

[Sh. Rajmangal Pande]

ment (Department of Education) Resolution No. F. 1-2/90. PN (D.II), dated 19th October, 1990. Read with item No. 5 (i) of the Annexure thereto, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from amongst themselves to serve as members of the Central Advisory Board of Education, subject to the other provisions of the said Resolution." (*Interruptions*).

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, position this Government has become very ridiculous. Please Call the Prime Minister. We have heard that he has resigned. He has to give a statement also. (*Interruptions*).

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That in pursuance of para 5 of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (Department of Education) Resolution No. F. 1-2/90. PN (D.II), dated 19th October, 1990. Read with item No. 5 (i) of the Annexure thereto, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from amongst themselves to serve as members of the Central Advisory Board of Education, subject to the other provisions of the said Resolution."

The motion was adopted

MR. SPEAKER: Calling Attention—Shri Saifuddin Choudhury. Is he there?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, there was item 5. It was a Statement by the Prime Minister. Why the Statement is not made?

MR. SPEAKER: It is scheduled at 12.30.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, when the entire timing is changed, accordingly the time table gets changed. For instance, if the item was over earlier, in that case the Statement would have been left out. So, it is customary that though that is the time that is prescribed, that does not mean it cannot be made earlier. I think the Prime Minister's Secretariat must acquaint with the process of agenda in the House and inform him stating, 'you need not wait till 12 o'Clock, your time has come.' Therefore, he must make a Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Yashwant Sinha.

Now, Matters under Rule 377.

(*Interruptions*)

11:20 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*CONTD.*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up further discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

Shri Atinder Pal Singh.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. The

item no. 8 is Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) and Shri Yashwant Sinha is to present a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not there.

SHRI RAM NAIK: He might not be there. But any Minister can do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Since no Minister is for the coming, I am moving to the next item.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, it is important item. We can understand the Prime Minister not authorising the Deputy Prime Minister to make a statement, because they do not have proper relations. But, so far as item no. 8 is concerned, any Minister can do it.

MR. SPEAKER: I realise what you are saying.

[*Translation*]

But the question is what can be done, when the concerned Minister is not present and no other Minister is coming forward. I am taking note of your point.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I have already moved to the next item. Now, let us discuss on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, what is your ruling? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Speaker, Sir this

Government has to present the Demands for Supplementary Grants

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the fact that the business before the House is only the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address and all those parties who are still in the House have had their say, therefore under Rule 362, I move for closure of this discussion on the President's Address. If the House approves of this closure motion, then the consequences are that we should decide about its closure.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Sir, it cannot be allowed; it is under your discretion.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Rule 362 says: -

"At any time after a motion has been made, any Members may move; 'That the question be now put', and, unless it appears to the Speaker that the motion is an abuse of these rules or an infringement of the right of reasonable debate, the Speaker shall then put the motion 'That the question be now put'.

My submission is that under the present circumstances, the invocation of this rule is an abuse, because there are Members who are willing to participate in the debate and it is under your discretion. Therefore, my submission is, you please call the names of the Members who want to participate in the debate.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you on the same point, Mr. Chitta Basu?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Yes, Sir. Rule 362 is absolutely clear. It relates to your satisfaction whether this rule is being applied as an abuse or not.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You know very well that

[*English*]

there is no abuse.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Yes, there is no abuse here. The second condition is that it should not be an infringement on the right of reasonable debate.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): We are only waiting for an unreasonable reply.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Almost all have spoken.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Only four hours out of the twelve hours fixed for the debate on this subject have passed so far.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Therefore, there is no infringement on the right of the Members because almost all of them have already spoken and given their views. So far as "abuse" is concerned, there is no abuse and you can decide about it.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: All have not spoken. That is a wrong statement. I contest it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: There is no abuse and, therefore, it is within the order and we demand for the closure motion.

The last point is about the Business Advisory Committee which has fixed up a certain period of time for the debate on this subject. Now that time has not yet expired. I agree with it. But the Business Advisory Committee is not the supreme authority. It is the House which in exercise of its wisdom can reduce the time fixed by the Business Advisory Committee.

Therefore, I think, it is in the fitness of things, and you know the mood of the House itself—we demand that the time should be restricted and immediately we go in for voting of the Motion.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, your permission is being sought to move the closure motion. As it has already been brought out before the House, the closure motion is perfectly under your discretion to allow or not to allow. While allowing it, you have to consider whether it is or it is not an infringement on the right of Members to have reasonable debate. My submission is that a reasonable debate and adequate debate has not taken place. The hon. Member who has said that all the Members have spoken is totally wrong. I am sure you have a long list of speakers and I have been sitting here waiting for my chance to make my submissions. It is not merely the Government whom we are addressing. Through you, Sir, and standing here in this august House, it is the entire nation that is being addressed and is being told of the state of the nation.

In the first place, I request that under your discretion, you should not allow the

closure motion which will be an infringement of the reasonable debate.

Another point that I am making is that the Opposition—I am very sorry to say—is behaving in a very irresponsible manner. Mr. Speaker, during the Question Hour.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Through you, in the august House, we are addressing the nation as regards the state of the nation. Here is the Opposition who wants to shut us on the floor of the House from addressing the nation and telling the nation as to the state of the nation. That is an irresponsible behaviour of this Opposition. (Interruptions)

I am sure, you would not, therefore, succumb to this pressure. Therefore, you would not accept this particular motion, and allow us to tell the nation the state of the nation. Though the Government is tottering, the nation is strong enough to hold the democracy. We have to speak to the nation and here is the opportunity to speak to the nation. This opportunity is sought to be scuttled by irresponsible Opposition over here in this House.

