

[Sh. Abdul Gafoor]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to speak on various things today. But I am going to leave all of them and going to sit down. I would like to point out that the speeches of the speakers who spoke here, were different, some of them spoke out of anger, some out of compulsion, some spoke from a political point of view, but I would like to request you very humbly to leave aside all these things. You are like my elder brother. I submit to you with folded hands that I am not in anger because neither you have no doubt, about me, nor they have. Nobody has any doubts about me. Neither the C.P.I., the C.P.M. nor the Forward Block has any doubt about me. This is very common in the family also that brothers quarrel with each other. I was the youngest of all my abrothers. We used to quarrel but being the youngest I used to win because of elder brothers liberal attitude. Today, I as a younger brother, am requesting you to adopt a kind attitude towards us. We are your younger brothers. If you do not want to adopt a liberal attitude towards the country, you should adopt this attitude at least towards us. If we are treated with generosity the country too will get the benefit of it ultimately. Every Muslim, whosoever goes to offer his prayer in this world, does certainly utter a sentence 'Al Hamdu Lilahee Rabbil Aal Meen'. Without this sentence the *namez* is not complete. It means that God is the sole master of the world and everything is the grace of that Almighty (Allah). It means that Allah is one for all, whether it is America or Japan or Iran or U.K. or Turkey or Pakistan or Saudi Arabia. But we are all afraid of I.M.F. and World Bank, because they are playing the role of God and a number of countries are compelled to accept them as God. "Al Hamdu Leelahee Rabbil Muslmen" are not the exact words written in the Kuran. Instead the words are 'Rabbul Almeen'. It means God is praiseworthy and he is the sole protector of the world. In Kuran the word 'Muslmeen' has not been written but the word is 'rabbul almeen' which means God is not only for the Muslims but he is for every human being. Thus, if God is one, why there should be any quarrel between us. We used to speak out of fun that Shri Khurana was the future Chief Minister of Delhi. (Interruptions)

We can demolish this very building. If Shri Vajpayee wishes, he can set it ablaze. If you wish, you too can set it on fire, and if they want to rebuild it, they can do it easily. But Shri Vajpayeeji strangles me to death, is it possible for him to bring me back to life? Not at all. Therefore, you should not commit any act that you cannot in do. You can do all other things whatever you want. You may cause a train accident, but you should not kill anyone. Once again I would like to say that you should not indulge in such things as may divide the nation and the society. You yourself mentioned the other day that 10 or 11 persons had set out to kill Shri Advani and others. Do you think that somebody has formed some society to kill Advaniji and others; certainly not, nobody can form any such society. The society is formed of its own. Today, I know that some hon. Ministers have black cats, or black-dogs, or Alsatian dogs. But I have not kept even a rat in my life for my own security because I have no fear of anybody. (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I consider Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as the present leader of B.J.P. and I understand his difficulties but my other colleagues do not accept it. I request him to desert those persons who have prejudiced feelings and fanatic ideas. He may fight with Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, Shri Arjun Singh, Shri Sharad Pawar and take on them properly. I would like to request him kindly to spare us because we are very weak but none is going to accept our request. In those circumstances when everybody is adamant on his stand, then where should we go? Today, I once again request you humbly to spare us.

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Speaker Sir, I am indeed grateful to the large number of hon. Members who have participated in this discussion and made valuable contributions. The debate has rightly been exhaustive and many Members were able to express themselves with anguish, with anger, with reason and with so much of patriotism that this debate, perhaps, will go down as one of the debates of a highest order in history of Parliament.

I once again express my gratitude to them. The occasion itself is one of introspection, seriousness, gravity and perhaps, an occasion where each one of us has to set our sights on the vision of the future.

