

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: It was clear from their slogans as to what they intend to do. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: The police has its own limitations. I would never direct the police to take repressive measures on a crowd of 10,000 people for merely saying something or raising slogans. I certainly admit that the slogans were most objectionable but at that time police could not take any action against them.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): How all the Congress Party leaders reached there? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Member, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI KALKA DAS: The Prime Minister has already started taking sides. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: All of you were shown on T. V.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, if they are annoyed over this, I invite all the MPs of Delhi to accompany me to riot affected areas immediately after the adjournment of the House and they would be given full coverage on T. V. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KALKA DAS: But you are here to take sides. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will not use that language which the hon. Member is using. I treat all the Members of the House equal and it is not my intention to take sides. I would like to assure the hon. Members that every Member of the House irrespective of his party affiliation or he may have political differences with me upto any extent will enjoy equal status and respect. Therefore, I appeal to the hon. Members that they would do more good to the nation if they do not show provocation on

the question of riots. We all should work unitedly for restoring peace and normalcy. We can have many other occasions to cross swords with each other but on the question of riots we should demonstrate unity so that we could restore peace and normalcy in the country.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: A judicial enquiry should be ordered into it. If it is not enquired into, it would be repeated all over the country *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Jaffer Sharief.....

(Interruptions)

11.34 hrs.

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up discussion on the Government motion expressing confidence in the Council of Ministers.

As decided at the meeting held by me with the leaders of parties/groups on 15 November, 1990, the discussion should conclude and the Prime Minister will reply to the debate at 3.30 p. m. Although it was agreed at the meeting that the House would not adjourn for lunch, today being Friday, I think, the House may adjourn for lunch at 1 p. m.

Members are informed that, as unanimously agreed to in the said meeting, the seating arrangement and the Division Numbers of honourable members will remain unchanged for today's sitting except in the case of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and Shri Viswanath Pratap Singh, who have been allotted new seats and Division Numbers.

Hon Prime Minister may now move the motion.

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRIISHNAN (Badagara): Sir, I am on a point of order. *(Interruptions)* Sir, according to the Rules of the House, the motion which is to be put before the House has to be precise. The motion, as moved by the hon. Prime Minister just says and uses the generic term as 'Council of Ministers'. Council of Ministers, headed by whom? *(Interruptions)* Is he afraid of naming himself or is he afraid of somebody else? *(Interruptions)* The House is entitled to know that. *(Interruptions)* Sir, there is no Council of Ministers. *(Interruptions)* The motion should be precise. *(Interruptions)* Secondly, where is the Council of Ministers? *(Interruptions)* More importantly, how has the Government of India carried on since 7th of November? Was it constitutionally permissible? Has any work been done, under Article 77 of the Constitution which is constitutionally mandatory? *(Interruptions)* Who is in charge of them? *(Interruptions)* Is Tau in charge of Commerce? Is Tau in charge of Information and Broadcasting? *(Interruptions)* How has the Government carried on for the last few days? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Berhampore): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

(Interruptions)

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA: Sir, my point of order is clear. Sir, the motion attracts Articles 74(1), 75(1) and also 352(3) of the Constitution. Then again, it attract Articles 77(1) and 77(2) of the Indian Constitution. According to the provisions of the Constitution and also according to the Rules of this House, the Council of Ministers is not existent at present. This is number one. Then, to constitute a Council of Ministers, more than one Minister, besides the Prime Minister is required because the term 'Ministers' has

been used in plural number.

Then, the question of division of portfolios comes into the picture. Not only that; the division of portfolios should be endorsed by the President, according to the advice of the Council of Ministers. There is a procedure in the Constitution particularly under Article 77(2) of the Constitution. But that has not been done. Portfolios have not been divided.

The intention of the Constitution, the intention of the Rules of Procedure and the Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha is that there should not be too much connotation of power in one or two hands; and that the spirit of division of functions and collective responsibility is maintained. Not only the letters, but the intention of the provisions of the Constitution should also be given due consideration. The import of the motion as proposed by the Prime Minister-as you have asked the Prime Minister to move, Sir-is against all democratic principles. It has been intended by such motion to obtain a seal of sanction behind the autocratic design. By such motion, a dangerous procedure is sought to be created. So, I oppose this. I will say again that if he proposes to move the motion, then, it will be wrong and unconstitutional. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): This motion is a serious fraud. We do not have any Council of Ministers. We have a small Cabinet. *(Interruptions)*

So, I propose an amendment that it should be:

"confidence in the future Council of Ministers."

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Indrajit Gupta.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Let us hear Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): I had given an amendment, Sir. You perhaps have rejected because it is time-barred. This difficulty can be overcome if the Prime Minister agrees.

My amendment was that simply one word should be inserted before the word 'Council' and that is 'proposed'- confidence in the proposed Council of Ministers-if he is willing to say that (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chitta Basu, be brief.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, no motion is valid in the House unless the motion is in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the country.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh): The Supreme Court has to interpret that, not Mr. Chitta Basu. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Chitta Basu.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): The supreme defector wants to go to the Supreme Court. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chitta Basu, will you please address the Speaker?

SHRICHITTA BASU: The motion before the House is:

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

Nobody knows. Of course, I have known it through the Press and the TV that one Mr. Chandra Shekhar heads this Government. (*Interruptions*) This motion does not include the name of the proposed Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, look at Article 74 of the Constitution.

It specifically says:

"There shall be a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at the head to aid and advise the President....."

There is no Council of Ministers at the present moment. And there is no Council of Ministers headed by anyone. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, the motion is not valid.

Secondly, there are many implications regarding the Council of Ministers.

SHRI MURLI DEORA (Bombay South): Not implication, but complication for you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: The implication would lead to complications for them also.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chitta Basu, please conclude.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: According to our Constitution, the Government and the Prime Minister can recommend for the imposition of emergency under Article 352. Suppose, for the time being, Mr. Chandra Shekhar wants to impose emergency in the country. (*Interruptions*) Then, the President cannot, unless there is a concrete resolution by the entire Cabinet. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, this is a very important point with regard to the Council of Ministers. (*Interruptions*)

There is no provision for the Deputy Prime Minister in the Council of Ministers. There is only one Minister, the Prime Minister.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chitta Basu, you have made your point. Will you please sit down?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I have not yet made my point. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not repeat your argument.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Probably there is one person, Mr. Chandra Shekhar and there is another person, Mr. Devi Lal who happen to be the Ministers. Now, how is the business of the Government to be conducted?(*Interruptions*)What about other Ministers?.....(*Interruptions*)Then, I come to Rules. Rule 2 (1) defines as to who are the Ministers, the Members of the Cabinet. Now, where is the Cabinet? Therefore Sir, the business of the House cannot be conducted. The Motion under consideration of the House is not in conformity with the letter and spirit of the Constitution. It violates the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of the Business of the House under Rule 2 (1). Therefore, I appeal to you that the Motion should be rejected. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): Sir, we are here to protect the honour and dignity of this House. We are here to see that no illegality is committed as long as you adorn that Chair.....(*Interruptions*)Therefore, I think that Mr. Chandra Shekhar would also agree and it is absolutely correct that nowhere in the Constitution there is a provision for the Deputy Prime Minister. No Council of Ministers can be constituted with one Minister.....(*Interruptions*)It is highly illegal. I would represent to you that, Sir, no illegality be committed as long as you are in the chair I request you to kindly recommend to the President to let him swear in at least one more Minister at least by 4 PM today and then come back here. If he does that, then it would be proper and in order. Please do it Sir.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am giving my ruling. The Motion is in order. It is not necessary to name the Prime Minister in the Motion. It is for the Prime Minister to select his team. There is no provision in the Constitution about the size of the Council of Ministers. This is a matter for the Prime Minister to decide. It is not for the Chair to interpret the Constitution. The points of order are ruled out. Mr. Prime Minister.

[*English*]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): I beg to move:

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret that the non-formation of the council of Ministers has shocked many of my friends and they are very keen to see as early as possible the new faces of the members of the Council of Ministers. They have become so habitual of seeing the faces of Ministers that Parliament is meaningless to them without Ministers. They want to know the reasons. There are many reasons for not forming the Council of Ministers.

Sir, very humbly we have undertaken this responsibility and many of our friends have raised their voice that we do not enjoy majority support in the House. I never wanted to give them an opportunity to say that I expanded my Council of Ministers in a big way without obtaining their consent or the consent of this august House. The only reason was that the Cabinet was to be expanded after abstaining vote confidence. I feel that they should have visualised it much earlier but it they failed, it was their fault like a particular bird who cannot see anything in the sun-light. The fault lies with the eyes and not with the sun. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to submit that today we are passing through a crucial phase and the condition of the country in every respect is bad. I do not want to level allegation against anybody here.....(*Interruptions*)

Neither I intend to level charges against anybody nor I am interested in delivering a long speech. I would like to reply to only a few questions which are raised repeatedly. The question which is often asked is whether we have got the mandate of the people or not, whether people have supported us or not, and this is a genuine question. Last time when we won elections and people elected

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

us to form the Government, Shri Advani, Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri Indrajit Gupta supported us and our strategy was to form a Government which could prove a viable alternative to the Congress. Advani ji had clearly mentioned in the election manifesto that no compromise will be made in regard to Article 370. Similar other issues were also raised by Shri Advani but I would not like to go into them. We along with our parties had also made it clear that no compromise will be made on certain specific issues. At that time, we had also given an assurance to run the Government for five years. It was also a basis to seek public support. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know from my friends whether I was involved in toppling the previous Government?.....(*Interruptions*)
.....

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

[*Translation*]

Please take your seat.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now Shri George Fernandes reminded me that we voted against the Government which had become lifeless since the day Shri Advani withdrew his support. You may not find even a single example in the history that a Prime Minister ever stuck to the Chair even after losing majority.....(*Interruptions*)..... Political morality is questioned here and I am being accused that I toppled the Government. I never concealed the fact that I opposed the then Prime Minister but I was not involved in toppling the Government. If the Government was toppled, it was only due to the misconceptions created between those friends who at present, are sitting together. If the previous Government relied only on their support.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Anil, Please take your seat. Mr. Biplab, you also sit down.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not want to raise these questions here, if my friend sought the reply, he must be prepared to listen because these questions.....(*Interruptions*) because in my opinion, these questions have no significance at all. The basic question is what challenges does the country face, in what condition the country is at present. We also have certain constraints and I would not like to relate how the country was administered for eleven months and in what condition the economy of the country was when the Government changed. However, I would certainly like to relate the prevailing circumstances at that time. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I seek the permission of the House as well as yours to put that situation before the House. The condition of the country during these six days has not deteriorated to the extent to which it was when we took over. I don't want to mention it. The economy of the country is on the verge of collapse today. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, we know that despite all this, the country will not break. Crores of people of this country, where thousands of years old culture persists, are its saviour. What direction was given, what policies were adopted during the last eleven months? These faulty strategies and policies have put a big question mark on the fate of the people, the economy, the stability, unity and integrity of the nation and the only way to remove this question mark is that we should enlist the cooperation of the people. The people are capable and the economy of the country is strong enough to face any challenge. I would like to appeal to all the countrymen that we are passing through a difficult and challenging period and thus we would like to have their cooperation and strength. Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to submit to the leaders of all the political parties that I am free to say a few things but I am ready to say only what I can, through you, and if there is any exaggeration in what I say, I will be ready to resign not only from Prime Ministership but also from the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was already aware of it and I would not relate this in the House today. I have been continuously urging Shri

Advani, who is present here, that the path on which the country was being taken is that of destruction. I also warned leaders of leftist parties of the same and made utmost efforts to avert it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is true that we sought the Congress support and there is nothing to be ashamed of it. I want the similar support from all other friends, who consider our actions to be shameful. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this issue is not related to the prestige or pride of an individual. It is related to the protection of the country and on this issue we want everybody not only the Members but all the citizens to unite to strengthen the country.

Sir, through you, I would like to submit to them that there was a time when they respected Shri Advani like a saint and now they consider him as "Rakshas" This is a fall out of your political approach. Today the leftists feel that they have full authority to declare anybody progressive or reactionary suiting their whims. I do not need an certificate from them. Mr. Speaker, Sir, my submission is that I have also passed a considerable time in politics and observed these stalwarts quite closely. Before pointing towards me, they, particularly the leftist leaders who participated in the national movements and who have created a history due to which I respect them, should do some retrospection. They seem to be unaware of the prevailing circumstances.

12.00 hrs.

They are not aware of the circumstances through which the country is passing today. I would like them to update themselves and think whether the need of the hour is to extend cooperation and support in the interest of the country or not. It is often asked as to who is the Prime Minister? At present you are ignorant of it, in a few days you will very well come to know about it. (*Interruptions*)

The issue of Prime Ministership is not related to an individual. Prime Minister is the person who enjoys the support of the House, whom the country has approved as such in

accordance with the provisions in the Constitution. Therefore, there is no need to be concerned about the Prime Minister. Think about the future of the country and about taking it out of the present miserable condition. I would like to submit that inspite of the fact that the country is in bad shape, it retains its strength. Our farmers and labourers have got the capability to rebuild the country. Crores of citizens of this country even today take pride and love their country. I would like to have their cooperation also. I belong to that category of people who believe that in order to save the country support of people is a must. That is why we took this initiative. I am confident that we will get the cooperation and support of all. With a view to throw a challenge to anybody but to make them realise the facts I would like to reiterate that while speaking they should exercise caution and restraint lest I am compelled to reveal certain things which may make it difficult for you to face the people. Therefore, my submission is that you ponder over the matter. I leave everything to your wisdom. If you want to know the facts and hold the responsibility, I being the Prime Minister of the country, would like to put all those facts before you due to which I opposed the previous Government, and joined hands with all the forces.....(*Interruptions*)

The people who are concerned about the future of the country, who have full faith in the eternity and dignity of the country will certainly support us in order to give new strength to the country and to infuse inspiration, vigour and encouragement in its masses. Instead of discord goodwill should be generated. Blood should not be shed. Every life is precious, whoever dies is either a son or a daughter of the country. I would like all of us to make efforts to unite on the issue of communalism and poverty and find out a way to soothe the hurt feelings of people and to boost a new strength in the country. With these words I would like this House to support my motion.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Bahraich): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to raise a question of propriety. I am not on a point of

[Sh. Arif Mohammad Khan]

order. The hon. Prime Minister in his speech said that the Member while delivering his speech should be careful about what he says, so that he (the Prime Minister) is not compelled to say something which makes it difficult for the Member to face the public in future. The question of propriety is that if the Prime Minister knows something about an hon. Member that he has done something which will totally mar his image before the public if disclosed by the Prime Minister in his speech, the Prime Minister should not wait for the member to say anything against him, but divulge it before hand instead. It is a Parliamentary procedure and if we say that it is an attempt to blackmail the hon. Members, it will not be incorrect. It is my request to the Prime Minister through you to divulge any such matter which he has in his knowledge and we are prepared to listen to him. It would be better to take the House and the people into confidence. (*Interruptions*)

12.05 hrs.