I am have my various agreements and disagreements either with the Government or with the Opposition. But, my right and the right of this House and every one here to address the nation and telling the nation of the difficult times that are there in future would be denied. I request you, therefore, under your discretion which is allowed to you under the rules, to disallow and not to admit this closure motion. In case you admit, I will be constrained to oppose it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Can we ignore the reality of the situation today?

Even the hon. Finance Minister was not available to present the Supplementary Demands for Grants. Today the Prime Minister has very correctly admitted and on more than one occasion he has said that this Government would last so long as the Congress supports it. Quite right. That is the arithmetic of the matter and that is the politics he has chosen. To survive here, to remain as Prime Minister, he has to have the Congress-I support. Now we are in the midst of the President's Address. All the major parties have spoken. The Congress-I has also spoken. But, they are not here to field their other subsequent speakers. Those who have not spoken, they have no unlimited time. Probably, Shri G.M. Banatwalla has got three minutes.

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour): He has already exhausted that.

MR. SPEAKER: He has already spoken.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Unfortunately, you allow time. He is now infringing on your time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Let him speak for 20 minutes. I am conceding. But there has to be some limit to the debate. Yesterday it was said that until the time allocated by the Business Advisory Committee is exhausted, no closure motion can be moved even if there is no speaker available. How can it be? Therefore, if a conscious decision is taken to see the reality of the situation, what is the good of prolongation of an agony? The country must know it. We are also addressing the country. But, shall we sit here endlessly waiting for the good offices of the de facto Prime Minister of this country? How long can it happen? I am also requesting the Prime Minister to respond to this.

MR. SPEAKER: You are on a point of order, I think.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: No. This is the position. Therefore, there has not been any abuse of the rules or infringement of the right of the debate. This is an eminently reasonable motion that has been moved and it should be put to vote. Please admit it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, of course the matter is in your discretion and I would request you not to look at Rule 362 in a mechanical manner. For instance, you have raised the question that the time of 12 hours allotted to this debate has not been completed and, therefore, the debate can go on. I would like to put before you certain contradictions. Shri G.M. Banatwalla said that he has not spoken. Probably, one or two might not have spoken. But I would like to raise the question by way of point of order. Suppose, the Business Advisory Committee allots 12 hours. Almost all the speakers have completed their speeches. Two or three who are left out have also spoken and if the time of 12 hours is not completed, do you mean to say that we should wait for two or three days for that 12 hours to be completed and then allow the Prime Minister to reply? And, therefore, I can understand, one or two speakers might not have spoken. I do not know whether it is the contention of Shri Banatwalla that, because 12 hours are there and only he is left out, so 8 hours are there, he can claim 8 hours.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: I am opposing the motion at this juncture.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I do concede that point. He functions juncture by juncture. He changes his attitude also. I have no quarrel on that. At the next juncture, he may say "I am supporting the closure motion." He may come forward with that.

My contention is that please do not look at the rule in a mechanical way. If 12 hours are there and if one or two speakers are yet to speak, we will not mind. The Leader of the

Opposition will not mind if those speakers are given time. But, after that, do not insist that the 12 hours are to be completed and therefore the closure motion must not operate. Therefore, it is quite consistent with the rules and also it is a fact that since 12 hours are not completed, if one speaker is only left out, he might be allowed to speak. But only see that he doesn't take rest of the 8 hours and then the Prime Minister replies. That speech might be completed and after that the closure motion should be applied (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI K.C. TYAGI (Hapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my point is that if we are made to sit and listen to Mr. Banatwalla for eight hours the all of us would fall unconscious.

MR. SPEAKER: Your name is there in the list and I shall call you also, Mr. Kundu.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Samarendra Kundu, if you have got any fresh points, you can put forth them.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): The relevant clause to Rule 362 should be read with the totality of the situation that is obtaining now. It cannot be segregated from the totality of the situation. What is the totality of the situation. The totality of the situation is that the Government has no sanction behind it since the Congress (I) are not supporting it. I just pose the problem before you. You may have eight hours' debate. After that, if the Congress (I) do not come to the Government's support, then what a humiliation the country will suffer on this account? This is one issue. The reading in this context suggests.....

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kundu, please come to the point of order.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: I am coming to that. I will request Shri Banatwalla to withdraw the words "irresponsible opposition". Shri Opposition is very alert, very vibrant and to the point. The role of the Opposition is to expose and depose the Government. (*Interruptions*) Now, we are exposing the Government. Coming to this Rule 362 (1) it says:

"At any time after a motion has been made, any member may move: 'That the question be now put', and unless it appears to the Speaker that the motion is an abuse of these rules or an infringement of the right of reasonable debate, the Speaker shall then put the motion....."

What I say is that the motion is not an abuse of these rules. The motion is not an infringement of the right of reasonable debate. Is this motion an infringement of the reasonable debate? Now, the Government has no sanction behind it. What is a reasonable debate? As I have already said, the Government has no sanction behind it. At the moment, the Speaker should feel that the motion of closure is in order House has no consensus, then voting should be taken up. This is my submission. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Barhampore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition Shri L.K. Advani. Why? Because, you have already heard the position of ours. Here, the Government, from yesterday, is in a minority. In this context we will have to see whether the debate has become a reasonable debate, whether there is any infringement of the right of reasonable debate. Most of the speakers have spoken. I draw your attention to the relevant Rules in this regard i.e. from Rule 362 to Rule 365. The rule amply says that you can take the consensus

of the House whether the House is prepared to continue the debate on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address. Therefore, you can take the consensus of the House. You are quite competent to take that. After going through the reasonableness about the continuance of the debate, you may ascertain the opinion of the House. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: At least, I will call those who want to participate in the debate.