This country has been a great country, it has risen to great heights, it has seen aberrations but from every aberration it has come out stronger and not weaker. I do hope that this great tragedy, this act of betrayal and vandalism which occurred on the 6th of December will be obliterated as quickly as possible from the public mind. I wish to God that this happens. Even the slightest remnant of the memory of this would be harmful to the country and I would appeal to all sections of the people, all sections of the House to help in this process, the process of living down this shameful event of the 6th December and prove to the world once again that this is just an aberration, otherwise the country is one full of harmony, full of brotherhood and this has been so for thousands of years; it will be so for thousands of years to come.

It is rather strange, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that this discussion should come in the form of a No-Confidence Motion. The Bharatiya Janata Party has no confidence in the Government of India. Why? Because the Government of India reposed confidence in the State Government of the Bharatiya Janata Party. May be, this is good justice meted out to the Government of India. I have to own that. I have to admit that. But how do we run the country, How do Centre-State relations run? On the basis of suspicion? On the basis of mistrust? How do we run the Governments of the States which are so inextricably linked with the Centre, that they have to be running a three-legged race all the time? One of them cannot run in advance, leaving the other behind.

In the National Development Council, in the National Integration Council, in the Chief Ministers' Conference, we have seen that every problem is so intractable if seen in isolation but becomes easy when seen comprehensively with the States and the Centre both Governments sitting together

and trying to sort it out. During the last one and a half years the National Development Council has been functioning this way. Several sub-committees of the Council headed by Chief Ministers of whichever party, have been constituted and they have been doing excellent work. There has been no dissension of any kind and the National Development Council on the whole has acquitted itself admirable as a result of this functioning. This is how a federal State has to function.

But is it possible, is it conceivable for the Central Government of any federation to even imagine that one of the units, a State Government, would keep giving affidavit after affidavit after affidavit, giving solemn assurances, and finally violate those assurances in a manner that until the last moment it cannot be detected? That is why my first reaction was that for all appearances it was pre-planned. There is going to be an enquiry. I would not like to anticipate there results or the findings of the enquiry. But it was so planned, it cannot be an accident, it just cannot be an accident.

Sir, I have been arraigned, I have been criticised for believing. That is the only sin I seem to have committed. I agree. I plead guilty for believing a State Government. I have no explanation on that. But the point is that I believed it not only as Central Government; I found that there was nothing else but to believe the assurance of the State Government. Was there any other way when the Supreme Court believes it? The Supreme Court hearing after hearing places more reliance on the State Government; asked the State Government to come back with more affidavits; asked me at some point of time to keep out because they would like to try the State Government. They have full faith in the State Government. I am not party. The Central Government is not a party before the Supreme Court nor in the High Court for that matter. But I was called for a particular purpose. We said: "We are prepared to help the Supreme Court in whatever manner the Supreme Court wants us." That was all the role we played. And ultimately on the 6th itself, the Supreme Court had been shocked,

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

what they said is revealing. I do not remember any State Government in a federal set up having behaved this way. So, those who told me and tell me now, did we not tell you? Yes, they have been proved right. But I was proved right in July. So, it is not a question of who is proved right. The question is what has happened to the Constitution of India in this process. It lies shattered. What happens to Article 356? It lies shattered. I would like constitutional experts to go into it. Where is it that the President of the Union finds that a situation has arisen whereby the governance of the State cannot be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution. What is that precise Point? We have dismissed State Governments times without number. Most of the State Governments dismissed or removed have been Congress Governments belonging to the same party at the Central Government. It was easy to tender the chief minister's resignation. We send advisers from here and the State Government gets President's Rule. In those few cases, where other Governments were also dismissed; similar procedure not quite beginning with the resignation, but some other procedure was followed. But in no case was the practical implication of Article 356 tested. You send the advisers. They take over at leisure any time, maybe one day late, maybe one day early. But here in the Ayodhya Matter, I cannot do a thing without dismissing the State Government. I send my troops, paramilitary forces. I sent them because I wanted them to be available to the State Government. At no point of time do the State Government tell me that they will not use them. Yet they do not use them. I have yet to come across a scrap of paper from Shri Kalyan Singhji to say that he refuses to use the Paramilitary forces sent by the Centre. The Home Minister will bear me out. But, he has not used them. Ultimately, on the last day, when we say please use them, please use them, please use them, the Home Secretary who is sitting with the Chief Minister says - it is so unfortunate - Unthinkable and unfortunate.