INTRODUCTION OF DEPUTY PRIME
MINISTER

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARIBHAU SHANKAR MAHALE (Malegaon): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a question of propriety. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat. I am not permitting you to speak.

SHRI HARIBHAU SHANKAR MAHALE: I have a question of propriety..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, no I am not allowing you. There is no question of propriety. You take your seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: You kindly permit his to speak. You are trying to be partial to him. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You resume your seat.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Mr. Speaker, sir, it has been a practice of this House that the Prime Minister introduces to the House every Minister who has been newly appointed. The new Deputy Prime Minister should have been introduced to everyone. Thus the Prime Minister should introduce him to the House before the discussion starts.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a point of order.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Member, who has drawn my attention towards this fact. Shri Devi Lal is the Deputy Prime Minister and all of you know him. I thank you every much.

12.06 hrs.

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

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved.

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

PROF. MADHUDANDAVATE (Rajpur): Mr. Speaker Sir I consider today as one of the saddest moments in the history of parliamentary life. Sir, it is a saddest moment not because we are out of power. It is a saddest moment, firstly because of the fact that when one of our colleagues of 40 years association has formed a Government, seeking the vote of confidence, unfortunately I cannot associate myself with the Motion of Confidence. But more than that, certain parliamentary traditions that have been a part of this House and of the Government are sought to be flouted unfortunately.

As far as the formation of the new Government is concerned, despite what my colleague Chandra Shekharji, the Prime Minister said, it is an accepted fact that the manner in which this Government is formed, it is not formed by the mandate of the electorate at all. (*Interruptions*) I would like to know from them what the mandate is.

As far as the last elections are concerned, those of us who are sitting on this side, no matter to which party we belong those who are non-congress parties sought the verdict of the electorate.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Including the B. J. P.?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Yes, including the BJP. All of us sought the vote of the electorate on a mandate that was against the working of the Congress and against the policies of the Congress. (*Interruptions*) Honourable Congress members. How do you know? We fought the elections. I do not allege that you fought against the Congress. We fought against the Congress. Each one of us who won the election in 1989 won it on a platform that was against the Congress. Sir, unfortunately, the new Government that is sought to be formed is flouting the promises given to the electorate on our behalf that we shall fight the policies of the past Congress Government. That was the basis on which we formed our Government. Not only that. The new Government that has been formed, has been formed by picking up splinters from the parent party and is trying to sustain itself with the help of the Congress. That is the basis on which this Government is being formed.

Sir, some friends have raised a point of order asking whether there will be a Council of Ministers. Shri Chandra Shekhar is the mover of the motion. But I must say that Shri Devi Lal is the architect of this motion. Because fortunately there is a Deputy Prime Minister available, we can say that there is a Council of Ministers consisting of two Members and therefore he is perfectly justified in seeking a Vote of Confidence for the

Council of Ministers. I do not raise the technical point but the most important point that I would like to raise is the manner in which this Government has been formed. Please allow me to refer to a very significant incident in the life of our country's politics. I would like to refer to our great Socialist Leader, the veteran freedom fighter Acharya Narendra Dev. I would like to point out to this House that in 1934, the Congress Socialist Party was formed by eminent Leaders like Shri Jaiprakash Narayan, Acharya Narendra Dev, Dr. Lohia and many others.

Sir, in 1948, at the Nasik Conference of the Socialist Party, we decided to leave the Congress. Acharya Narendra Dev had moved the Motion for leaving the Congress. But when we left the Congress in 1948, a very significant incident occurred after that for which the entire country is proud. When we left the Congress in 1948 and Socialists started functioning as an independent Socialist Party outside the Congress, Acharya Narendra Dev and a number of his colleagues who were Members of the Uttar Pradesh Assembly resigned from the Assembly. Acharya Narendra Dev got up in the Uttar Pradesh Assembly and declared "I and my colleagues were elected to U. P. Assembly as members of the Congress Party and since we have left the Congress Party, we are all resigning from the membership of the Uttar Pradesh Assembly." The Chief Minister who was a veteran Congressmen, requested Acharya Narendra Dev. "Acharyaji, you must continue. You symbolise the dignity of this House." Some Members pointed out to Acharya Narendra Dev that there is no Anti-Defection Law enacted either at the Centre or in the States and so there is no compulsion of law that you should resign from the Assembly. Acharya Narendra Dev said then, "I am not guided by the laws that are written on the paper but I am guided by the inner moral law and I am now going to tender my resignation." And, they quit the Uttar Pradesh Assembly. They contested the elections. All of them were defeated.

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj): Not all but one. Shri Gajadhar Prasad was elected.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I stand corrected.

Sir, when Acharya Narendra Dev was defeated in the election, you may recall, what type of campaign was carried on. In the campaign, it was said:

"Prabhu Ram Chandra ki bhoomi ke Ishwarwadi matdata Nirishwarwadi Acharya Narendra Dev ko vote denge,"

That was the level at which the campaign was carried on.

I remember that in one of these campaigns, when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was invited, he refused to join the campaign. That was the plane at which the politics was conducted at that time. Acharya ji was defeated but his defeat and his decision and decision to go out of the Assembly, despite the fact that there was no anti-defection law laid the foundations of fair and clean politics in the country. I would have been extremely happy if Shri Chandra Shekhar and my colleagues, instead of seeking the help of the Congress, were to demand and recommend that "Let there be fresh elections and we shall take fresh mandate" and elections were held. That would have been a saner path to carry on the politics of this country.

Our friend Shri Chandra Shekhar, the Prime Minister of the country, has sought the support of the Congress Party. I do not want to settle accounts with personalities. But as far as politics is involved, I would like to remind the House, that when Chandra Shekhar ji has sought the support of the Congress Party led by Shri Rajiv Gandhi, what are the views held by these two leaders of the two parties, about each other and their party organizations. I would like to point it out to you, in their very words- in the words of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. I will try to recall what he had said in this very House, on the floor of the House, regarding Chandra Shekhar ji and what Mr. Chandra Shekhar ji said about the Congress (I) and its leader Mr. Rajiv Gandhi.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: What about V. P. Singh?

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: Yes; I will quote everyone. However, I will not quote you, because you are not worth quoting. *(Interruptions)* I am coming to Mr. Chandra Shekhar. *(Interruptions)* In September 1987, our colleague Shri Chandra Shekhar had addressed a Press conference. What did he say in the Press conference? he said:

"Rajiv Gandhi is running a Government enmeshed in corruption. It is a Government of national shame. It has to go." "the party president Chandra Shekhar told newsmen at the Press conference in the capital.

The Janata leader said: " Mr. Gandhi has no mind of his own. He is still like a pilot who is used to get directions from the control tower."

I do not know where the control tower is located today. *(Interruptions)* Further, my colleague Chandra Shekhar ji said:

"While Mrs. Indira Gandhi was never in a position to be blackmailed by foreign Powers, Mr. Gandhi faces the prospect of blackmail by foreign countries", he said.

These are the views held by my friend Chandra Shekhar ji about Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his political party, whose support he is now seeking. *(Interruptions)* Under his leadership, and under his presidentship, a meeting of the General Council of the Janata Party was held at Bangalore and there, a resolution was passed pleading for a national alternative to the Congress with the Janata party as the nucleus, saying that the Prime Minister has forfeited his moral claim to continue in office, and his continuance in power is a threat to the unity and integrity of the country.

I can go through so many quotations, but I think this sample is quite sufficient to indicate what view he was trying to holding as far as the president of the Congress (I),

whose support he is seeking, today.

sir, in this very House, many colleagues in Parliament may recall that I had initiated debate on Punjab a number of times; and whatever our differences with Chandra Shekhar ji, during every debate on Punjab which I initiated, I spoke with pride about the bold stand that he had taken; we are proud of the association, and we shall continue to be proud of our association, and we shall never try to take a defensive attitude. I remember, on one occasion I was initiating a debate on Punjab, and there were certain observations made by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his Home Minister, Mr. Buta Singh. They were very much disturbed by the pronouncement that Chandra Shekhar ji had made after the Blue Star operations. They were disturbed by the discretions that he had made in defence, of the rights of the minorities like Sikhs? On one occasion when I was on my legs in the House, the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi asked me a straight question: "For these observations and statements of Chandra Shekhar ji, regarding the situation in Punjab which approximates to a point of view which goes against the interests of the nation, are you going to make a statement in the House? Are you going to take action against Shri Chandra Shekhar?" I got up and said, "Not only no question of action comes up, I told Mr. Buta Singh, it is none of your job what we do inside the party. Mr. Buta Singh, if I ask you for any action against your President Shri Rajiv Gandhi are you going to take action against Shri Rajiv Gandhi? Are you going to say anything?" Here is a case in which we agreed with the views expressed by Chandra Shekharji in defending the rights of the Sikh community. He was trying to assuage the hurt psyche of the Sikhs. And when our nationalism was challenged and national loyalty was challenged, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi I told you in this very House-Mr. Prime Minister, I am not referring to you; I am referring to the old Prime Minister-we had taken our lesson of patriotism and national loyalty at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi and Jayaprakash Narayan: it was too late in the day to take a lesson of patriotism from you,

Mr. Rajiv Gandhi." That is what I told you. We know what were your reaction about Chandra Shekharji. I want to recall those days. (*Interruptions*) I know what was your opinion, as far as he was concerned.

After the blue Star operation, we repeatedly referred to a number of developments that had taken place. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Mangalore): You shattered the economy. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: When I am talking about atrocities, he is talking about economy; when I talk about economy, he will talk about atrocities. (*Interruptions*) This is regarding November 1984 riots. This is a sensitive point for you. Whenever we raised the question of November 1984 riots in which atrocities were committed against innocent Sikh population in Delhi, even the Sikhs who suffered had said, "We have nothing against Hindus and Muslims in Delhi; it was Hindu and Muslim neighbours on that day who gave us the protection." But it was police and also the politically motivated individuals who were responsible for the atrocities against the Sikh community. When vandalism and *goondaism* was going on, you know the famous observation of the Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister said:

"When a big tree collapses, even the earth starts shaking"

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: You admit what I have said. (*Interruptions*) That was the justification what was given by them. (*Interruptions*) Even the commission that was appointed. had said, that on a broad estimate, about 3000 persons were killed. And when we raised this issue, this is the very same party, which is supporting the Prime Minister today, had attacked Chandra Shekharji and attacked whatever he had said about atrocities in Delhi. I would like you to remember that; and also I would like

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

Chandra Shekharji to remember what they had said. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga): What is it that we are discussing today? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We are discussing the vote of confidence in the new Prime Minister.

Now, let me come to the question of Bofors. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Has he got any right to speak on that? We asked the Prime Minister, V. P. Singh to lay on the Table call the papers. They did not do it. (*Interruptions*) There is no money to pay salary and he is talking about Bofors. What were they doing for 11 months?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Whenever we attack Bofors they feel as if they are attacked. They identify themselves with Bofors. (*Interruptions*) I am talking about the Bofors. I am not talking about the Congress (I). (*Interruptions*) I am talking about the Bofors, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about them. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You address me.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am addressing you, Sir. Unfortunately, some of them feel that Bofors is the surname of Congress (I). Therefore, whenever we attack the Bofors, they feel as if they are attacked.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: We asked you to lay all the papers but you never did it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, yes, rightly so, one of the Members raised the question about the laying of the papers on the Table of the House. Here are all the Members. All the non-Congress parties agreed with us. When we wanted to have some sensitive documents, the Swedish Government said that "If you want further

sensitive documents, you must not lay the documents already submitted to you on the Table of the House." We were prepared to lay them on the Table. We wanted more documents. Actually, the matter was pending before the Federal court in Switzerland. It is your tragedy that today when we are discussing this Motion, already the newspapers have carried the judgment of Swiss Court—the Federal Court—which gave the direction that all the documents that were there, which they were hiding under the veil of confidentiality, can be handed over to the Government of India for investigation. Now all the investigators of the Government of India, according to the Switzerland's Federal Court directive, will get all those copies of these papers. (*Interruptions*) Look at their way. Whenever I refer to those Bofors investigations they get disturbed as if they are standing in the dock.