[*English*]

SHRINANI BHATTACHARYA: It will be amply clear by the consensus of this House. This is my submission.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, it seems to me that you have decided not to apply your discretion and leave this matter to the wisdom of the House whether there has to be a closer on this debate or not. I urge upon you to leave it to the House to decide on the matter. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): You take the sense of the House and approve the motion. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: I will call out the names, which are with me. I think that Shri Advani will agree to it. Prof. Madhu Dandavate too is of that view.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I agree (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: How much time will you give? (*Interruptions*).....

MR. SPEAKER: Somnath Babu, will they go on speaking for indefinitely.

(Interruptions)

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Party-wise time is allotted. This cannot be extended. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): The House has the right to know how many speakers are listed in the list which is in front of you and whether they belong to the parties.....

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: There are three or four speakers left and the Prime Minister would speak thereafter. I shall call those who are present in the House and thereafter hon. Prime Minister will speak.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Prime Minister will speak in the end..... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that we should not waste time. Let me call the speakers.

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): How many more speakers are there?

MR. SPEAKER: There are five speakers including the Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

[*English*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: You can even fix the time.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let the Prime Minister give his reply either at one's clock or at half past twelve.....*(Interruptions)*

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I need your permission and the leave of the House. If and when the hon. Speaker asks me to reply to the debate, I shall do so. It is upto you to decide whom to call. It is your jurisdiction. You are free to call whomsoever you want to. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let it be decided that the Prime Minister will give his reply at 12.15 p.m. then all the members will be present in the House. You may call whomsoever you want to within half-an-hour.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it will be over by 12.30 p.m. Only three or four speakers are there.

(Interruptions)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now Shri Manvendra Singh to Speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Since he is not here, I shall call Shri Banatwalla to speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, will you please resume your seats'.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, never before since the Independence of the country has the Parliament met under such circumstances as extraordinary and pressing as of today. These extraordinary circumstances under which the Parliament has met today are very clear. The entire polity of the country is under disarray. The opposition is impatient to pull the Government down. And the major supporting party has chosen to run away from the duties to which it has pledged itself. I am sure that the nation will consider these extraordinary circumstances and pass its necessary verdict.

The situation in the country is highly difficult. We find that the communal tensions are at a new pitch. The recent violent incidents have once again fully exposed the utter failure of both the Central and the State Governments to protect the lives and properties of the minorities in particular. Everywhere in UP, Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh the administration presented the pathetic picture of a helpless spectator while the law enforcing machinery everywhere appeared thoroughly communalised.

In Aligarh for example the police refused to intervene in order to check the rioters also. The police even went on strike because the senior police officer belonged to SC and was pro-Muslim. There are numerous complaints against the PAC for its openly partisan attitude against the Muslims. This is a fact which cannot be ignored.

I may here point out that during the 1977 Janata regime the PAC was packed with recruits from the erstwhile Jan Sangh by a home minister who was the leader of that party. We therefore have a PAC with a record of active collaboration with the majority communal forces; with the result that the UP Chief Minister Mr. Mulayam Singh's pledge to protect Muslims also proved hollow.

At this juncture I don't want to go into details of the various happenings, the sordid happenings. But I must emphasize the need for the restructuring of police and intelligence machinery with greater minority representation. This matter brooks no further delay. If this Government continues or when a new Government comes in future, this House will have to consider the need to amend the Constitution in order to provide for the concurrent responsibility of both the Centre and the States for the protection and welfare of the minorities.

The statutory schemes will have to be formulated for ex-gratia payments and compensation to and rehabilitation of the victims of communal violence. In the absence of such statutory schemes we are faced with very difficult situation. At various places the loss to life and damage to property are not properly recorded by the governmental agencies and the police. At other places—Maharashtra for example—' we go on urging upon the Chief Minister to announce ex-gratia payments and compensation to those who have suffered loss. But then no such announcement comes. In the matter of Jogeshwari in Bombay we have been telling the Chief Minister Mr. Sharad Pawar, several times we have made representation, but in defiance of the all-India policy the Chief Minister has not come forward to offer ex-grati payments and compensation to the victims of the unfortunate and sordid violence at Jogeshwari and other places. Therefore, there is need for statutory schemes in order to provide these ex-gratia grants and compensation to victims of communal violence.

I must also refer to verdict of the Press Council of India. The Press Council of India has recently condemned four Hindi newspapers of Uttar Pradesh for their communal reports on the Ayodhya dispute. But mere condemnation is not sufficient; and mere censure is not sufficient. What is the Govern-

[Sh. G.M. Banatwalla]

ment doing? What action has the Government taken in view of the censure by the Press Council of India against these four newspapers who have indulged in the virulent communal campaign on this particular issue?

I will well only very briefly on the vexed, controversial and sensitive issue of Babri Masjid-Ram Janambhoomi. I must say that the prayers have been offered continuously in the Babri Masjid for over four and a quarter centuries till 22nd December 1949, when the recent controversy came up and all sorts of misleading reports have started coming in. How is the problem, particularly at the present juncture to be solved?

I would like to draw the attention of the House and the nation to what Gandhiji himself has said. I quote from the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi—Volume 90, extract from the prayer meeting on November 30, 1947, pp. 140—145:

".....it is the duty of those who have installed the idols to remove them from there at daybreak and then keep them wherever they choose. By thus installing idols in the mosques, they are desecrating the mosques and also insulting the idols".

Gandhiji may have made these observations with respect to some other incidents. But, they apply it to the present controversy, equally.