*At 2.20 P.M. DG, ITBP informed M.H.A. that three battalions which had moved

from DRC had met resistance and obstructions en route, there were a lot of road blocks and people stopped vehicles. After talking to the people en route, the convoy reached with great difficulty at Saket Degree college where the forces were again stopped and the road was blocked. Minor pelting of stones also took place. The Magistrate asked them in writing to return. DG, ITP further informed that three battalions had returned accordingly. the Commissioner had been contacted, who informed, the Chief Minister, Uttar Pradesh had ordered that there will be no firing under any circumstances."

(Interruptions). Earlier, the Home Secretary spoke to Principal Secretary, Home, Government of Uttar Pradesh at Chief Minister's residence asking him to persuade the Chief Minister to accept the assistance of the Central forces. The Principal Secretary, Home, Government of Uttar Pradesh said that he would requisition central forces after consulting the Chief Minister. At no point of time was it refused? This is what I am trying to impress. When does that moment arise when we come to the conclusion that the governance of the State cannot be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution? So, these are some of the difficulties. If only one word had been there, in Article 356 which says, " a situation has arisen if after that it could have been added - is likely to arise." Then the Governor gets, the President gets a greater leeway. But, then, one has to go into greater detail. This is the first time in the history of the Constitution, in the history of Article 356 when it has been put to a time based test, it was never put to before and it has not been able to stand the test. Never mind who used it, never mind who did not use it, howsoever you look at it you will find that there is a lacuna and that would have to be made good.

On one side these are the reasons why I have to trust the State Government (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack) Did you receive any IB Report or not?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is no variance between the IB report and what I have read. The, three days before the date, the Governor of Uttar Pradesh writes in categorical terms, that the Central Government should not, I repeat, should not, think of imposing President's rule in the State. He also adds that if any such thing is contemplated, the safety of the Babri mosque can become questionable. I have got the letter. All these factors are on one side which stop me from invoking article 356. On the other side is, of course, the private advice tendered by more supposedly knowledgeable persons.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): He is quoting Article 356. Is it not under Article 356 that if the Government of India is convinced without the report of the Governor and without the report of the State Government that the Constitution is not being implemented there, they can take action? And action has been taken even without the Governor's report, on the information that the Government of India collected.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I agree Chandra Shakhari. I am only trying to list out the circumstances under which the Government of the State could not be conducted. That is all I have said. On the other hand, as I said, was the advice that these people might let us down, and some statements here and there, not from the Government but from some leaders, saying that they would not do *kar seva* only by sweeping. These were the other things. I say in all sincerity that the Government had to weigh the evidence on both sides and we came to the conclusion that it was not possible to impose President's rule, in the face of all this, at the time at which it would have been of some use. And I would also like to add - I do not know whether I should say this - that the situation in Ayodhya was such that one had to be very careful, extremely careful. The Babri Masjid - that structure - was a hostage. On one side was the possibility of its being saved by negotiation, by further commitment of the State Government, on the other side, you had absolutely no lead time to save it by the central forces in spite of