Sir, I wish to make one thing explicitly clear. Unfortunately our Prime Minister Chandra Shekharji made one remark, off the cuff. I know him very well. Sometimes he makes remarks in a lighter vein and he made one statement, "that it is not the Prime Minister who is going to inquire into the Bofors deal and corruption. This has to be investigated by the Sub-Inspector of Police." That is what he has said. I know that Chandra Shekharji has a sense of humour as I also have got and therefore he wants to take it in a lighter vein. Chandra Shekharji, Chandra Shekhar residing at No. 3, South Avenue is different and Chandra Shekhar occupying the seat of the Prime Minister is different. When you made such an off the cuff remark that an important investigation of Bofors was not your responsibility, but that of Sub-Inspector of Police, do you realise that you have contradicted this House? It was this very House, which in its own wisdom, this House had decided to have a special Parliamentary Joint Committee to investigate into the Bofors episode. It is of course true that we did not approve of the terms of the reference of the Joint Committee the previous Prime Minister did not feel that Bofors deal should be investigated by the Sub-Inspector of Police.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Tripura West): I would like to say something. The ex-Prime Minister and the Ministers of the previous Government are misleading this House. In the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee we have decided to investigate into the Bofors issue and the out-going Prime Minister was the Defence Minister, and a letter came from the Secretary, Ministry of Defence, saying, "We cannot give any papers, give us time." That means they have denied papers even to the Members of the Public Accounts Committee. Now he is giving wrong information to the country. You put the whole papers about Bofors before the Public Accounts Committee. They refused to give them. (*Interruptions*)

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Fatehpur): Sir, on this matter the Comptroller General of Audit and Accounts had asked for the papers of all these files and whatever he had asked we had submitted to him. So, there was no concealment of any document that was required by the proper authority and the highest authority on this. The other thing which had been said is that we were pursuing this case and as stated in the House, we had won the case in Zurich. We have got a message today that the Federal Court has given a judgement in our favour. Why could not that Government do what we have achieved? This should be thoroughly probed... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: The Defence Secretary had refused to give the papers to the Committee. If necessary we will lay it on the Table of the House... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Sir, I am on a point of order. What transpires in the Committee are not to be discussed on the floor of the House unless and until report is submitted. How is he doing that? He must keep to the convention of the House... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I am

prepared to leave the Public Accounts Committee. But let me apprise what is Mr. V.P. Singh. He is misleading the House.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This should be expunged. This is never done unless the report is submitted... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, since my friend, Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev has raised a question, I would like to put the record straight. If you recall, the entire question was obstructed to some extent because of the veil of confidentiality. The matter was pending before the Switzerland Court. A.E. Services had already made an appeal that the documents should not be made available to the investigators of the Government of India. Fortunately, as ill-luck would have it for you., today only the Switzerland's Federal Court's judgement had appeared in the press and we can assure them that in addition to whatever was in our possession even the new documents that are available secret documents which were not available before the Switzerland's Court judgement will be now available to the entire House and the Public Accounts Committee. All those documents, Mr. Prime Minister, will be at your disposal. According to the Switzerland Courts, veil of secrecy has disappeared and, therefore, to your heart's content, Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev, you can carry on the work of the Public Accounts Committee and probe the issue... (*Interruptions*) Sir, I am not prepared to believe the reports in the press. But the press has stated that the new Prime Minister will be willing to withdraw the cases arising out of Bofors... (*Interruptions*)

AN HON MEMBER: Shame.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I do not say 'shame' because I do not believe in that report. I would only urge the new Prime Minister that especially after the new judgement of the Federal Court of Switzerland and after the new that had appeared in sections of the press that there seems to be some

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

pressure from the Congress party regarding the withdrawal of cases arising out of Bofors, while replying to the debate give a categorical assurance that no withdrawal of cases arising out of Bofors will be allowed. We would like to have that assurance from the Prime Minister. I am confident that the Prime Minister will give that assurance. I do not want to cast aspersions on him... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI (Amethi): I categorically say that we have not talked about Bofors at any point with Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, many things come in the Press. to be fair to the leader to the leader of the Congress Party, at no stage he had mentioned the name 'Bofors' to me during the last one month. If some friends feel satisfied by chanting Bofors all the time for solving all the problems of the country, I have nothing to say about it. But I assure my friends Shri Dandavate, that the law will take its own course and nobody will be spared. What I said was, and am saying in all seriousness is that the Prime Minister should not address himself all the time to the corruption cases. What I meant by 'Sub-Inspector' was that it is the investigating agency that does the job. I feel that the job of the Prime Minister is reconstruction, development and upliftment of the people and not investigating the cases. Any contrary position I am not going to accept.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: As Shri Rajiv Gandhi has clarified on the floor of the House that he has actually made no demand that the cases should be withdrawn, I am very happy about that assurance and at least that settles the controversy. As far as the Prime Minister is concerned, I say that I did not believe in the report. But it is good that on both the sides the issue is clarified. Now path will be paved for the safe conduct of all these cases. In addition to the Federal Court's judgement, I think proper steps will be taken to clinch the Bofors' issue.

I would like to raise a point regarding one more aspect. I am not raising it in the form of a point of order at all. I do not want to do it that way. But I would like to point out to you that as far as the construction of a new government and its membership is concerned, a very interesting construction is put on the very Rules of Procedure and the Constitution. We have enacted the Anti-Defection Law. We had a lot of debate in this very House. And today we find that a very interesting construction is being put as to what constitutes a defection, what constitutes a split which has actually led to the formation of the ruling party in cooperation with the Congress Party. Now in the first week of November, a list was submitted by the ruling party or a ruling faction I may call it, to the Speaker. I do not want to raise anything with which Mr. Speaker, you will be connected. But I want to raise something about the law its distortions and aberrations. Those of us who discussed the Anti-Defection Law threadbare in this House may recall an interpretation that was put by the constitutional experts on that very law. That interpretation makes it very clear that at any particular point of time when a split occurs or the defection takes place in fact, whether it is a split in itself is a challengeable proposition and you are in the possession of it— all of them are disqualified if they are less than one-third of the strength of the Party which they quit. I do not want to go into that. But even those who claim that they have caused the split and they have submitted the list to the Speaker in the first week of November, they are under the impression that there is, according to the rules, one month period for continuous process of defection. I have carefully studied the rule and Sir, you at least, bear in mind that in this House whenever I have spoken and interpreted the rules, have always tried to objectively place before the House the fair interpretation of the rule. There is one rule which says that when a new legislature party is formed, the details can be given and for that the period is one month. But when you do not form a new party on the basis of the verdict of the people and you try to break your own party and cause a split, that split defection is not to be brought into

the ambit of this rule. Some are under the impression that I can split the party on 5th or 6th November declare the names, give them to you, tell it to the press and then in driblets I can go on inducting the defectors every two days, three days, or four days. Every time more people come to the new party that is a new split. The rule complies that whenever there is a split, all the splits that take place later on, and you go on inducting the people, all those who enter your new party born out of split will have to be one-third of the total remainder that is left there behind and, Thus this continuous process of defection for one month cannot be erred process of defection carried on. That is one aspect that is to be noted. I would like to raise another question.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga): Does he accept that his party was split on the 5th of November? If so, what part he has played?

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: I made it clear Mr. Chidambaram that it is a matter under the consideration of the Speaker because when thirty people have violated the mandate and violated the Whip, whoever are left are less than one-third and, therefore, that question is also under the consideration of the Speaker.

DR. THAMBI DURAI (Karur): Prof. Madhu Dandavate has just said that split has not taken place. At the same time, he adds that after submitting the list many people are joining in the split group. It is a contradiction and also regarding the split hon. Speaker has not given his decision. It is not fair on our part to speak regarding the matter. I want to know whether you accept the split or not.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I would request Prof. Madhu Dandavate to understand the propriety of this discussion. If others also begun to discuss this question then it will be very difficult for you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to take positive view on the question. When the matter is under your consideration, if he wants to make some submission, I have nothing to say about it but he should know

that there is some limitation to our talk in the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: I am glad that Mr. Chandra Shekhar has reminded me about the limitation that I have got as a Member of Parliament. I have been here for last twenty years and I will not violate any rules that are framed. I am only trying to point out that in playing our political game, how we are trying to distort the traditions of the House and the Anti-Defection Law also. Sir, I did not say anything about your jurisdiction... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI KAPIL DEV SHASTRI (Sonapat): Please listen to me. I too have a right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I am not giving you permission to speak. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE: I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*)

I fully agree with the views of hon. Members including Mr. Chandra Shekhar, that we should not bring into the discussion the scope of the Presiding Authority. On the contrary for that very reason I want to point out to you that we should try to pose the political problems in such a way that the propriety regarding the Presiding Authority is not at all violated and the separate identity of the two Houses is not at all obliterated. I am very sorry to say that one of the spokesmen of the new Ruling Party tried to compare the actions of two Presiding Authorities. This should not be done for mere political ends. This House has certain traditions. Shri Somnath Chatterjee is sitting over here. I would refer to another Member of this House, Shri Somnath Chatterjee's father, Shri N.C. Chatterjee, who had been a Member of this Lok Sabha. I would like to raise one particular issue which is relevant to what is happening in politics today. On one occasion

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

when the other House—the Upper House—passed the Special Marriages Bill, Mr. N.C. Chatterjee who was Member of the Lok Sabha had said in one of the Conferences in Madras that “after all who have passed the Special Marriages Bill—a batch of urchins in the Upper House had passed the Special Marriages Bill.” And as a result of that though he was Member of this House, a Privilege Motion was brought against Mr. N.C. Chatterjee in the Rajya Sabha. Then the notice was communicated to Mr. N.C. Chatterjee. He was a Member of the Lok Sabha and issue was brought in the Rajya Sabha. So, Mr. N.C. Chatterjee brought a counter Privilege Motion in this very House. Shri Mavalankar was in the Chair. Please try to recall Mr. Speaker what type of glorious traditions you are inheriting in this House. Mr. Mavalankar the Speaker got up at 12 o’clock and he announced: that “I have received a notice a Privilege Motion from Mr. N.C. Chatterjee and his Privilege Motion is that though he is a Member of this House, Privilege Motion has been brought in another House. “The two Houses are independent. Their identity cannot be obliterated. And when he said that, the then Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru got up and angrily said: “This Member has brought the Privilege Motion but what type of remarks he passed against the other House? I do not think he can be tolerated.” The Speaker, Mr. Mavalankar then said: “Mr. Prime Minister, I do not agree with you. So long as I am the Speaker of this House, I will never allow my Member to be subjected to the jurisdiction of the other House. The two identities have to be retained and you cannot obliterate them.” I will also point out to you, Sir, that the spokesmen of the new ruling Party are openly comparing the judgements and the rulings given by the two presiding authorities of two Houses of Parliament. I would like to request the Prime Minister to restrain the Members. You can have the political game but while playing the political game do not try to bring the separate identity of the two Houses and the ruling of the two presiding authorities—the Speaker and the Chairman—into dispute.

That is the point that I would like to bring to your notice.

While initiating the Motion, my friend Shri Chandra Shekharji said that even when the BJP had withdrawn the support, we tried to cling to power. Today only the President has made a statement that whenever there is any question of testing the majority, it must be done on the floor of the House. Apart from that, I would like to reply to another point made by the Prime Minister. He said. “They tried to cling to power even the withdrawal of support by BJP.” If Mr. V.P. Singh were to cling to power and continue as the Prime Minister, the softest option available to him was to have a compromise with Mr. Advani, have a compromise with Vishwa Hindu Parishad, and tell them that we are prepared to accept their conditions...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, Dandavateji says that he would not compromise with the Congress. I would like to say that he sent us two feelers from two senior Cabinet Ministers.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, as far as Congress is concerned, I tell you this is a blatant untruth...*(Interruptions)* I shall never make any overtures to the Congress.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Mirdha is sitting here. He spoke to me personally. Perhaps he would like to clarify that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, as far as I am concerned, my cardinal principle is that we shall fight the Congress tooth and nail, both inside and outside...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA (Nagaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did meet Rajivji. Everyone was present there. Now, Shri Chandra Shekhar has said that it is in the interest of the country. I had also said the same thing that under the present circumstances the atmosphere in the country can be made congenial only through mutual discussion.

[English]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, if I can remind Mr. Mirdha and it was not only Mr. Mirdha, Mr. Fernandes also contacted me... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

Let me finish it, since this matter has been raised.

[English]

Sir, these are things one does not normally bring out into the public, but as Mr. Dandavate is presenting such a picture of honourable behaviour, I think it is necessary to bring these things out.

Sir, we were given two clear feelers. Mr. Mirdha can deny it if he likes, but what he said to Mr. Kurien and then he said to me, was that by any means let us protect Mr. V.P. Singh on the 7th of November.' (Interruptions) And he was willing to have any compromise with the Congress provided we saw Mr. V.P. Singh through on the 7th. We said, 'No'. (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Those of you... (Interruptions) Yes, I am making it clear. I had stated it very clearly, for the last 40 years of my political career, I have never indulged in this clandestine behaviour and he has not been able to give any proof that I have sent the message. Sir, on a number of occasions... (Interruptions) There is not even one occasion.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: He must apologise. He said, it is a 'blatant untruth'. It is confirmed by Mr. Mirdha. He must apologise now.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Not at all. Sir, neither Mirdha nor... (Interruptions)

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao): Sir, stop these... **... from

giving sermons. (Interruptions) You are ...**... giving sermons.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Faleiro, please take your seat. He is not yielding.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, he is trying to call us '...'.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, can a Member refer to another Member as '.....'? (Interruptions) He is calling Mr. Dandavate a '.....'

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Your calling me a '.....' does not carry any weight.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is using the word "....." (Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: His calling me a '.....' does not carry any weight at all. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have not heard it. If he has said it, it will be expunged.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Faleiro is a senior Member of this House, he was a Member of the Council of Ministers and it would not do merely to expunge it. His remark is so obnoxious, so objectionable that he should withdraw it, he should apologise. (Interruptions)

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: His speeches do not go with his behaviour. These speeches are destroying the country. You have destroyed the finances of this country.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat and be calm, Mr. Faleiro.

[English]

I will still give a chance to Mr. Faleiro to make amends.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Faleiro, the word you have used.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What can I do? I say, you must apologise.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Please tell him to withdraw the word. He has not withdrawn it.