I submit before this august House and I submit before the entire nation that the search for a historical and archaeological solution to the problem is futile. History poses a serious challenge to claims even about the existence of Ram—not to speak of his Janmasthan. As disputes have also been raised even with respect to several other mosques,

shrines, etc. The only way out is to have a legislation to protect the status of every place of religious significance as it existed on the independence of the country, that is on 15th August 1947.

In the last Lok Sabha, I had a privilege to rise in this House, moving a motion for the introduction of such a Bill. Sir, the time has come in order that such a legislation is made, to give our people peace and communal harmony which is today, so delicately poised.

An important question now is about the Mandal Commission, which is now before the Court. While the Mandal Commission issue is before the Court, I would again reiterate the necessity to provide specific reservation for Muslims commensurate with their population. When the object of reservation is to secure a social order based on equity, no backward class can be excluded from the reservation policy. The report of minorities submitted by the High Powered Panel on minorities headed by Dr. Gopal Singh has given us a data which presents an appalling state of backwardness of the Muslims. In fact, the report, while emphasising that Muslims should be given better representation in higher educational institutions and in services at all levels, has even specifically asked for reservations in class III and class IV services. While we support the Mandal Commission report and are eager to see its early implementation, we must also emphasise the need for specific reservation for the Muslims commensurate with their population when the Mandal Commission report is implemented. It is very shocking to see that in the entire report, there is no reference to the problems being faced by the minorities and the Government's eagerness to work for the welfare of the minorities. No word is there about the 15-point programme for the minorities and this Government's attitude towards the same. This 15-point programme for the minorities has to be implemented with greater vigour.

We find that the economy of the country is in a shambles. Here I must refer to the challenge that is being posed by the double-digit inflation. Most unfortunately and shockingly, this double-digit inflation reveals the disturbing departure from the trend of the previous year. If we analyse the composition of this double-digit inflation, we find that in 1989, the increase in the prices of primary articles was to the extent of 0.6 per cent and in 1990, it rose by 13.5 per cent. Similarly, in the sensitive areas of fuel, power, light and lubricants in 1989, the prices rose by 4 per cent whereas in 1990, they rose by 18 per cent.

We are being told about the Eighth Five Year Plan that it is being finalised. We have had seven Five Year Plans but even after seven Five Year Plans, there is a total absence of equality in our social order at present. We find, that despite all these seven Five Year Plans, 40 per cent of the population is still below the poverty line. According to the 1981 census, 33 per cent of our households do not have any literate member. Sixty two per cent do not have access to safe drinking water and 74 per cent have no electricity whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: There is enough time, Sir. You just bear with me.

The House is very well agitated over the question of telephone-tapping, surveillance, and so on. According to the extracts of the CBI report, which have appeared in the Press, I understand that I am also a victim of this telephone-tapping. I must say it is a very abhorring practice. It is an assault on liberty and on civil society. It is not merely enough to condemn this telephone-tapping and other things which the Hon. Prime Minister has done. There is also the need for an action. Swift punishment of those who ordered all these illegal acts, must take place. Sec-

only, there must be an amendment of the necessary laws and also proper administrative orders should be there in order to protect the right and privacy of every citizen of this country.

A few words on the international difficult situation and I shall conclude.

12.00 hrs.

It is most unfortunate that the Iraq-Kuwait conflict came to be escalated to the level of a war waged with utmost savagery and brutality. Indeed there could be no two opinions that Iraq had to vacate Kuwait. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait could not be condoned; but liberation of Kuwait was not to mean destruction of Iraq. It is a great fraud to maintain that war was inevitable. The trigger, happy US President Bush was too anxious to seize the opportunity provided by Iraq's President Saddam Hussein to promote his colonial ambitions and control over oil wealth while ostensibly defending Kuwait's Sovereignty. It has now become clear and well known that the report to the UN General Secretary and the transcript of his Baghdad talks show that there was every prospect of averting war and that President Saddam Hussein of Iraq had admitted that his stand on withdrawal from Kuwait was not irreversible and had expressed readiness to respond to the cause of peace.... (*Interruptions*).....

But the unfortunate was hustled on. It is also unfortunate that the Soviet Peace Proposal was not given the due chance. It was all accepted by Iraq but the US chose to respond to it with his ultimatum for ground war. This only demonstrates the unabashed arrogance of power on the part of the US.

While the war witnessed heinous crimes of savage bombardment of civilian population, we cannot close our eyes to the atrocities committed by the occupying forces. They

[Sh. G.M. Banatwalla]

are also to be condemned with equal force, be it Iraq or Israel. The war is now over. Kuwait has been liberated. We congratulate the people of Kuwait and wish them well. At this juncture, I must emphasise that peace-keeping terms and was compensations be not inspired by sentiments of revenge and destruction of Iraq. Reconstruction of both Kuwait and Iraq should be the equal concern of all nations.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Sir, they are impatient. At least you don't get impatient. Please give me some time to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I am not getting impatient.

(Interruptions)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: The Western forces should withdraw totally without delay leaving it to Muslim countries and regional forces to address themselves to problems of peace. I submit that the war-time aim and patriot missiles supplies supplied to Israel should be withdrawn. It is condemnable that the US comes forward in big way to give aid now even to Israel under the disguise that it has suffered damages during the war. Israel itself is a culprit before the United Nations and the civilized nations. Now, it is time that the United Nations should come forward without any delay to secure immediate vacation of territories occupied by Israel with the same speed and determination as was demonstrated in the case of Iraq.

The United Nations has also to be re-organized so that it cannot be exploited by any nations howsoever big for ulterior objectives.