the State Govt. It is not only with *kudals* and these things, as were used on that day. It could have been blown up in a matter of minutes, seconds, by one bomb the size of a tennis ball, detonated from two hundred years, if the State Government connived at it. There were the real possibilities. This is like the mother stabbing the child, the mother poisoning the child. You do not expect it to happen but when it does happen, no one can save it. This is my case... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): What about previous experiences?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I say. In July I succeeded. You all heard me, heard my statement here in this House. We discussed it. It worked. I was taking the same line... (*Interruptions*). Please. I was taking the same line which I had elaborated in my statement. We had the Cell. We got the discussions going. Two meetings were held in a very good atmosphere. The third meeting was to clinch the issue of reference to the Supreme Court. It was at that point that a spanner was thrown in the works and the whole thing came back to square one. This is the situation. History will judge, people will judge. I am not really being dogmatic about it. Some of my own party people had different views. I told the party that it is possible for Congressmen to have different views. Who is proved right, who is proved wrong, is not the question. You take a decision, you stick to it, you defend it. If you win, you win, if you do not win, you do not win..... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANTAH PRATAP SINGH (Fatehpur): With you permission. Sir, the hon. Prime Minister's full case is that he totally trusted the BJP Government, the U.P. Government, and he had no reason to mistrust it. And because he trusted fully, therefore, this tragedy took place. May I remind the hon. Prime Minister that we had put a question that if Kalyan Singh suddenly resigns, how will he manage the situation. He did say: We have alternative programmes and within minutes we can get into action and manage the situation. That means that it was = and prudently so - as any administrator

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

should do to have alternative plans and also not mere trust. We were given to understand that there are alternative plans; if Shri Kalyan Singh resigns, the alternative plans are there and within minutes the things can be managed. The whole scenario, as it developed, was described here. May I know where has that alternative plan gone? What happened to that alternative plan that, if Shri Kalyan Singh at the last moment resigns, you will put into action?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHARAO: Sir, when Shri Kalyan Singh resigned, it was too late to do anything. He timed it like that. In fact our information had been that the BJP very much wanted to save its States Govts. Resignation route was not expected. But when it happened contrary to our information, nothing could be done then except to dismiss the Government which was done.

What I am really trying to impress on the House is let us not go into who is right and who is wrong information wise. I have borne all the criticism from friends and from other parties. I am only trying to place some known facts. In spite of these facts there had been a betrayal. A betrayal is something which is never detected. A conspiracy is something which comes to light much later, when only hindsight functions. Indiraji would not have been assassinated Rajivji would not have been assassinated if the knowledge about the conspiracy had been available earlier. This is one of those mishaps the way it has happened. Nobody can say that he is impeccably right. No plan can be absolutely, hundered per cent foolproof. You get everything but you do not get magistrates. Is it possible? I would like to ask where do you take magistrates from? If the State Government does not give you 20 magistrates who are needed, do you take magistrates from Delhi? Is it possible legally? Can any legal luminary tell me?

Therefore, if you go into the details, here are many factors. There is a Commission of Inquiry which will go into

there, I am only placing before you some rudimentary facts which need to be taken into account.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, one small question to the hon. Prime Minister. Is it not a fact that the news that the demolition work on the mosque structure having begun reached you, reached the Government of India by Twelve noon? If so, why the Cabinet meeting was not called till Six O' clock in the evening to decide what to do?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The first impulse of anyone who gets a report like this is to see that we save the mosque first. We ask them to make use of the forces; we go on pleading with them; we go on asking them to do it. This is all that could be done at that stage. (*Interruptions*) *

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the logic of what happened on the sixth of December...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, How long did the Government of India continue to have faith in the Uttar Pradesh Government? Was it till Eight O' Clock in the evening or till Nine O' clock in the evening, when by this time the demolition work had gone on? Therefore, what we have been most anxious to find out from the hon. Prime Minister is that realising that the betrayal had started, that he has been betrayed, how long did he continue to have trust in him. This is what is worrying us.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: By 9.10 p.m. the President had signed the papers. By 7.30 p.m. or so, Shri S.B. Chavan took the papers to him. Those are the timings if I remember right. (*Interruptions*)

The inexorable logic of 6th December has started... in right earnest, started within whatever time is necessary to take action. Action after action after action has been taken. Yes, this is a change in direction

because it was warranted by the worst tragedy we could imagine and the now direction has been accepted, the challenge has been accepted, the battle has been joined. There is no need for us to go into history now. The need for us is to make new history and that is that for the first time after many many years the secular forces of the country have come together, the secular parties with all their internal differences have come together. I feel that at this is time(Interruptions)

And we will forge ahead, we will see that the secular credentials of this country are re-established fully and what our great leaders through the constitution and through their own example told us to do, we will do it to the hilt.