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karol Bagh): What he has said is objectionable, it should be expunged.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. In the past, for using such abusive language, Mr. K.K. Tiwary was sent out of the House and somewhere else he was brought to the bar of Parliament and was given a reprimand. When he is using such a word, he must be asked to withdraw it. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Please sit down.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not hear what he said because of the noise. But if that word was used, I apologise for my Member and I request him to withdraw it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, let him apologise.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us hear Mr Faleiro. I still think Mr. Faleiro can make amends.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Let Mr. Dandavate apologise for misleading the House. (Interruptions) He said that they have not sought the support of the Congress. This is false, Mr. Mirdha and Mr. Fernandes... (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has to apologise for using the word '...' against me.

MR. SPEAKER: I again ask Mr. Faleiro to respond.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr Chandra Shekhar, this is the company you are keeping now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Sir, it was not my intention to use any unparliamentary word. But then I was shocked and the whole House is shocked by the empty speeches which mislead the House. (Interruptions) Therefore, I expect Mr. Dandavate to apologise for misleading the House and I apologise for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Faleiro has apologised. I have heard it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, do I take it that the hon. Member has apologised to the House for calling me a '.....'?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now the leader of the Opposition has named me and said that I had approached him for his support.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, please resume your seat.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has said that I approached him for his support. I have not even talked to him till date. Despite this, I do not know how he has claimed that I approached him for lending support in favour of our Government.

[English]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not say that Mr. Fernandes contacted me. What I said was, Mr. Mirdha contacted me. I said Mr. Fernandes telephoned to Mr. Sharad Pawar in Bombay. He asked Mr. Sharad Pawar to come to Delhi to talk about the details. Sharad Pawarji phoned me; I said: 'yes, let us find out what is in his mind. He came to Delhi, he talked with him and he gave us offers which we rejected. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it would be a matter of great shame for him if I divulge here whatever Shri Sharad Pawar and many other leaders of his party remarked about him while they came to meet me to discuss this matter. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, I want to make clear one point to the Leader of the Opposition or the supporter of the Government. He has categorically said that approaches were made to him that on 7th any compromise can be made to support the existing Government. I categorically deny it. It is a**..... it is an untruth and he must apologise for that. (Interruptions)

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Mr. Speaker, Sir. He has used the word '.....' It is unparliamentary; it should be expunged. (Interruptions)

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): Sir, '.....' is unparliamentary Madhuji will bear

me out. Madhuji had raised the question several times and it has been declared unparliamentary. (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, instead of '.....' I say 'untruth'. (Interruptions)

13.00 hrs.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: We demand an apology from him. Now we demand an apology from Mr. V.P. Singh. He has used an unparliamentary word. Just like Mr. Faleiro has apologised, he should apologise. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Let us hear him.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR (Kishanganj): I have seen personally signed letters asking for support. (Interruptions)

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

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat. Yes, Mr. V.P. Singh.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Instead of the word '.....' I will say "untruth".

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: It is not adequate, Sir. We demand an apology.

SHRI CHANDRASHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I very humbly request all the Members to understand each other's point of view. I shall request specially Rajivji not to press this point because truth is getting out and some people are feeling uncomfortable. You should have some sympathy with them.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: One basic truth has come to that even before this split, for more than a month they were in

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

touch. They did not discuss Bofors but they discussed how to split the Party. At least, that truth has been corroborated by both. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding. I am in the Opposition now.

Sir, I want to make it clear. If it was the question of saving the Government, we could have compromised with the BJP and we could have saved the Government. But we took a conscious decision that we will sacrifice the Government but will not compromise the BJP on this issue.

So, it is very clear that there was no question of saving the Government. With open eyes, we sacrificed the Government on 23rd itself. There was no question of saving the Government. It was a question of saving the issue.

About feelers which you have mentioned, may I tell you, many Members of the Congress—if I were to take names, I can mention many—contacted me saying, they were fed up with the leadership sitting here; they want to walk out of the Congress. (*Interruptions*) He has mentioned the name of Shri Sharad Pawar. I do not want to say anything about what he said in confidence.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Let us name them.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: He should be careful about the feelers that he sent to us. It will not be quite safe for Shri Rajiv Gandhi. He should be careful.

[*Translation*]

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER (SHRI DEVILAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is truth in this matter. Nothing is hidden now from anyone. A special plane was sent to bring me here. At that time I was in Dhulia district. My friend, Shri Pritish Nandi, because of whom I was dismissed earlier, was also sent there to bring me back soon. First of all, I was told on the telephone that Shri Advani had

not taken any decision till that time. I told him to take some action. He persisted on me that I should come soon. I told him that I would reach there two days later. But he could not wait for two days and that very night a special plane was sent to carry me here from Dhulia district which is 160 miles away from Nasik. Shri Pritish Nandi was sent in that aircraft. After my arrival I told him that one should learn how to rule first, before ruling the country. I placed two proposals before him one was to withdraw support from the Rajasthan Government and to ask Shri Chimanbhai to sack the Ministers belonging to the B.J.P. in his Cabinet as the B.J.P. had withdrawn its support from the Union Government. The second was to contact Shri Sharad Pawar. I suggested two names but he sent George Saheb there. When I asked him whether there was some hope he replied that efforts were going on. When I asked who has been sent to contact Shri Sharad Pawar? He said 'Wait and Watch'. George Fernandes spoke to Shri Sharad Pawar and urged him to save the Government by any means. But it could not be done. There is truth in it.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: In the recent political crisis, BJP has held together, Left Front has held together, and our Party held together. The only person who could not hold his Members and who has split his Party and divided his Party, is Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They are very happy about the break up of other's marriages. That is the vicarious satisfaction that they derive.

Having placed before the House, various distortions and aberrations that have taken place, I would like to refer to a very dangerous trend that has come into the political affairs today. We have seen Lok Sabha set up from 1952 up to 1989 and in 1990. But unfortunately... (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding. I would like to point out to you the most dangerous trend that has entered into politics today. We have seen the Lok Sabha elections from 1952 onwards up to 1989. Also, we have seen the reconstitution

of various types of Ministries. Sir I do not want to make any allegation against any individual 'X' or 'Y' here because that is not the tradition of this House. But please go to every lane and by-lane in Delhi today. You go to journalists. You go to Correspondents. You go to foreign journalists. They will tell you the most dangerous trend that has entered into the political set up today namely, the horse-trading based on the sale and purchase that is taking place today... (*Interruptions*) Sir, it is a very dangerous trend with this horse trading one day, at one particular point of time, one Organisation may gain. At another point of time, another Organisation may gain. But in the entire process the political party system will be totally destroyed. Today, you ask Correspondents, of various journals. They will tell you what is the seat of power in Ashoka Hotel. They talk about the split. They talk about horse-trading. If you allow horse-trading on the basis of sale and purchase of people's representatives, remember that whichever party survives and whichever party dies, the Parliamentary Democracy will definitely die in this country. It is a dangerous weapon, a double edged weapon. I want to warn this House in the end that as far as the healthy political life is concerned, we have to take precaution to see that industrialist do not try to teach us political morality. One industrialist the other day was saying while we were going out of Parliament, "if you had followed political morality, and changed your leader your Government would have been saved." I said: "Gentleman, carry on your own industrial business. Do not try to teach lessons of morality to those of us who have been in the movement for 40 years and more. We do not want to learn political morality from you." The point is that institutions are getting destroyed. Horse-trading is taking place. Money power is having an upper hand. We will have to take note of that. With our Prime Minister, I will just have a friendly word. You are seeking the support of the Congress Party. You do it at your own risk. You will survive to see the experiment in the future. We too will survive to see the experiments in the future. Today, we are bidding good-bye to each other. But I am sure

after you learn from the experiences of these people which they demonstrated in 1979, a time may come when we will have to share our experiences and come to a conclusion about the future. With this note, as a compulsion of duty and democratic norms, I totally oppose the Motion that has been moved by my colleague and friend the Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stand adjourned for Lunch to re-assemble at 2.15 p.m.

13.13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till 15 minutes past Fourteen of the clock

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at eighteen minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

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

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to point out one thing before inviting Shri Advani to speak.

[*English*]

The question whether there has been a split in the Janata Dal in terms of the Tenth Schedule to the Constitution of India and other related matters are, as the House is aware, under my consideration. I shall, therefore, request Members not to raise that issue in the House.

Now Shri Advani to start.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): So, that issue is nullified.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

PROF.P.J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): We should like to know whether in the light of your ruling what has been already narrated by Mr. Madhu Dandavate will form part of the record or not. In the light of your ruling, will you go through that.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It does not follow from my ruling.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will see.

[Translation]

SHRI R.N. RAKESH (Chail): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have come to know just now that my name has been mentioned in some poster which appeared in connected with recent incidents in Delhi.

MR. SPEAKER: When was it mentioned?

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: On the 14th November, Sir, my name appeared in a poster though I am not fully aware of it. I know nothing about it as I have not participated in any meeting at all. I am in no way related to this. *(Interruptions)* If my name has been mentioned in any such a poster, I request you to order a thorough inquiry into this matter and take stern action against those who have mischievously printed my name in the poster. I am not concerned with it. The deeds for which I have been blamed for, might have been committed in my name in the poster. I condemn it. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You may resume your seat now as your personal explanation is over.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: Thank you Sir. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, only the member of the opposition have spoken so far on the confidence motion moved by the Hon. Prime Minister. I wish that some speech should be delivered by the members of the ruling side also. Sir, let some one else speak in favour before Shri Advaniji speaks. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): I would again submit to you that an Opposition leader has spoken against the Confidence Motion. In fairness to the House and for the purpose to proper debate, it would be appropriate if some one who is in favour of the Motion speaks and then I am called upon to speak.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Otherwise let them declare that nobody wants to support the Motion. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I understand your point. That is why I am calling upon Mr. Janardhanan to speak.

[Translation]

*SHRI KADAMBUR M.R. JANARDHANAN (Tirunelveli): Hon. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of AIADMK and the people of India including the Tamil masses, I would like to support the motion of confidence moved by Hon. Prime Minister Shri Chandrashekharji.

I would request the new Prime Minister to create confidence in the Indian people. They have lost their confidence in the last eleven months and I hope, we are sure, the new Prime Minister who has travelled out Bharat right from Kanyakumari to Himalayas will be knowing the minds of the Indian people, the poorer sections of the Indian people. They are still suffering and I am sure

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in . . . Tamil.

the new Prime Minister Chandrasekharji will scale upto the mark and create confidence in the people of India who lost their confidence in the last eleven months.

I am sorry to say that Prof. Madhu Dandavate remarked that today is the saddest day in India. But we hope that this is the happiest day in the Indian history. In eleven months, the Government has been changed purely on principles of code. But these people, the MPs who have been elected by the people of India are true and they stand by the Gandhian way and not by the other ways like the foreign powers. Without any blood-shed by just following the great democratic way, the change has taken place.

Thiruvalluvar, the great saint poet of Tamil Nadu, says in a couplet which means you tell a word which cannot be won by another word. But in the morning we saw how the greatest leaders were quarreling for one word.

*Since we hail from such a glorious tradition, we feel that the confidence which the people have lost, has been restored by the Hon. new Prime Minister. Let the august House know that this Government which is being supported by our dynamic leader Hon. Selvi Jayalalitha and Hon. Shri Rajiv Gandhi has in turn being supported by the people outside who in 1989 rejected lock stock and barrel the Government presently in Tamil Nadu.

We are now fulfilling the wish of the Tamil Nadu people by supporting this motion.

*Over the past 2 years, we have been placing before this House several issues for the consideration of the Central Government. On several occasions, we had pointed out to the incidents of disruption of peace in Tamil Nadu. These have fallen on deaf ears. The National Front Government turned a Nelson's eye to the whole problem. On the other hand, they supported the Tamil Nadu Government to the hilt.

But, today, with a heavy heart, I am recounting the sorry state of affairs in the State. The Indian Express newspaper has published a news item. Hon. Prime Minister must kindly take a serious note of it. The opinion in the news item was not expressed by an MP or an MLA, not even by a Minister. It is the opinion of the Air Vice Marshal Ramdas. The news item is under the caption "Lankan Tamils let off by TN. Government." It is about how the Tamil Nadu Government nakedly violated law by releasing the smugglers held captive by the naval forces. The militants are being fanned out into all the districts of Tamil Nadu by the Government of Tamil Nadu. Kamraj District, Chidambaranar district and Hon. Muthuramalingam district where the activities of the militants are in full swing and on the increase to the detriment of peace. In such a situation, we place our utmost confidence in the Hon. Prime Minister Shri Chandrasekhar that a solution will be soon found to this problem haunting Tamil Nadu for the past 2 years.

As far as religion is concerned, our stand is whatever the religion may be, we take all religions equal.

*The Hon. Prime Minister who had undertaken padayatra and won the hearts of the people will definitely take steps to improve the present communal situation.

*Sir, systems of political management have been changed in many countries including Russia and other communist countries. These countries have opted for democracy which is thriving for centuries in India.

*Sir, I must take the opportunity of drawing your attention to the very low standards of writing by a Tamil weekly. It is a reputed weekly. It says that the 525 members of this Lok Sabha fear elections.

It says "we are living in fearness; we do not want to face the people." I humbly request the Hon. BJP members and others: Are we

[Sh. Kadambur M.R. Janardhanan]

afraid of people? We are never afraid of the people. But the Press is afraid of the people. The election held in 1989 was a battle between the Press and the People. The Press has won in the North and the people have won in the South.

* Sir, the weekly I had referred to had drawn a cartoon depicting members of Parliament running away from elections. That is not the truth. Take my case. I scared 2.75 lakhs votes in the last but one election and I scored 3.84 lakhs in the last elections.

Nearly I have secured 1.9 lakhs more than what I have secured in the last election.

*We can only hope that as we are in a pivotal position, our status cannot be allowed to be assailed by the Press this way. These imputations must be curbed. What is the state of affairs today in India. How many innocent lives have been lost in communal and religious clashes.