I must also any to this tottering Government as also to the entire nation that India's role in the Gulf war has been most disappointing. It merely stood aghast at the developing West Asian tragedy; not only the attempts at promoting peace were extremely weak, delayed and ineffective, but the United States defence planes in India.

I must refer to the pressing need of our countrymen, those expatriates of ours who had to leave the Gulf countries because of the war situation. Today when they want to return to their work in these Gulf countries, they are being denied the facilities for the servicing of their passports. These expatriates are required first to clear and pay the amount that was involved in their evacuation from those territories. This is a matter that must be seriously considered by the Government. I urge that these facilities for the servicing of passports should be restored.

As far as the amount that was spent on every individual who had to be evacuated from the Gulf and recovery of that amount is concerned, some governments must be made keeping in view the convenience of these people. The more these people are given this facility and their passports renewed, they will be able to go abroad and earn the necessary foreign exchange for our country also.

Every opportunity must be taken in order to see what role India can now play in the reconstruction work, that is now going on in the war ravaged countries in the Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, both at the national front and the international front, there are extraordinary circumstances. It is necessary that these situations should be met with necessary determination in the wider national interest and to serve the country rather any particular party's ends.

With these words, I support the Motion

of Thanks on the President's Address. I also thank you, Sir, for the opportunity afforded to me to say a few words.

[*Translation*]

SHRI YUVRAJ (Katihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our country's unity and integrity is facing a great danger from the communal and divisive forces to day. Our economic condition is very miserable. In this hour of crisis I want to draw the attention of the people of this country towards the far reaching consequences of this situation. In Jammu-Kashmir, Punjab, Assam and Tamil Nadu the violent and secessionist forces alongwith the terrorists were putting hurlers in the functioning constitutional machinery. And in order to maintain law and order in these states the centre had no other option but to impose President's Rule after suspending the Legislative Assemblies according to constitutional provisions. So we have done it. We are seriously concerned about the terrorist activities prevailing in Jammu Kashmir, Punjab and other parts of the country. A chance was provided to the terrorists to come back into the national main-stream and for that the dialogue with them was also initiated. Every attempt has been made to include them in the negotiations so that these problems may be sorted out through a democratic process to dialogue and discussion. An Attempt to find an unanimous solution to the problems of Jammu Kashmir and Assam has been made also on the very line of what had been tried to do regarding Punjab. The responsibility of finding a unanimous solution to these problems is not our's only but of each political party as well as an individual in the country, so that democratic process may continue and a Government duly elected by the people may founder and we may give concret shape to the concept of socialism and to nurture our spirit of secularism which has been the very base of our socialist, democratic institution. I would like to draw your attentions towards. What the

hon. President has said recently. He has rightly observed that a national level effort in needed to solve these problems. He has also emphasised on instituting a National Re-construction fund to collect resources for the developmental works of the country. I do not know what reactions the political parties have about the efforts as have been made by the government in that regard. But everybody will agree with me that it is not a single party's responsibility but it is for all of us contemplate as to how democracy, secularism and socialism may service in our country. We all shall have to participate in the process of the nation building and development and in defence of its unity and integrity. The industries are to be made organised and dynamic. There has been a breach in the communal harmony in the country our government by starting dialogues with the religious leaders has marked a new beginning. Our country's future much depends upon the hard labour of the Mazdoors, who are the most important part of our population in the industries as well as other spheres of the country. It is matter of satisfaction that the industrial relations has been constant in the country despite many social upheavals.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is may appeal that we, forgetting our all internal differences should unit ourselves in the interest of our country. Our government has tried to improve its relation with Pakistan and China also. As our friend Shri Banatwalla has raised the issue of Iraq and he has expressed his concern about the liberation of Kuwait as well. Our Government did not send its force there whereas the Pakistan government as well as other friendly nations had sent their forces there. Iraq has been our friend for-ever. so we did not think it proper to use our military-power against it. We followed the very convention which our enactors had established in the post. We never wished that Iraq should bear any loss but at the same time we certainly intended that Kuwait must be liberated. When the Lask of

[Sh. Yuvraj]

liberating Kuwait was achieved, we favoured the just and necessary steps to be taken there. So our representatives when there immediately after the war was over to offer our help in providing medicines and other things to Iraq. We should contribute in rebuilding Iraq which has been devastated in war with these words I support the motion of thanks for the President's address thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH (Mathura): Mr. Speaker, Sir. (*Interruptions*) Listen to it atleast. You have spoiled everything (*Interruptions*)

I cordially welcome the hon. President's address and I am on my legs to support the motion of thanks moved in the House. He in his address has said mainly that our country today has come to a point where we should Unitedly work for nation. Building and should fight against the secessionist forces which are working against the national interests. I still remember the day when the people had given their mandate in favour of the Janta Dal which emerged as a strong opposition Party and owing reverence to the People's mandate Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh was sworn in as the Prime Minister of the country. I also remember these people who used to say to us during our election campaign that we should not to repeat the story of 1977. (*Interruptions*) we had the hopes that the senior Janata Dal leaders who had been trusted with the people mandate would not repeat that story as there is a proverb that a burnt child dreads the fire. But hon. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh in his race between Left and Right forget what the people of the country asked him to do.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Hajipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Now they remember Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Did you obey the Public mandate our you too forgets it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. MANAVENDRA SINGH: They forget the promises they had made to the people. (*Interruptions*) you do not remember that, but I do. I remember everything regarding my election.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: On which party's ticket had you won the election? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. M. MANAVENDRA SINGH: When I was contesting from Mathura Parliamentary Constituency, the former Prime Minister attended my election meeting. It was decided that the legislative Assembly seat of Mathura town would be left for the Bhartiya Janata Party candidate who was contesting from there. In the Parliamentary Board's. We had decided to hold a combined meeting of the Bhartiya Janata Party and the Janata Dal in the central place of Mathura. But Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh declined to participate in that meeting. He did not care for Manavendra Singh, who might win or loss. He professed that he was caring modal for the country as his candidates were contesting more or less all over the country. I was the first Parliamentarian who had associated myself with Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI PAUL R. MANTOSH (Nominated Anglo-Indian): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. He is just wasting the time. He is discussing internal party matters and not the President's Address. If he does not know the Rules, let him read the rules.

