the Government has done at that time, was the need of the hour but it will hold elections within 6 months. It will be a right decision for all, for you, for the Government and for the political health of the country and for all these four States. In this regard, I would like to have an assurance from you. I regret that the Hon. Prime Minister is taking support of Governors.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not taking support of Governors. Whenever any step is taken, it has been taken on the recommendation of Governors. The Government has done nothing except that. But it is not proper to give assurance in the House that I will do this or that or I will not do

this or that.

SHRILAL K. ADVANI: I am not satisfied with it and we are walking out.

16.41 hrs.

*At this stage, Shri Lal K. Advani and some other hon. Members left the House*

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Sahasra): Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to know from the Hon. Prime Minister whether he would like to refer the disputed site at Ayodhya under Article 138 for eliciting opinion or not? As the Hon. Prime Minister has said just now in clear terms that he would take any decision only after consultation with the B.J.P. Disputed land should be referred under Article 143. It should be decided as early as possible. Secondly, I would like to know whether Government would like to take into account the Dunkel Proposals in view of the recent farmers' rally in the country since the farmers are quite confused over Dunkel Proposals in view of the recent confused over Proposals and since there has not been any discussion on Dunkel proposals? Will you like to discuss it?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would like to say that we would ensure that Indian farmer may not suffer on account of Dunkel proposals.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: A number of amendments have been moved by the hon. Members to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Shall I put all the amendments to the vote of the House together or any hon. Member wants any particular amendment to be put separately?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, you may put them together.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put all the amendments together to the vote of the House.

*All the Amendments were put and negated.*

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the main motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:-

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 22nd February, 1993."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up Item No.7 of today's agenda, Statutory Resolution: Shri Nitish Kumar.

16.45 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF NATIONAL THERMAL POWER CORPORATION LIMITED, THE NATIONAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION LIMITED AND THE NORTH-EASTERN ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION LIMITED (ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF POWER TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS) ORDINANCE,

AND

NATIONAL THERMAL POWER CORPORATION LIMITED, THE NATIONAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION LIMITED AND THE NORTH EASTERN ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION LIMITED (ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF POWER TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS) BILL

[English]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House dis... the