Sir, Mr. Indra Jit has raised a very relevant point. In fact, I was going to read the same Resolution which he read from the Constituent Assembly, I had occasion to raise this in one of our Party meetings. In a secular democracy, what is the place of non-secular parties or what should be the composition and the programme of parties participating in that democracy, is a question which needs a national debate. I want this debate, I want thinkers, I want leaders to come together because the time has come when we can easily see that there is an irreconcilability in these forces. We tried to carry on for many many years. Now we find that there is a Party which takes a religious issues as its main plank. I have nothing against a religious issue, I have nothing against religion, but a religious issue being brought into politics election after election after election cannot be accepted. This will have to be looked into and this will have to be effectively checked. If there is a party which takes to arms, for instance, if the candidate of one party has an AK-47 and moves with it and the other candidate has nothing, it is an unequal fight. If a party takes Ram as the spokesman of the party and affects the minds and hearts of people day in and day out, whereas the other party does not even utter this because it is a secular party, does not want to make use of that as an issue, then it is again an unequal fight and the Constitution does not, in my view, allow such unequal

fight. The field has to be even for both teams, those who are participating in the elections would have to participate on the basis of certain guidelines, certain principles which are common to all and which are defined very clearly in the Constitution. This will have to be looked into. This is fair to both of us. Let Ram remain where he remains, let us fight on the basis of other issues which are much more important from the point of view of the people and that is the only way of making the constitution work in its right spirit. I appeal to the other parties who are thinking perhaps that religious issues are going to be a permanent asset to them, they will not be a permanent asset to them. The people of India can see through game very easily and very quickly; may be in one election or in the other election, the next election, they will see through it and perhaps you will be wasting five years for doing nothing except raising unnecessary slogans. So, I would like this to be gone into. I thank Mr. Inder Jit, for having brought out that resolution. We will have to act on it; we will have to think about it. I will come, if possible to the House or to the leaders of the Opposition first, all leaders and perhaps for a general debate, a wider debate in the country, of how this aberration which has become rather menacing during the decade has to be set right. It started with small beginnings, but then it has permeated, more or less, every party. Today, when I say that something which has happened will have to be undone, there are eye-brows going up in all parties. I do not want this at all to happen in any party. If we are secular, the vandal cannot be allowed to take advantage of the act of vandalism committed by him. It is quite clear to me. Everything is there for discussion. We will discuss all these things, find ways, as we were about to find the way, we will find a way once again. I assure that to all of you. I would like to once again appeal that today, the day of balancing pluses and minuses is over, we will have to go ahead with a programme.

So far as rehabilitation and reconstruction measures are concerned, I thought I should apprise the House of what has been decided. The Government of India have advised the State Governments to take

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

strong action against officers who have been derelict in their duties in maintenance of law and order during the recent communal riots. At Present, the scale of *ex gratia* assistance to victims of communal riots differs from State to State. The Government of India will see to it that assistance to riot victims is given on a uniform scale by all the State Governments so that next of kin of persons killed in riots could be paid Rs. One lakh and those who are permanently incapacitated are paid Rs. 50,000/- each. For this particular incident, I would like to add that as a one time exception, we would like to raise this amount to Rs. Two lakhs in case of death.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): The Uttar Pradesh Government is paying only Rs. 50,000/-.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will talk to the Uttar Pradesh Government; between them and us we will see that it is paid.