[*Translation*]

SHRI K. MANAVENDRA SINGH: There he did not agree to address that election

meeting. He emphasised that he would not hold any election meeting with the B.J.P. AS a result the B.J.P. men pelted stones at my meeting. Anyway I through an adjustment succeeded to retain my seat from there. But now, may I ask Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh as to why did he beg the support of that party for the chair of the Prime Minister? Why did he our his government for Nine months with the support of that party? Where did his value-based politics Vanished that time? Where was the change in the system for which he used to a talk so-often? For the rake of his Prime Minister ship he befouled the Bhartiya Janata Party on one hand and spreaded his hands before the C.P.M. and C.P.I. on the other hand. And for that there had always been a tussle between him and the Senior Janata Dal Leaders. He was repeatedly to asked to resign from the post of the Prime Minister and to accept the post of the Party President so that another Senior leader of the National from might assume the office of the Prime Minister. But he for the sake of had power did not pay any heed to that proposal and as a result the Janata Dal was divided.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the country was pushed to 50 years back from the economic view point. The price was not risen so high in the country as had been during Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh's regime. The instability of the government, non-fulfilment of the Promises by a Prime Minister and the existing political differences were the main reasons for that. His government was not a state Government because he was always under the apprehension that the Bhartiya Janata Party would with draw its support. After that he on some one's advice ousted Shri Devi Lal from the Council of Ministers. When he found his chair in danger and found that the Bhartiya Janata Party's thinking to withdraw its support and expected new election in the Country, he started the Ram Mandir dispute. On the one hand they assured our Muslim brethren that their mosque would not be allowed

to be demolished and on the other hand they asked the B.J.P. to go ahead with temple construction. In the meantime when they apprehended that their party was heading for a split and they were going to be unseates they implemented the Mandal Commission Report hastily. Purpose of its implementation was not to give benefit to the poor or Harijans or backward classes or weaker section. If they had the interest of the weaker sections in their mind, weaker sections found in other castes should have also been covered in the above scheme. The Congress Party had been nourishing the weaker sections, Harijans and the backward classes for last 40-42 years. Scheduled Tribes, backward classes, scheduled castes, Valmikis, Harijans and other castes were also included in it. But intention of these people was how to divide the Hindu Votes. They had the motive of dividing the backward classes, the Harijans on the basis of Mandal Commission Report. They planned to take the Muslims to their side in the name of Ram Janambhoomi. When the Mandal Commission Report was implemented, it appeared to the B.J.P. that Hindu Votes are going to be divided. In order to arrest this move Mr. Advani, for whom I have highest regards, rode on the chariot. He started travelling the entire country and thus started the politics of caste and religion in the country. Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Advani are the creators of this situation. A situation has been created in the country in which Hindus and Muslims started fighting against each other. Workers of various parties started fighting against one another and thus a revolt like situation was created in the country. It is very unfortunate that in our country.

(Interruptions)

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Saharsa): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. The hon. Members has said that all

[Sh. Surya Narayan Yadav]

this happened due to Shri V.P. Singh. In this connection I would like to point out that after independence no one belonging to backward classes has ever been allowed to become the Prime Minister of the country and when Shri V.P. Singh championed their cause, it is being alleged that all this was done by him.... (*Interruptions*).

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

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH: A situation was created in the country in which human massacres took place all over the country on caste and religious basis. The Punjab tangle was not resolved. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu hopped knobby with the L.T.T.E militants and the then Prime Minister encouraged him. In Bihar atrocities were committed on Harijans openly. Police personal were killed in the State. In Punjab the fire further flared up. Even after repeated requests no decision has been taken in respect of Assam. They had their political interest in it. They wanted to devoid the country in the name of caste and religion. The country was not supreme for them. Their votes and the Prime Minister's office reigned supreme. Development of the whole country came to a dead stop. It cannot be estimates as to how much loss the country has suffered under an unstable Government. Sentiment's of the people in the whole country were badly hurt. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH: At the time of elections we made promises like the introduction of rural development schemes, to people Waiving of loans up to Rs.10,000 standing against the poor people, doing urban development and providing employment to the unemployed youth. (*Interruptions*) These people dashed all the hopes of the people to

the ground only to capture power.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Manvendra Singh Ji, please take your seat, now Basudeb Acharia is raising a point of order.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you had said that the hon. Prime Minister would give a reply at 12.30 hrs. Please call the Prime Minister to give reply.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order in it. Please take your seat. Manvendra Ji, now, please conclude.

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH: Such was the situations all over the country. Power hungry people were making a demand for elections. People doing politics of caste and religion tried to divide the country. When the country was during in the fire of hatred, Shri Chandra Shekhar was sworn in as the Prime Minister. I am also grateful to the Congress Party and Shri Rajiv Gandhi for extending their support to Shri Chandra Shekhar. The opposition also knows this thing very well. The country heared a Sign of relief after Shri Chandra Shekhar became Prime Minister.

SHRI K.C. TYAGI: That is why the Congress Party opposed (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Tyagi Ji, is it necessary that you should go on speaking?