We have lost more people in the communal and religious clashes than in the second world war. Are we not responsible for the lives of the Indian people?

*We hope that the communal and religious clashes will be averted by the Hon. Prime Minister Chandrasekharji.

Confidence has been created in the minds of the Indian people by the new Prime Minister after his visit to Sadar Bazar area in Delhi.

We have confidence in you. He had told in the press that he would not take a vindictive attitude towards bureaucrats and the Opposition Member.

*You have rightly said:

"I would not stand on personal prestige as Prime Minister in negotiating problematic times."

"The readiness for negotiations has infused a new hope in the minds of the people. The earlier Government, in contrast, invited people with conditions for talks which led to so much loss of life.

Following Gandhiji, father of the nation, not only the Prime Minister but also we, the MPs of every constituency must be ready to face the people and talk with them. They may hit us. They may sold us. They may kill us. But we must have the tolerance to face them.

I am a follower of Anna and MGR. I am a poor man coming from my constituency for the second time with a greater majority of votes. In a Tamil Magazine, Anana Vikatan, all the MPs or Maharajas are criticised that they live a princely life and are afraid to face the people. I request all the leaders in this House.

(Interruptions)

Let us talk only about the problem. Let us not interfere. Let us have tolerance and patience to hear each other. Then only, will we be able to drive our country to the Himalayan success.

One more, I repose our full confidence in the new Prime Minister hoping that he will create confidence among the Indian people.

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the confidence motion moved by Prime Minister, Shri Chandra Shekhar.

Today, as I said in November last when Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh moved his confidence motion, the debate cannot be on the performance of this Government because this Government has just taken over. For that, there will be subsequent occasions when we can discuss—if today this Government is able to get a vote of confidence from the Parliament—how it has fared, how it has performed. Today, we can think only

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Tamil.

about the nature of this Government. Just as I said last time in November, 1989, we can only debate about the implications of the mandate, and our interpretation of the mandate and frame our attitude to the Government on that basis.

When I oppose this motion, I have three principal reasons, one of which has been referred to by my friend Shri Dandavate. I hold that this Government has no popular mandate. It is not only so. I also hold that the formation of this Government is a violation of the popular mandate. That mandate, however you interpret it, was positively anti-Congress. The Congress which has a strength of over 400 in the last Lok Sabha was brought down by the people of this country after five years to a strength of hardly 190 and odd, may be 192 or 193.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is 212. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Everyone knows it. Now, I do not know of any democracy where this kind of a change in the strength of the Ruling Party in two consequent elections is not accepted by everyone, including the Ruling Party, as a rejection of the earlier Government. It was a positive vote against the Congress Party and so, any Government formed with the support of that Party which was rejected in 1989 just cannot claim to have a popular mandate. This is obvious and patent. This is my first reason as to why I say that my party cannot support this Motion. Regarding the immense embarrassment such a party faces, I need not elaborate. If we were of some research and go through the speeches made during last year by Members who are in the ruling party today and see as to what they spoke about the Congress Party and the Leader of the Congress Party, I am sure that we will get numerous samples of the kind that my friend Dandavateji earlier recounted and its leader Mr. Chandra Shekhar's observations about the Congress Party and Shri Rajiv Gandhi. There are numerous samples. I remember that in that very Confidence debate in December, 1989, the opening speaker was Mr.

Janeshwar from the Ruling Party.

SHRI R.N. RAKESH: It was when Mr. V.P. Singh was here.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: No, in 1989, he was here and at that time, the principal spokesman, the opening batsman and the opening speaker was Shri Janeshwar. He has also to go through his own speech at that time and find out as to what he said about the Congress Party, how corrupt it was, how it was dividing the people and pursuing the policy of divide and rule and on that basis ruling the country for so many years. He has to go through his own speech. I did not go into it. And perhaps, everyone of those 63 or 68—I just do not know—who are supporting Shri Chandra Shekhar has reason to feel embarrassed.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is 75.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: All right. Every one of them has reason to feel embarrassed and when you act against popular mandate, you will always be facing embarrassment. Anyone who acts against the popular mandate will feel embarrassed. I am not going to say what a mandate is though I recount so many definitions. Essentially, it is a contractual obligation that we have with our electorate. But if you express confidence in us, then we, on the basis of this programme, shall carry it out and we will be faithful to what we have promised you. If we have promised you that we are going to keep the Congress out of power, then I shall see to it...

DR. THAMBI DURAI (Karur): Will you please yield for a moment?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I cannot yield. I have just started. I have not said anything as yet... (*Interruptions*) ...A mandate is a contractual obligation which every Member of Parliament and every Government has with the electorate. Now, suddenly I find that the party which is in office today, instead of a contract with the people, has a contract with the Congress Party. It has been substituted by a contract with the Congress Party... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Rakesh please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: In this case what had happened was, when Shri V.P. Singh resigned, this Government resigned,— the President called the Leader of the Opposition and asked him whether he was in a position to form a viable Government. If Shri Rajiv Gandhi has accepted the invitation and said: "Yes, I am willing to form a Government", I would say that the Government that would have been formed would also have been without a popular mandate, but it would nevertheless have had legitimacy, because it would be in conformity with the rules of the parliamentary game. According to these rules, if any Government resigns, then the Head of the State is obliged to call the Leader of the Opposition and ask him: "Are you in a position to form a Government?" And if he volunteers: "Yes, I am going to form a Government", and he forms a Government that Government may not have a majority support of the people, but nevertheless it would have legitimacy, I find that when Shri Rajiv Gandhi met the President and came out to meet the press, he very rightly said: "I have declined to form a new Government, because we do not have the majority mandate from the people". This is precisely the correct thing to do. Therefore, if he said that, I respect him for that, but I do not respect him for trying to form a Government which does not have a majority support, majority mandate, but even lacks legitimacy. This Government lacks political legitimacy. What is the basis of this Government? The Prime Minister himself has described it somewhere as being a Government of exigency. Exigency is a good word, but I would like to think that it is a Government of expediency, not exigency. Nothing more.

I just cannot conceive how a person like Shri Chandra Shekharji could accept this. Not that I agree with all those who say that he will be doing whatever Congress wants him to do etc. I know him better than that, and I think that he would try to act independently.

But the limitations are so obvious that anyone can see it and, therefore, it just surprises me that he should have accepted the situation.

First of all, this Government does not have a popular mandate. Secondly, it lacks political legitimacy and the third reason which I think is no less important is that for the first time, we have a Government in this country which is not ideology-based, which is not programme-based either. I can even conceive of Governments and parties—we have seen them in the country—which are not ideology-based, which are not programme-based, but which are very often leader-based. We have seen them. But in this case, I am unable to include this party and this Government even in that category. Of course relationship is someone can say that the new group is related to a leader, but the relationship is not acceptance of a leader, but rejection of a leader. Only to that extent, it can be called leader-based, otherwise I sometimes feel amazed to think of the people who have abandoned, the J.D. how only the other day a person in the Council of Ministers acting virtually his Home Minister suddenly crosses over and goes to the other side. How does it happen? If a party of that kind forms the Government, can it really endure, can it really serve the people, because that is more important?

I recall, that since sometime, there were ideas floating around; that why not have a national Government. I respect the rules of this House where we do not refer to certain people in high offices. But it is true that the idea was seriously mooted for the formation of a National Government. And the arguments that were being given, I could appreciate them. The arguments that were given were that the economy is in a very bad shape; the country is under external threats which are really very serious and about which we cannot talk outside; besides, there is tension in society of all kinds casteist, communal, religious, etc. In such a situation, if there is a moratorium on political controversy, say for a period of one year, it will be in the best interest of the country. I could understand

these arguments and conceive weight in them though I had pointed out the difficulties also but I cannot conceive that because of this situation a Government of the present kind should be allowed to be formed. I could not understand that and I could not agree with that. I would only ask is this present Government, this kind of Government with 60, 63, or 68 Members supported by a party of 193 and certain other supporting parties which adds up to 205 or 210...

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD SHAFI: It is 220.

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: O.K. let us take it as 220. I am even ready to take it as 420.

[English]

is this not too fragile a base to build a party upon and is it not too slender a base to sustain a Government? How could I or my party support a Government of this kind?

I was listening to the Prime Minister and the only point that he made in his opening speech was that he was not responsible for the fall of V.P. Government. I do not disown my own share. Indeed I would have been unhappy in spite of withdrawal of my Party's support Government did not fall. Therefore, I do not disown responsibility for the fall of that Government though I cannot justify the split of that party without any issue, without any ideology and without any basic difference. Whether it is the temple issue or the Mandal Commission, members holding contradictory views are on both sides of the fence. So, it is not any issue which led to the split. Reasons are elsewhere.

Sir, before this debate commenced you made certain observations in respect of the claim made by the two sections about the split, therefore, I do not want to go into that at all. But because my friends Shri Dandavate has referred to the issue I would say that we has passed this anti-Defection Law some

year back. I feel it is high time that a parliamentary committee review the functioning of that law. During the last 4-5 years, how has it worked? After all, there have been several Committees to consider this problem of defection. There was a Committee formed way back in 1967 or 1968 in which even Jaiprakash Narayan was there. Shri Kunjru was there and other very eminent people were there. They made certain recommendations. Subsequently, there were two or three parliamentary committees which also went into the question. A law was enacted in 1985 recommendations. Now, it is time that we go into working of this law.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You were there during emergency.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Yes, I was arrested there. (*Interruptions*)

I may mention that when there was a Committee on electoral reforms we had referred to that. We also made certain recommendations. I think now it is high time we go thoroughly into this question. On the one hand we should keep in mind that this evil of defection is curbed and on the other hand the law should be such as enables the party system to stabilise. A point was made by Dandavateji also and I think that this is a matter which has to be taken cognizance of by all; that you should not allow these money-bags, these big capitalists and industrialists to play havoc with the political system.

DR. THAMBI DURAI: Who are the Capitalists and industrialists who control over political systems? I would like to know whether he can name any Member who has received money. He should not make allegations like this. This is not a fact. He should tell us the name of the Member who has received the money.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, he has yielded to me. Mr. Advani has referred to certain recommendations with regard to the Anti-Defection Law. I would like to know whether in those recommendations one of the recommendations says

[Sh. Saifuddin Choudhury]

that the defector should not be allowed to hold a ministerial post for one year at least..

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: That was the recommendation of the first Committee in which J.P. was also there, but those recommendations were not accepted, not implemented and subsequently the Parliamentary Committee recommended the law in its present form were not mentioned. As the law stands today but it does not prohibit a person from becoming a Minister. The law also recognises the fact of split. But there is a clear case for review of the entire anti-Defection legislation to ensure that defections which are an evil, where a person is lured away from a certain party on the basis of some consideration, is prohibited and on the other hand if a party is in a position in which people cannot work together and there is a split, that split is also recognised. How to do that is the problem. But when split takes place, if you take recourse to subterfuge of various kinds then the problem does become complicated.

This morning, the Prime Minister reacting to what Dandavateji has said about Bofors an unfortunate remark once again. The first unhappy remark that he made was when he said that this is a matter which has to be dealt with not by the Prime Minister but by a sub-inspector of the police. He tried to explain that today. Today while explaining he went on to say that there were some people who think that the country's problem could be solved if they kept on chanting 'Bofors'. I am certainly not one of those. But I do believe that Bofors is an issue which cannot be dismissed lightly. It cannot be shoved beneath the carpet. In the last 40 years, very often, the issue of political corruption has been raised in various elections and so many rackets have been talked about. but I do not know of a single scandal which has become so incorporated in the vocabulary of the common man as the word 'Bofor'. So, I would plead, particularly after today's decision by the Court in Switzerland which says very clearly...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The

same allegation had been made against Feroze Gandhi when he raised the Mundhra scandal. He rightly replied it on the floor of the House.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The Federal Court of Switzerland has rejected the appeal made by the entities behind AE Services and ruled that the bank documents with details of some of the illegal pay offs made in connection with Bofors India Howitzer deal be transferred to the Indian investigators.

Further "this sensational development in the highest Court of Switzerland confirms, if confirmation is necessary, that the amount of 7.6 million dollars at 1986 rate paid by the Bofors to the AE Services was a bribe and not winding up charges as it was made out to be". I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister not to view it as a single scandal. He must view it in this manner that if at the highest levels of public life, there are people indulging in malfeasance and getting away with it, and the entire penal machinery of the State is engaged only in catching petty thieves here and there. The authority of the State would be undermined. After all this Bofors is a clear and patent case of gross and serious financial malfeasance. About this, there can be no two opinions. Whoever is guilty, and wherever they may be, whether on this side or on that, they ought to be punished. I would also like to say that though this matter has come three years back, constantly there has been an attempt at a cover-up. In case of the ruling party that was earlier in office, accuse them of a sins of commission. With the NF Government, I accuse them of a sin of commission or perhaps lethargy.

Buy so far as Chandra Shekharji is concerned, he is in a position to see the whole thing with an absolutely open mind.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Will he be allowed to do so? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Today the leader of the Congress Party has said that they have not spoken about Bofors at all. The Prime

Minister himself has confirmed that the issue of Bofors has never been discussed. I am going to accept the Prime Minister's word about it. I would request him not to delay it in the least and in the next session on the very first day all the Bofors papers must be laid on the Table of the House. He must let the House know the truth. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga): I am very happy that Mr. Advani has, one year after we made the demand, belatedly recognised the wisdom of our demand and supported our demand that the papers be laid on the Table. Shri V.P. Singh is not in his seat but I am happy that Shri Advani recognised that the demand being made by the Congress for the last one year, is a justified one.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I am happy to find that the Prime Minister himself has landed the demand made by me meaning thereby that he is going to do it on the first day of the next session.

PROF. RAMGANESH KAPSE (Thane): When will there be a next session?