[Translation]

SHRIMOHRAN RAWLE (Bombay-South Central): Does the Government propose to pay any compensation to the next of the kins of the police personnel, who were killed during these incidents?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: A fund will be set up for repair and reconstruction of all places of worship which were damaged in the disturbances. In addition to the *ex gratia* relief in the case of death, grievously hurt or damage to the property, the Government of India will recommend to the State Governments that the victims of recent communal riots may also be given the following assistance; employment to widows or wards of the families affected by the communal riots where in earning member of the family had been killed or permanently incapacitated, allotment of tenements and house sites to families rendered houseless, allotment of shops/space for kiosks to families to restart their business and bank loans for

capital investment as also working capital for recommencement of industries and businesses affected in the riots. Similar measures will also be taken in the Union Territories. These are the steps that have been decided upon.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: What about the payment of wages to the workers during the period of curfew? This also should be taken into account.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, some of these suggestions have come from the hon. Members. If more suggestions come and we find them feasible, we will go into them. I have done. (Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: After the imposition of President's rule, the compensation has not increased. He has not replied that (Interruptions) *

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): The Prime Minister told day before yesterday and assured the House to give a White Paper on Ayodhya issue. That has not been submitted, about the reconstruction of that structure, you have not said anything today. What is your response about, Reconstruction?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The Supreme Court have asked the Government of India to submit its views on this particular subject within a time-frame which they have fixed. We would like to examine all aspects of this and go to the Supreme Court and make our submissions. I would like to tell the hon. Members that this is being looked into. (Interruptions)

SHRI INDER JIT: (Darjeeling): The cause of mediamen who have suffered has not been referred to.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, there is a specific term of reference in the terms of reference of the Commission of Inquiry in regard to what happened to media persons.

We have meanwhile decided to give those whose equipments etc., were damaged, certain concessions which were asked by them. So, the Commission of Inquiry will go in great detail into what happened to the media persons.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Are you including the lapse of the Central Government in the terms of reference? That should be there. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Shri Vajpayee.

*(Interruptions).**

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record.

*(Interruptions).**

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I could not hear the speeches of all the hon. members and could not remain present here, but I have tried to go through the speeches delivered by them.

I regret that the discussion has not taken place in tune with the feelings expressed by me while initiating the debate. Allegations and counter allegations were levelled against one another in the House and it will continue also. It is easy to accuse but difficult to make introspection. Had the interpretation of the incidents of 6th December been so easy, as some of my friends sitting here have tried to do, it would have altogether been a different thing. I am looking for Shri Rajesh Pilot. One after the other hon. Ministers seemed to be eager to show their loyalty and commitment to the hon. Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)* They were Members of the Council of Ministers and were a party to the decisions taken. *(Interruptions)* I have no objection to it, but am I not entitled to make comments?

Now I would like to raise a minor issue where after I would come to serious ones.

That day Shri Rajesh Pilot got up and said that the structure had been demolished in Ayodhya and the people who demolished it had been imparted military training. A camp had been set up in Sarkhej near Ahmedabad to impart training. He also mentioned the name of a Brigadier. Of course, you have not allowed the name to go on record... *(Interruptions)* It appeared in the newspapers the next day that there must have been a conspiracy behind the demolition. It would have been a conspiracy by those people who had received training and the training was imparted by a Military Officer. Shri Pilot should have found out the truth. There is an institute in Sarkhej which imparts training in internal security and the Brigadier is associated with the Congress Party. He had been appointed by the Congress Chief Minister to a post. He has issued a statement. He has been appointed as the Chairman of Water Pollution Board. I am not making any criticism. He was imparting training there. Training on rifle shooting and Judo are being provided in the camp. There is nothing objectionable in it. I am making any allegation against neither the Brigadier nor the Congress Chief Minister. He should have found out the facts. After all he is the Minister of Communications. Cannot he not communicate properly.... *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Atal ji, even today, you are not prepared to accept that it was pre-planned *(Interruptions)* Please say from your inner conscience whether it was pre-planned or not. Even today I am ready to accept... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Pilot had made this allegation in the House. At that time hon. Members from this side had voiced their protest that Shri Pilot should resign if this allegation is proved wrong. He is a friend of mine. So I am not demanding his resignation. But I would like to register my complaint against creating such a turmoil in the House.