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to take much of your time. Finally, I will say this much that the present position of hatred is the gift of these people. I will would like to tell them that the people of the country will teach them a good lesson in the forth coming time. The politics of temple and Mandal will not continue more. The sensible people of the country will make them understand in fututre. The people of the country will corner. Those people who

are power hungry and playing the politics of votes and religion People will not tolerate them in future.

With these words, while welcoming President's Address. I conclude.

[English]

SHRI NANDU THAPA (Sikkim): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have a few observations to make on the President's Address.

The President's Address has given a wrong message to the nation, I feel a bad image of the country and the people has been projected because mention has been made in the President's Address, of Punjab, Kashmir, Assam, etc. and of riots and communal disharmony in some parts of the country. The need for national integration etc. is also mentioned. These are all negative aspects and I would say that a negative aspect only has been projected. India as a nation has not plunged into civil disharmony and disorder, as has been projected in the Address of the President. There are other messages also which could have been given to the nation, which could have been highlighted in the President's Address. For example, there are States like Sikkim and some other parts of the country which are most peaceful States. Apart from communal harmony, even crime rates are lowest in Sikkim and elsewhere also. There are no communal or relations tensions in many States. Therefore, in totality, the President's Address has projects a very wrong image of the people of the country and of the nation.

There are demands like the demands of regional languages to be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. One of the major demands in this respect is that of Nepali language to be included in the Eighth Schedule. The history of demand for inclusion of this language starts from 50's. This demand has been made by the Govern-

ments West Bengal, Sikkim and Tripura. The Nepali-speaking population in the country is about one crore. This language has been recognised by Sahitya Akademi and is also the official language of the State of Sikkim. The language has been recognised by various Indian/universities up to post-graduate level. Without being violent, the Nepali-speaking Indian people have been making this demand democratically and in a peaceful manner. Memoranda after memorandum delegations after delegations have been sent to the Government in this respect. But there is no mention in the President's Address of such demands raised democratically and in a peaceful manner. Therefore, Sir, pointing out these critical remarks or observations on the President's Address. I support the motion.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRISHAN YADAV (Azamgarh): Hon. Mr. Speaker, Sir, democracy, pillars secularism and socialism all the three main pillion of our constitution. But I would like to ask the Government and my follow beings whether this was the dream Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar saw while drafting the constitution of this country? Is democracy being strengthened in the country?

Today, as many as five states are under the President's Rule. They are Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab, Assam, Pondicherry and Tamil Nadu. This is an ample proof that as we marched forward in the post independence are. our democracy continued to get stronger as more and more states were brought under the President's Rule. I am very clear in my perception and I must say that power has now gone to the hands which do not deserve it. The rule of democracy is that power of Governance should go to those who enjoy mass support. But what I see today is that power is in the hands of a minority Government and the power of Governance, money and media have gone

[Sh. Ram Krishan Yadav]

into the hands of mafia. Even after so many years of independence, all the elections are won through money, media and mafia. The President's Address speaks..... (*Interruptions*) It says nothing about how democracy is going to be strengthened.

Another point where I want to make is that power should go to the workers. But it is misfortune of this country that those who earn wealth for the country, produce raw material and manufacture products do not at all enjoy the fruits of that wealth, as they do not have any control over it.....(*Interruptions*) The entire money power is concentrated in a few hands like those of Tatas, Birlas, Goenkas and Ambanis. Justice demands that this money power should be in the hands of farmers, the poor, the workers and the common man. But the fact remains that the entire money power is being controlled by the capitalists of this country who constitute just 15 per cent of the total population. The President's Address is totally silent on the issue as to how to distribute the money power among the poor. I among the conviction that as long as money power does not come in the hands of the workers, socialism cannot be brought about in this country. The importance of people's power has to be accepted if socialism is to be brought about. Dignity of labour has to be recognised, but it is unfortunate that money power is being controlled by those who do not work at all.

One point I would like to submit about secularism. Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar had said that national culture should be developed in this country. But the slogan that is being raised today is:

Hindu Hindi Hindustan, Kahan se aye Musalman, Maaro inki Jaan, nahin to bhejo inko Pakistan."

Another slogan that is being raised is:

"Babu ki aulad ko ek dhakka aur do, Musalman ke do hi sthan, kabristan aur Pakistan,"

When a Punjabi raises his voice, other raise the slogan-

"Beti hai Sardar ki, desh ke gaddar ki"

When Maneka Gandhi contested election against Rajiv Gandhi from Amethi, he gave the aforesaid slogan. When a Muslim raises his voice, he is dubbed as Pakistani, when a Punjabi raises his voice, he is dubbed as khalistani. When the poor labourers, farmers, the oppressed, the exploited and the people from the backward classes of the society support a leader, they are dubbed as casteist. I want to ask whether the destiny of this country is to be shaped by a selected few. They have exploited one society as erstwhile princes as feudals, landlords, contractors and high caste Hindus. The same people are today occupying the corridors of power and are engaged in manoeuvres. I am of the view that the situation which has developed in the country has contributed nothing towards strengthening either the nation or democracy. It has helped neither secularism nor socialism. This is a blot on the country as we are heading towards darkness..... (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay a few words about the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. A provision for 22.5 per cent reservation has been made in the Constitution for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, but this quota is not fully filled up. Let me tell you the position from 1952 to 1990. Since these 3.5 per cent people from high castes are sitting in the corridors of powers, they are ruling over 70 per cent people. Another fact which I want to reveal is that 4.5 per cent people in this country are monopolising agriculture, five percent are controlling the industries and 5.5 per cent have acquired control over the land. In a situation like this, where will the son of a farmer or the son of a labourer go? I would like to say that the people in power in this country have indulged in dishonesty. The power has not been distributed in the real sense.