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir I am glad that Advaniji has made my task very easy. I only hope that after putting the papers on the Table of the House, the Government should not be accused that further investigation was not made possible. I want to make this very clear. I have no intention to conceal any fact, nor to save any person. I will be the first person to lay all the information on the Table of the House because I was telling in the beginning of my speech that this is a matter which is agitating the minds of our people and putting the whole country in the very embarrassing situation.

15.00 hrs.

I think that this country will be saved from this embarrassment. Whoever is found guilty, should be punished or he should be brought before the people. When I say that

this is not the job of the Prime Minister, I think Bofors is a good scandal, but this is not the national problem to which the Prime Minister should devote all his attention. That is what I want to say.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: There are so many issues to which you have to devote the attention. This cannot be the only issue. I wish to draw attention to yet another case, i.e. 1984 riots. In those 1984 riots, according to the Government's own admission, 2700 persons had been killed, yet a single had been punished, this certainly affects the authority and reputation of the establishment. *(Interruptions)* Only this morning, Shri Malhotra, Shri Khurana and Shri Kalka Das referred to the happenings in Delhi in the last two days, singularly unfortunate happenings. Everyone knows that the authorities had advance information of the proposed procession. A Meeting had been held four or five days back where a procession of this kind, in which the Muslims of Delhi and the Sikhs of Delhi were called upon to participate and to highlight the "atrocities" being perpetrated on minorities etc. I am really very happy that the Sikhs of Delhi have not associated themselves with this procession and all the representative organisations of the Sikhs have condemned this procession. I am also happy that none of the responsible-even though I may disagree with them-representative body of the Muslims also have associated themselves with the procession as such, day before yesterday, though some of them had associated themselves with the first meeting that was held where this decision was taken. That is a happy indication. To that extent I welcome the situation. But I do think that when it has happened in Delhi and it has happened immediately after four incidents are reported where *Granth Sahib* is burnt there from Punjab and one from Delhi this is a matter which should be taken very seriously. There is a statement by the Governor of Punjab. I have no way of verifying it that Pakistan has succeeded in sending some agents, provocateurs, into India who are up to mischief of this kind. This is a matter which should be taken very seriously I demand that a judicial

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

inquiry must be held in view of the happenings in Delhi day before yesterday in which this particular aspect which has been brought out by the Governor of Punjab also should be thoroughly investigated. Because I am sure that if such people have succeeded in infiltrating into the country, they would be going about doing mischief not only in Delhi but elsewhere also.

I have one or two more points to make. Six of my colleagues visited Ayodhya three days back and the kind of stories that they have come and told me are horrifying. I cannot believe that in a free India this kind of situation can develop and particularly I felt unhappy that the Prime Minister before he had become Prime Minister, participating in the Confidence Vote debate, the other day, defended the U.P. Government and the Chief Minister of U.P. in a manner as if to say that nothing wrong has happened and all that happened was necessary. It had to be done. I wish he could go through some of the video tapes that are available freely now-a-days as to what exactly happened, how it happened. Those video tapes do not lie and you would see that absolutely innocent, absolutely peaceful Kar Sewaks or pilgrims were brutally fired upon, lathi-charged, tear gased in a manner which has never happened before. I can understand a violent mob coming there, and policemen being forced to use the force against them. But there was no violence of any kind people were absolutely non-violent, sitting down and chanting *Ram Dhun*; and they were brutally attacked by the police; And this is defended. I think that the Prime Minister should Associate himself from all that has happened...*(Interruptions)* The crimes committed in Ayodhya on the 30th November and 2nd November...*(Interruptions)* are an inefaceable stigma...*(Interruptions)* I am not yielding...*(Interruptions)*

I am not yielding...*(Interruptions)* I am not yielding to anyone. They can reply in their own turn. *(Interruptions)* I have referred to it because, as I said...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mayawatiji, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please resume your seat, Mayawatiji. The speech of any member other than Shri Advaniji will not go on record. Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)[*English*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I own responsibility. I did not say that it was Chandra Shekhar Ji who brought down this Government. I said: "My party owns the responsibility", because I believe that the Central Government was guilty of criminal mishandling of the Ayodhya issue, and the U.P. Government was guilty of the worst type of atrocities. *(Interruptions)* I said it the other day also that I now the responsibility. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Two other issues are there. One issue was referred to by Mr. Janardhanan. Mr. Janardhanan referred to the situation in Tamil Nadu. I think that the Government owes it to the people of India to take immediate note of that; and it is really a very serious situation that in any State, whether it is Tamil Nadu or whether it is Assam, militants are carrying on their activities with the patronage of the State Government. *(Interruptions)* After all, we are facing militancy. *(Interruptions)* The country is facing militancy and terrorism even in Kashmir, even in Punjab. But no one can accuse the Government that they are encouraging militancy or encouraging terrorism. If arms are being supplied to the terrorists in Punjab or to the terrorists in Kashmir, they are being supplied by Pakistan. If training is being imparted to them, it is being done by Pakistan across the frontiers. But in Assam, I have seen video tapes, where training classes, where training camps are going on within the country, even in Assam itself. And

how can the Government in Delhi reconcile with that? We cannot. And therefore I would appeal to the new Government—if it is able to muster majority in the House and if it continues today—to attend to both, Tamil Nadu as well as Assam immediately.

One last point and I have done. I address myself to the new Prime Minister. After all, this is the fourth minority Government this country has seen. There have been four minority governments in New Delhi till now. The first was in 1969 when the Congress Party was split; and at that time, though Chandra Shekhar ji was not in the government, but even outside government he was very much part of the establishment; and it was by the support of the CPI that that government was able to command a majority in this House. The second occasion came in 1979, exactly ten years later—when the Government adopted the same strategy and the same device and the same subterfuge that they have adopted today and made Charan Singhji the Prime Minister of the country. His was also a minority government with the supporters being outside government. Then ten years later in 1989 came a government which was thrown up by the people; it was a minority government. (*Interruptions*) That third government was also a minority government. It was supported by two parties, two sections, the Leftists and the BJP, who also had a mandate of the people when they supported it they did not go against the mandate of the people. (*Interruptions*) Now in all these three cases, though the government that was a minority government was a ; it had a sizeable strength. But today the supporting party is nearly three times the Rulling Party.

I would only like to caution the Prime Minister that in a situation of this kind, where two partners come together—and one of them is just one-fourth or one-third of the senior partner; the junior partner is in the government and the senior partner is outside—the temptation to play the puppeteer is natural and very strong. I am not accusing Chandra Shekhar ji of being a puppet. (*Interruptions*) No; not at the moment. But I am only saying

that the temptation to act the puppeteer is very strong. And so, for Chandra Shekhar ji it will be a persistent dilemma if he agrees to act as the puppet, the consequences would be extremely harmful both for the Government as well as the country. But if he refuses to act as a puppet his Government might come to an end. This persistent dilemma he would be facing with. I would appeal to him, that even if his Government comes to an end, at no point of time should he agree to become the puppet of a party which has been rejected by the people, and this party should be allowed to rule the country only with the people's mandate; not without that.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR (Kishanganj): You counter your numbers. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Devi Lal.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): I want to say something. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, No. Please sit down. I am not allowing you.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: I will just take only one minute. On this Bofors case Mr. Advani has shifted his stand.

MR. SPEAKER: What is this? I do not allow you, please.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: Shri Chandra Shekharji told that if "I lay the Bofors papers then you should not blame me for leaking out the secrets. But I want to say that the responsibility would be entirely of Shri Chandra Shekhar and he cannot blame anybody. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing. Please sit down.

[*Translation*]

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER (SHRI DEVI LAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our Janata Dal

[Sh. Devi Lal]

(S) Party is only one week old. We are not seeking any support through you or this House for our actions or performance, but we are seeking support for the implementation of our welfare programmes for the farmers and labourers. I just want to tell you about our Government that we had made frantic efforts to form this Government. I convened a meeting against Congress and invited all people to attend it. We tried to finish Congress with the help of all other Parties... (*Interruptions*) ...I invited different political parties at Surajkund near Delhi and tried to bring all the leaders at the same platform, but some of them did not like to come with us. I again tried to do the same at Pinjore near Chandigarh. Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Biju Patnaik and former Prime Minister Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Shri Ajit Singh and other colleagues were present there. I asked him. He (Chandra Shekhar) says that he was not there. He asked me as to who will be our leader. I told him that Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh would be our leader. Chandra Shekhar Ji said that he did not recognise him as his leader. Mr. Speaker, I told him that I also did not recognize him as my leader and he is not a leader even... (*Interruptions*) but we will have to appoint someone as Prime Minister. Everybody agreed to this proposal. We took out processions at different places in the country and everywhere I declared that Shri V.P. Singh would be our next Prime Minister. Actually he had no following and we wanted him to realise this fact. To show this to him one of my relatives invited him and organised a meeting at Sangaria mandi in Rajasthan. This city which is about five miles away from my village has the population of only Twenty five thousand. I asked my relative whether he will be able to gather the people for public meeting. I told that we intend to make V.P. Singh Prime Minister of the country. It was I who gathered people for his meeting and two lakh people came to Sangaria and there I declared for the first time that V.P. Singh would be our Prime Minister. He had to go to Ganganagar in the evening. I did not accompany him. The population of Ganga

Nagar is one and half lakh, but only Twenty thousand people gathered there and he came to know about actual position of his popularity... (*Interruptions*) Mr. Speaker, Sir, please ask the house to allow me to speak. I started this move in the whole country and due to this move, all the people agreed that V.P. Singh would be our leader. Actually it was my strategy to gather the people.

Today, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan says that he has created a world record by winning the election by a margin of Five lakh Forty thousand votes. The same Ram Vilas Paswan was defeated in Haridwar and lost even his security deposit...

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You were also defeated in Haryana.

SHRI DEVI LAL: Then he again tried and contested from Bihar. There also he was defeated. It was due to the booth capturing by the powerful castes like Rajput and Bhoomihar...

(*Interruptions*)

Please at least hear me, I was defeated two times, now please sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Devi Lal Ji, Please address the speaker.

SHRI DEVI LAL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was requesting to you only. He says that I was also defeated. I have contested elections 36 times. Regarding Contesting of elections only the family of Rajiv can compete with my family. Gandhi family have fought 16 elections whereas my family have fought 36 elections. I have won in 12 elections. I mean to say that the people of every caste are equally important. We need barber for hair-cutting and shaving, potter for making pots, carpenter for woodwork and these people reside in almost every village. We need Brahmins for religious ceremonies. Every village has Brahmins. North India has been ruled by Rajputs for 700 years and we can find them in our villages also. I had six Brahmin Ministers in my cabinet in Haryana. In Faridabad

and Sirsa by-election I got only 5 per cent votes. But after these elections I got 85 per cent votes due to V.P. Singh. So, I thought that we should have a Rajput with us to get the votes for poor and backwards also. In this way there will be no rigging in the elections. When he came with us a new wave started and due to that wave in the whole country...

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know that there were 542 Members in this House and five out of them were—Sardar Patel from Gujarat, Prof. N.G. Ranga from Andhra Pradesh, Ranvir Singh from Punjab and Haryana and one Mr. Badan Singh from Badaundistrict and Dr. Ram Subhag Singh from Bihar— and the other 537 members were big industrialists and wealthy persons. These people were promoted and brought forward in the politics. With the result that these 319 persons are now here as Members of Parliament and sitting in the Lok Sabha. They were not even able to become 'Sarpanch' of Panchayat...*(Interruptions)* What I mean to say that according to our political strategy, we projected V.P. Singh as our Prime Minister and not as leader. We prepared our election manifesto and NTR was also with us. NTR and myself declared that there will also be ceiling for urban properties of these big wealthy persons as in the case of farmers...*(Interruptions)* I do not know Ambani by face...*(Interruptions)*...I ...*(Interruptions)* ...We declared our election manifesto and we wanted to serve the people according to that manifesto. One thing you will have to accept that our ex-Prime Minister had implemented the manifesto and issued a circular in the entire Secretariat that the assurances given in the manifesto should be taken into consideration—before taking any decision. Now, many of my colleagues are raising two points regarding that manifesto. The Mandal Commission Report was included not only in our manifesto, but it was also included in the manifestoes of Congress and BJP...*(Interruptions)* ...We had agreed to this in our manifesto. I would like to inform you about the Mandal Commission that Shri

Ram Avdesh Singh who was a Member of Parliament at that time and who is still an M.P. and I myself launched a Satyagrah here on 5th December, 1977. Chaudhary Charan Singh was the Prime Minister and nearly seven or eight hundred people were arrested from here. The Cabinet meeting had to be called to consider that issue, but unfortunately there was no quorum in the meeting and the credit could have gone to Charan Singh and not to him. I was submitting that if they had implemented the Mandal Commission's report honestly according to our manifesto, it would have been a different situation then. I was the convenor of Mandal Commission sub-Committee and this matter was included twice in the agenda for cabinet meeting. I told them that the States should also be consulted in this regard and this matter should be examined properly. In the meantime, I was sacked due to Bofors issue. I came to know that I was sacked because of a news regarding Bofors issue. But today, I am not saying but newspaper are saying it. I have written a letter to the then Prime Minister in this regard:

[English]

1 Willingdon Crescent,
New Delhi-110004,
September 7, 1990.

My Dear Prime Minister,

Of late, I have been deliberately keeping myself away from offering comments or reacting to Press Reports. However, I cannot refrain from giving vent to my feelings in regard to what the Press has to say about the involvement of Mr. Arun Nehru.

[Translation]

It is a very lengthy letter. I forwarded it to the Prime Minister stating that now all the Newspapers are associating the name of Shri Arun Nehru, So he should do something. Later on, I wrote another letter and received its reply also. It was stated in the reply that:

[Sh. Devi Lal]

[English]

Dear Ch. Devi Lal Ji,

I have received your letter of 7th September, 1990.