About the Muslims, I want to say that

their representation in services before independence was 35 per cent which has now come down to 0.5 per cent. Why so? There is no recruitment for them in the army. They are seen with suspicion which is not a good sign for the country. We are a country of 85 crore people. We are not Hindus, Muslims, Christians or Sikhs when it comes to the nation. We are the sons of mother India. All of us need food, clothes, shelters self respect and dignity. But what is sad is that in our country one gets dignity on the basis of birth in a high caste family. If by chance one is born to a scheduled caste, a poor or a scavenger, he gets nothing but indignity. As long as this wall of indignity is not demolished. This problem cannot be solved not even through enactment of a legislation in the Parliament. My submission is that we are the sons of one mother, this land and this nation belongs to us and, therefore, we should not divide the people on the basis of caste. We have to develop a national culture. We can build this nation only if participation of all sections is ensured in the political and public life. Women constitute 50 per cent of our population, but what is their condition in our country?

Women have to work throughout their life and no arrangements have been made for their education. The number of such women in this country is 4.5%, and unless they are given proper respect in political, social and economic life and unless they are given a chance to make progress, the country can't develop any further. I would also like to say something regarding the children. In this country, children of the age of 8 years are also employed. They pick pieces of coal or do other such minor jobs. They don't get any opportunity of receiving education. If our Government or our society does not think about the youth of our country, the country cannot make progress any further.

I would like to say something regarding the dual educational policy also. In our country some children join Doon School or Public Schools right from the very beginning and some children don't even get an opportunity to go to the primary schools. If all the

children for this country are not provided uniform pattern of education and if proper education system is not evolved the day is not far off when there would be a revolution because our children are exposed to the world history. They study the history of the Russian and French revolution and the revolutions in all other countries. They will definitely bring about a change. They don't believe in fact and God. That time is gone.

I want to say that there are some people in our society who want to keep our society illiterate, handicapped and with the help of superstitions and by perpetrating caste system propounded by Manu and Brahminic system they try to spoil the society. They define and promote wrong concepts about heaven and hell. If our society has got an opportunity to make progress and a change is being brought about, we should favour it.

Thirdly, today when the people of scheduled castes and backward classes are standing up for waging social and political struggle, some people try to suppress them with the help of their money power, I would like to challenge them that nobody can check their marching steps. Today the people of scheduled castes and backward classes want equal participation in political, social and economic life. So, I would like to submit that if no attempt is made for grant them their rights, they will revolt and the present situation will not continue for long. Government should guarantee the holding of free and fair elections. If free and fair elections are not held, the democratic system in this country would be destroyed. Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar had said that if equal social rights were not given to the people, the constitution will be torn into pieces. (*Interruptions*) So far as international issues are concerned, India should follow its traditions. Iraq has always stood by us, they have always helped us and at least we should also help her. Therefore when humanity was at stake at the international level, America wanted to maintain its hegemony in the world by suppressing all other countries. When we allowed refuelling of American planes, we have departed from our international policy, foreign policy and

[Sh. Ram Krishan Yadav]

the policy towards the countries which were friendly towards us. These friendly countries have been betrayed by us. So the entire world does not trust us. We should have firmly followed the policy of non-alignment. If we would not have favoured Kuwait at this juncture, we should not have favoured America also. So if we want to bring about unity in the entire country we should give due respect to all the people. All the revolutions in the world have not come merely for food, clothing and shelter, but for protection of honour also. Today our society is fighting for self-respect. I wish that all people should have self-respect, dignity and honour and the President's address does not say anything about the same.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

12.50 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY
GRANTS (GENERAL), 1990-91

[English]

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Sir, I beg to present a statement (Hindi and English versions) showing the Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1990-91.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT—2214/
91

RE . CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN THE
COUNTRY

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, with the fall of the V.P. Singh Government on 7th November, 1990 a new chapter in Indian politics had started. It seems that chapter is also coming to an end.

Sir, I am not participating in the discussion on the Presidential Address. With your permission I am briefly intervening to speak on the stalemate that has arisen since yesterday morning. This problem has many facets. The crisis was so deep that if the Opposition had wanted, this phase could have ended yesterday itself but the Congress(I) was given a chance to realise that its behaviour in the given conditions was most irresponsible. I am surprised that a national party like the Congress(I), which is the biggest party of the country in this House and has State Governments in four States and on whose support the present Central Government is based, has chosen the trivial surveillance issue to create such a serious crisis in the country. After all who started this surveillance. The Congress(I) has indulged in surveillance of its own members as it did not trust their devotion to the party. This party has also treated Opposition leaders as subjects for surveillance. In the States where this party is in power, the State Governments indulge in this sort of thing. They have blown this issue out of proportion and are threatening to dislodge this Government if their political demands are not met. If the objective was to dislodge the Government, they could have approached the President and declared their dissatisfaction with this Government's performance and then withdrawn their support. People may be angry with us for our action but the withdrawal of our support was not done in such an unethical manner. The Congress(I) wanted this Government to fall without withdrawing their support. That is why they are complaining that we should have co-operated in dislodging this Government yesterday itself.

Sir, I am raising this issue because of the Congress(I)'s irresponsible behaviour in this time of crisis. Secondly, they are guilty of breaking their promise to the President. They are not withdrawing their support as it would mean once again going through the process of seeking a mandate. What they want is that this Government should go and they take its place. (Interruptions) Unfortunately, these are some elements in the