The CBI is fully investigating the Bofors howitzer deal including the documents published in the Independent Bombay dated 29.8.90, referred to in your letter.

Let me assure you that there will be no compromise on our commitment in this regard. The law shall take its course.

[Translation]

I do not know what course the law will take and what course it will not take. (*Interruptions*) I do not give much importance to Bofors issue. It is also being pointed out that the people's mandate was against the Congress and our Prime Minister and other colleagues say that they got this mandate due to Bofors issue. Sir, had it been so we would have also won in Karnataka, Andhra, Tamil Nadu and Kerala. Had it been a mandate against congress, then how would Dandavate ji won in Maharashtra. Dandavate ji (*Interruptions*) congress Government is there and the People of Maharashtra have given their mandate in favour of Congress party. There is no doubt that the main reason behind the mandate which we have received is the work done by the Haryana Government.

You have the election manifesto but it is not mentioned these as to what has been done in Haryana. The Haryana Government have taken a decision that all the persons above the age of 65 years whether they are rich or poor would be granted old age Pension. It is not mentioned in the manifesto that Rs.300 should be granted to the poor Harijan 15 days before the delivery of child but it is granted in Haryana. Many other facilities have also been given in Haryana and the people who gave publicity to the achieve-

ments of Haryana Government won the elections. The people in Karnataka did not mention about the achievements of Haryana Government in their elections campaign. Our party conference was held at Bangalore I declared that if our party came to power we would give unemployment allowance to every unemployed educated youth as we have given in Haryana. I call it pocket money I had announced that Rs. 100 should be granted as unemployment allowance to every educated unemployed youth. While laying the foundation stone of Sugar Mill on the Haryana foundation day i.e. on 1st November. You will be surprised to know that Shri Bommai suppressed this news from the press. In the evening when we met at a dinner party, Shri Bommai told me that I had put them in trouble. He said that if they would give Rs. 100 as pocket money or unemployment allowance that would spoil the youth.

What I mean to say is that the persons who propagated our ideas won the election and who did not, lost the election. Shri Sharad Yadav who did not have even clothes to wear became the Textiles Minister. Earlier Shri Sharad Yadav lost his security deposit (*Interruptions*) Similarly these are many other colleagues. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Badaun): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he does not know, that I never lost my security deposit. In Badaun I lost by a margin of only 30,000 votes.

SHRI DEVI LAL: I am talking about Amethi Mr. Speaker, Sir how untrue statements are made by people even in your presence. You can ask any one about Amethi. Ask Shri Rajiv Gandhi. (*Interruptions*) I have not said about Badaun. (*Interruptions*)

However, what I mean to say is that the announcement about the recommendation of Mandal Commission was not made with good intention but with malafide intention and that is why it evoked nation wide protest and agitations. I am not against the recommendations of Mandal Commission and I would like to go one step ahead of the Mandal Commission. Every individual cov-

ered under the Mandal Commission should get reservation but one family one job principle must be followed. Today if a person belonging to Backward class or Scheduled caste gets any Job. He manages provision of government jobs to 5 to 10 other members of his family also where as the poor people of the same caste do not get any jobs. Therefore, I would like to say that the principle of one family one job should also be adopted so that the benefits of reservation may also reach the poor.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Tell about your own family also as to how many members of your family are in service.

SHRI DEVI LAL: None of my relatives hold any gazetted post what to speak of my family members. You ask the definition of family from me but you tell me the actual definition of a family. That is a legal position. What I mean to say is that one member of each family should get employment so that only some families may not reap the benefits of reservation (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chavda please sit down, it is not a question hour.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRIDEVILAL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, some of our colleagues are raising Ram Janambhoomi issue and are creating communal tension to get political mileage. Had the Ram Janambhoomi so dear to them why they had not raised it during 250 years rule of Britishers? Why did they not raise it during 40 years of congress rule and 4 1/2 years rule of Shri Rajiv Gandhi? How they want to become Chakravarty Raja by taking out Rath Yatra. Now 319 Members have come to the Lok Sabha with rural background. Hukum Singh came in place of Gopi Chand Bhargva, Mulayam Singh Yadav came in place of Chandra Bhanu Gupta, Laloo Prasad Yadav came in place of Lalit Prasad, Bhairon Singh Shekhawat came in place of Mohan Lal Sukhadya and Chimanbhai Patel came in

place of Hitendra Desai. This thing has greatly disturbed them and they thought they did not have any programme because their party is a class of traders only. I can cite example for it. In Rajasthan they have 17 members from local Banias, 2 Sindhi Banias and 3 Punjabi Banias. I used to tell Shri Bhairon Singh Shekhawat that his Government was not the Government of farmers, only 2 Jats, 3 Gujars and 8 Rajput MLAs are with him so would he work on the advice of these 13 MLAs or on the advice of 35 MLAs (*Interruptions*) Don't depend on these 35 MLAs (*Interruptions*) They talk about the money bag. They indulged in horsetrading and offered Rs. 10 lakh to each MLA of our party in Rajasthan (*Interruptions*)

What I want to say is that when our farmers and workers have awakened, they have started using the money power. They say that Shri Morarji Desai's Government could not continue, when Shri Chandra Shekhar was party President, because Ch. Charan Singh walked out of the Government. I would like to remind that when Ch. Charan Singh went to Sirsa, two lakh people attended his rally and it created an apprehension among them that the Jat leader would win. I do not want that the same thing is repeated. Now we are taking the support of congress party but we are not supporting the Congress party. Earlier we were running Congress Government. Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, I.K. Gujaral, Arun Nehru, Satya Pal Malik etc. all are Congress men. (*Interruptions*) ... Shri Unnikrishna is also a Congress men. What I mean to say is that till now we were running the Congress Government and now congress is running our Government. If a burgler enters the house, the owner can bring lathi from the house of any neighbour to beat the burgler. Our Government is not a short term arrangement but we have created an atmosphere in which the people can live in peace and harmony. We want to implement the election manifesto of Janata Dal and restore peace in the country and for that purpose we request the House to extend support to us so that the people who want to establish Chakravarty Raj in the name of religion do not succeed.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, now we have heard the entire Cabinet consisting of two Ministers, and after having heard them, Sir, and specially the speech of the Deputy Prime Minister, I am more convinced that the sooner this Government goes, the better for the country.

Sir, I oppose this motion as the continuation of the so-called Council of Ministers with the grand number of two members without even allocated portfolios, will mean the continued mockery and debasement of parliamentary democracy in this country. Sir, this Government is founded on political immorality, constitutional impropriety and betrayal of the people of this country.

Sir, this Government is the product of political expediency where personal ambition and avarice and abject surrender to forces of authoritarianism have been given primacy over national interests and at the cost of secularism. Mr. Advani touched that point. The Prime Minister has said, he wants to save the country from the aftermath of what according to him, the misrule of V.P. Singh's Government and that is why he has come out and has taken the support of the Congress for the purpose of running the administration. I would ask him, why is it not the other way round? Why not the single biggest party in this Parliament have the political courage and honesty to take upon itself the responsibility of the administration and why Mr. Chandra Shekhar and his supporters did not decide to support that Congress Government? They would have had a working majority. No explanation has been given for that. I would like to know as to what is the manifesto that Mr. Chandra Shekhar will implement. Will he implement the National Front manifesto on which he was elected or will he implement the Congress-I manifesto on which his opponent was defeated in the last general elections? He must answer this. The National Front manifesto to which, I am sure,

Mr. Chandra Shekhar was a conscious party says:

"The nation is in a whirlpool of crises, crisis of confidence, crisis of character and crisis of leadership, a fall-out of the policies pursued by the successive Congress-I Governments and particularly by the Rajiv Gandhi Government in the last five years. The Rajiv Gandhi Government which came into power on a sympathy wave promised a clean Government, has scaled new heights in corruption and inefficiency."

Now, within 11 months he has changed his mind. I quote again:

"Rajiv Gandhi's path to power was marked by the violent deaths of thousands of innocent men, women and children in Delhi and elsewhere in the country. Punjab is now a boiling cauldron. What is worse is, the spectre of violence has now spread to several other parts of the country. Not a single day has passed since his coming to power when scores of innocent citizens have not been massacred in various parts of the country."

This was the judgement given by Mr. Chandra Shekhar on the performance of the Congress Government. Now, he must tell the people and the country which manifesto he will implement and on what ground. Has he jettisoned the Janata Dal manifesto? Does he say now to the people of this country that he has no obligation to implement what he had promised to the people of the country when he was elected? Will he say now to the people of this country that his adopted God Father, the Congress-I's policies and programmes will be implemented by his Government? He has to tell the people of this country. That is why, the way this Government has been formed, say, it is nothing but an aberration. It is a two-headed monster with nobody or limbs and it is a progeny of the combination of the forces represented by Lal Krishna Advani, Rajiv Gandhi and Chandra Shekhar. For about a week, what is the position in the country? We have never seen it since independence. For one week, we have a Prime Minister and a Deputy Prime

Minister, but no Council of Minister. For one week this country has no Finance Minister, no Home Minister and no Foreign Minister, obviously because Mr. Chandra Shekhar cannot somehow regulate or adjust the claims of all the ministerial aspirants in his party. There is no Defence Minister when the situation across the border is so serious.

Sir, apart from the difficulties he has within his own-called Party, obviously he has to get the clearance irrespective of those whatever public protestations may be from his supporters who are supporting him from outside. We have seen a pathetic admission from Mr. Chandrashekhar—obviously we find it in the newspapers, which has not been denied—that because he could not find a suitable co-defector to become a Foreign Minister of this country, he has approached Mr. Gujral. I congratulate Mr. Gujral on spurning this offer of defection which was given to him.

SHRI KALPANATH RAI (Ghosi): No offer was given.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We have seen the unique phenomenon of a handful of collaborators with no Party, no policy, no programme, no mandate, no majority forming the Government of the country which is now facing a very serious problem and in the same process resurrecting a Party which has been consciously and unreservedly rejected by the people of this country. Now that rejected Party and the leader of the rejected Party is occupying the driving seat in the vehicle of power in this country.

There is a blatant violation of the Constitution of this country.

PROF. MEIJINLUNG KAMSON (Outer Manipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has said that this Congress Party is a rejected Party. Earlier Mr. Madhu Dandavate has also said this. What I want to say through you is, that congress Party has secured more than 40 percent votes of the electorates of the country. Janata Dal has got less than 20 percent; BJP has got 8 percent of the votes of the elec-

torates. On what basis, this Congress-I Party in a rejected Party?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the law relating to defection in this country is not a simple statutory law. It is part of the Constitution. It is part of the organic law of this country. Those people and that political party which have been shouting from the house-tops that they have tried to clean the political life of this country, remove the impurities, remove horse-trading by introducing in the Constitution the provisions relating to defection, are unabashedly aiding and abetting a handful of persons for the purpose of forming the Government in this country for pure petty political ad personal interest. What the Congress Party could not achieve with the mandate of the people, they want to achieve by violating the mandate of the people. That is why, they have bolstered up a handful of defectors for the purpose of ruling this country now.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: You gave a ruling this morning that nobody shall mention or speak about the subject of split. He is touching upon the same subject.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I have not. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I believe reciprocity in politics. May I request my hon. friend, Somnath Chatterjee not to use the language which I may be forced to reply in the same way.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It is not only unfortunate but also serious that in his first appearance in the House, the Prime Minister is holding out repeatedly threats to other Members, about the manner of speaking. This is the way the Prime Minister will behave! This is showing respect to the House! Every time, he is threatening others!

This law of defection is part of the organic law of the country. What shall we say when the people of this country read in the newspapers that one hon. Member from Orissa has admitted that he had admitted that he

[Sh. Somath Chatterjee]

had been offered a vast sum of money for the anti-V.P. Singh camp. It has appeared in newspaper and has not been denied. Today that hon. Member is found to have changed sides.

SHRISAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: He is here.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I am not mentioning any name. But I have got the newspaper. Was there any denial? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: In 1979, when there were defections and the then Janata Party Government fell, Mr. Chandrasekhar, as the Leader and the President of the then Janata Party was rightly and seriously concerned about not only the fate of the Party and the Government but also about the future of parliamentary democracy in this country. I cannot but appreciate the principled stand he has taken at that time.

On the 26th July, 1979 Mr. Chandrasekhar described the then President's decision to ask the rebel Janata leader to form a Government and I quote:

"as an extraordinary one which tantamounts to putting premium on defections.

He had described the President's decision as "abnormal" which may be misconstrued as a reward to those who had left the Janata Party."

Mr. Chandrasekhar on July 15 that year sharply criticised all those who had resigned "when the government was faced with a no-confidence motion. He had regretted that the dissidents had "chosen to strike when the party was in trouble." In another statement, Mr. Chandrasekhar had remarked that

the "unscrupulous manner in which the defections have been engineered had shocked the nation."

In a statement issued on July 22, Mr. Chandrasekhar said that he would like to "remind" the Congress-(I) that "the course adopted by it of supporting a government dependent on authoritarian forces was against the interest of the party as well as the Government." He exhorted the Janata Party members to stand united to meet the challenges before it."

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): He was ten years born immature at that time.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I also quote another statement:

"The Janata Party President, Mr. Chandrasekhar observed here today on 18th July, New Delhi, that the current crisis in the party was not due to any ideological differences but personal ambitions of a few. There are, however, many who did not have such ambitions but they had fallen a prey," he added.

Why am I reading out? Because he had advocated some basic principles at that time. He had objected to the manner in which the parliamentary system of Government had been undermined, and how money was playing its role and how peoples mandate was being violated.

I would most humbly ask him "Is the situation quantitatively or qualitatively changed today?" Today every time whenever such Governments are constituted, it is very easy to say that "I have to save the country from the effects of the rule of the previous Government." But, what is the policy? What is the programme? What is the economic policy of this Government? What will be the policy with regard to Ram Janamabhooni? What will be his policy with regard to Vishwa Hindu Parishad's decision to again renew

Car Sewa at the disputed site? We would like to know from the Government.

16.00 hrs.

Sir, these are serious matters apart from the serious situation that is already existing- the danger of separatism, the danger of secessionism in Punjab, Jammu & Kashmir, Assam, the grave economic situation, the danger from across the border when there is a change of Government in Pakistan where fundamentalist forces have taken control and when such serious issues are facing the country, what is the policy and programme of this Government? Till today, we do not know about that.

Sir, Bofors is not a dead issue. I am glad that certain clarifications have been made. Even as a humour, the Prime Minister of a country cannot indulge in humour when serious issues are involved like the investigation of Bofors case. It was very unfortunate to hear of such a humour. Today, we have seen that the Federal Court of Switzerland has delivered its judgement and allowed making over of the papers to our CBI-the Central Bureau of Investigation. We also know that the Swedish Government had stated that premature disclosure of certain information would dry up and affect the further investigation in Sweden. Therefore, mere disclosure will not help the matters unless the Government makes it absolutely sure that it will not affect future investigation and future ascertainment of the persons who have been guilty of this bribery and corruption. Therefore, merely placing the records on the table of the House will not do. Such records which are placed at a time should not affect the further investigation in this matter. I would like to mention one other thing which is very serious. It is regarding how Shri Chandra Shekhar has kept his option open with the BJP. It has appeared in the BJP's Organiser of 15th November as to how Shri Advani's good offices were taken advantage of or utilised by my good friend, by Shri Murlidhara Deora who was sent on a mission to meet Shri Advani on behalf of Shri Chandra Shekhar and Shri Rajiv Gandhi so that cer-

tain actions following their change of Party or loyalty did not take place. For the purpose of coming to the Gaddi they can openly go and seek the support of the BJP. What has happened in Rajasthan? How has the Rajasthan Government been saved? Who has voted along with the BJP to save the BJP Government there? I would like to know why the Congress which was so much strident in its demand for the dismissal of Shekhawat Ministry has suddenly stopped it after the BJP Government got the support from its new friend JD (Socialist). This is very clear. Therefore what the greatest danger facing the country-apart from the dangers which I have already mentioned, which we are all aware of-is a deliberate threat to the national unity and integrity and the creation of a frenzied atmosphere by religious fundamentalist forces and the BJP's open declaration of founding a Hindu Rashtra in this country.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): No.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, secularism in this country has never been under such a serious attack as at present. I would like to know what this Government would like to do in this regard. What would be the policy of this Government with regard to this? I would like to know it from them.

Sir, the Ramjanmabhoomi-Babri Masjid controversy cannot be shirked away by the Government saying whatever has been done has been done because of the supposed mishandling of Shri V.P. Singh and his Government. The danger has again come up. On the 6th December, what will happen? We do not know about it. That has not yet been said. But sufficient threats have been given and it will only create further division among the people of this country. Therefore, this Government's policies and programmes should be known. But now, I would like to know from the Prime Minister-if Shri V.P. Singh had wrongly handled the situation, what is his solution for this? What is the best way and according to him, how it should be handled? Would he permit the Kar Seva to

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

be held on the 6th of December? I would like to know categorically from the prime Minister about this.

As we have to fight financial corruption in public affairs, we have to fight political corruption. Combination of persons and parties with no common policies and programmes will not solve any of the basic problems facing this country. This Government has no political and constitutional basis and no mandate from the people. It must be ended here and now. And I can assure the House that not a tear will be shed when this Government goes as it is bound to go.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Wardha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard today eminent speakers, leaders of different parties on this Vote of Confidence Motion sought by a Government which is only eight days old. And, therefore, I thought that the attack of those who are opposing it would be based on some basic policy matters or principles. Abusive language, accusation etc., that we have seen, has been there for the last eleven months and the country has already formed an opinion about the hon. Members of different parties in Parliament. The basic mistake, misunderstanding, wrong appreciation with which the Government of Shri V.P. Singh—his party, the BJP and the United Left Front—began, has been seen today and repeated not only by hon. Shri Madhu Dandavate but reiterated also by Shri Somnath Chatterjee. That was about the mandate given by the people in the last elections. The mistake was in belief that it was an anti-Congress mandate. That is how they began. If the people had given any clear mandate in favour of a political party, one would have said that there is a positive mandate in favour of some political party against the Congress. But what happened? Although people had shown their anger against the Congress Party yet we most gracefully accepted it and our leader at the very first moment after the declaration of the result said: "All right we accept this verdict

and we will not even try to form a Government."

SHRI INDERAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): They had no choice.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Wait, wait. The fact remains that Congress still continues to be the largest single party in this country judged by any parameter. We talk of the man, date of the people. Let us consider any parameter of people's support. The first parameter is of the numbers. Consider the numbers of different parties in Parliament. The Congress has 195 Members. The Janata Dal has 143, the BJP has 88 or 86 and the United Left together has 52. Kindly see, can anyone of them claim individually that they have a mandate from the people to rule this country or the country's administration? No one can say that.

I would like to know from them. Did they do like the previous Janata Party where under Jayaprakash Narain's leadership and Morarjibhai's leadership all the other parties were merged together and one party was formed; a common manifesto was there; a mandate was asked from the people and the people did give a very clear mandate in favour of that party? Did these various parties tell the people that if we are voted to power we will form a coalition and we will give you a stable Government as against the Congress? They did not. They had manifestoes of their own and they were asking for support on the basis of their individual manifestoes. How can they say then that there was a mandate in their favour against the Congress? Because that is not how they asked for the vote collectively.

Therefore what happens now? The verdict of the people was that no party has been given a clear mandate. But the single largest party still is the Congress. This is one parameter—the number of Members in the House.

All right, take another parameter. The percentage of votes given by the electorate to different parties. In spite of the fact that we

got nearly half-a little less than half the number of seats-the percentage of vote still was more than 42-the highest and higher than anybody else. The Janata Dal got 18% the BJP got seven point something and the United Left got less than 4%. Yet they say that they have a mandate in their favour! This is the travesty of truth.

Even then we thought, all right people have not given us a clear mandate. Our leader said, we accept and bow to this verdict and we will give a chance to anyone else to form a Government. We also promised that whosoever forms the Government, in the interest of a stable Government, for the next five years we would give constructive cooperation. We talked of cooperation-constructive-as long as you work within the framework and the preamble of our Constitution and the basic principles enshrined in the preamble. That was all the condition we put. In spite of that, what has been the sight of performance of the Government in the last eleven months, supported by the crutches of these two parties? In eleven months this Government literally brought the nation to the brink of disaster and anarchy. If anyone has been prophetic, it has been Shri V.P. Singh and Prof. Madhu Dandavate. Shri V. P. Singh had declared publicly that if ever I become the Prime Minister- because earlier he had protested and told the television, the Newstrack and everybody that he shall not become the Prime Minister, don't ask that question again and again because I have already told that I will not become the Prime Minister, I will not contest and I will not become the Prime Minister and ultimately when he was asked, suppose you do-then it will be a total disaster! *(Interruptions)*

Sir, let the people feel that he is a nice Person; honest person; sincere man; selfless person and does not want any post of Prime Ministership at all. But he himself declares, "If I do become, won betide; it will be a total disaster. He has now proved so. He has worked towards that.

Sir, another forecast was made by hon. Shri Dandavate. He has begun by saying

that the coffers of this Government are empty. *(Interruptions)* He worked towards that objective. Literally, in these eleven months, he has squandered whatever was there in the coffers and tried to see that it becomes empty. This is proved by the fact that the foreign exchange reserves have come down from Rs. 5,700 crores to Rs. 3,400 crores. Now in the month of December, it will be Rs. 2,000 crores. It will not last for two weeks. He has now declared. One can squander; but you do not squander the heart and money of the ordinary man. The last thing, commonman would ever do, will be to sell the ornaments of his wife; the gold of his wife. Mangala Sutras were given to this nation during the Crisis of Chir war and you have the cheek to declare to the country, "I will even sell that now." Today I thought, hon. Shri Dandavate while speaking...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Will you kindly yield for a minute?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do you want to say something more?

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, as far as our friend Shri Vasant Sathe's point is concerned, in this very House, I had declared already that, that was in order to conserve and augment the foreign exchange reserves. We were formerly getting Rs. 250 crores worth of gold from the foreign countries as imported gold. To those who wanted to export actually the ornaments, we were providing this gold. We stopped that import of Rs. 250 crores worth of gold and we decided that whatever smuggled gold has been actually captured, that will be sold to the goldsmiths instead of foreign gold which is brought. That will be provided in the foreign exchange; and that will be sold at the price slightly above the international rate. That will be utilised for that. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, I do not mind Shri Dandavate trying to correct himself retrospectively. But what we read in the newspapers was that, "You are selling the

[Sh. Vasant Sathe]

gold to those people, belonging to the Reserve Bank of India, to the Government. That is what we read. If you want to correct yourself, you can do it retrospectively...*(Interruptions)*

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Outside the country.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Yes, not in this country, but outside the country, to earn foreign exchange. That is what was said. That was the objective. Anyway, that is not the point. I thought that he would say at least a few words about the great performance that he had done during the last eleven months as the Finance Minister of this country. But, not a word has been uttered. Kindly see as to what he has said. He said that the previous Government had increased the deficit to Rs. 11,000/- crores and that he would reduce it to Rs. 7,000/- crores. Today's latest figure is that the deficit will become more than Rs. 14,000/- crores.*(Interruptions)* The Reserve Bank has said that it would go to even Rs. 25,000/- crores. This is about their performance. Please see the price structure. Everything in the country has become costlier. Commonman's life has become miserable. There is not a single item that he could buy—edible oil, grains whatever it is. You take anything. That has become sky-high. What does the commonman do? I had quoted this last time here, while speaking on the Budget: Both Mr. V.P. Singh and Dandavate had promised publicly that they would take firm measures to see that the prices come down. Normally during September-October, the prices used to come down. This time what has happened? Even in this period, the prices have gone up with the result that today you have touched the CPI more than 10.5 per cent- double-digit. The wholesale price index has gone to 9.7 per cent. The previous Government does not feel concerned about the economic situation.

SHRISONTOSH MOHANDEV (Tripura West): Prices have not come down. They have come down.*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Naturally, that will happen.*(Interruptions)* A few months back, we used to see unrest in the country—common man suffering from rising prices and unrest on account of rising prices. What do we see in the strategy? This is what pains us most.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mandal Commission.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The Government headed by hon. Shri V.P. Singh played the dirtiest trick, the most disastrous trick, gimmick, that anyone could ever play with the nation of plunging it in an emotional and communal anarchy—casteist and communal both—threatening to fragment this country. Jinnah had fragmented it into two. Hon. Shri V.P. Singh decided to fragment it into 4,000. This is a gift to this country. Kindly see it and today he talks of secularism. What can be more communal and anti-secular than to try to divide this country either on the basis of religion or on the basis of birth-based religious entity called caste. If you try to divide this country on casteist lines which Manu had done thousands of years back, you become another Manu again wanting to divide this country on casteist line and thereby worse anti-secular, communal man than this man.

Just consider, Sir, what pains the youth of this country.

[*Translation*]

Shri Ram Vilas, just think over it. Such incident occurred in Chauri Chaura during the time of Gandhiji.

[*English*]

There was one incident of Chauri Chaura in 1921 during the national independence movement and Gandhiji withdrew that entire movement saying, "There is something wrong. Probably, we have made a Himalayan blunder." He withdrew that movement. Pandit

Jawaharlal Nehru was angry. *(Interruptions)*

Kindly see here is a leader. 180 young children immolated themselves, burnt themselves. You are not moved at all. You do not feel that there is anything wrong. You do not try even to persuade them, talk to them: Why are you doing all this? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Hajipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he has mentioned my name in his speech. I do not want to ask any question but I want some information from Shri Sathe because he hails from Maharashtra. Have we committed any crime and sin by providing relief to the backward, downtrodden and minority? Will he tell us as to why the Maharashtra Government have announced to implement the recommendation of the Mandal Commission? *(Interruptions)* We had a talk with the Karnataka Government on it ten months back. What Shri Rajiv Gandhi had said in Madras in the presence of Jayalalitha and AIADMK workers? He said that he fully supported the recommendation of Mandal Commission. He criticised as to why it was not being implemented in educational institutions. Shri Rajiv Gandhi is present in the House so he should clarify whether he support it or oppose it. You should tell us about Maharashtra. You should also reveal your thinking about Sharad Pawar. Is he Casteist or secular...? *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: In the morning, we had agreed that the debate might conclude and the Prime Minister would reply at 3.30 PM. Now, I find that already it is over 4 PM and a number of speakers have given their names. Therefore, if the House agrees, the discussion may conclude at 6 PM and the Prime Minister may reply at 6 P.M. and voting, if required, may take place at about 6.30 or 7 PM. If it is acceptable to the House, I request all the Members to limit their remarks to five to six minutes.

(Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 5 O'clock.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. can only try. It is up to the Members.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe, I am not limiting you.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Sir, I do not agree. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE: As far as this question is concerned, I think, Mr. Devi Lal has given a very fitting answer to you. You better search for another constituency now because you are not going to get the same constituency. So, I need not go into that question.

[Translation]

It is not the question of helping the poor. Your intention is malafied. Your intention is not clear.

[English]

It is cheap gimmick to get votes. And the worst things has been done in what had happened recently in the communal riots. Sir, I am amazed that our Leftist Parties friends who are here, for 11 months up till now, were sleeping partners with the BJP. Everytime they were shouting and supporting the Government and shouting against us. Now, what has happen@d? And today morning, we saw you... *(Interruptions)* ...As I have said in the beginning, all that has been said, unfortunately, is anti-Congressism. I would like to know whether there is any basic difference among the Congress Party policies, the Janata Party policies and the policies of the Left Front so far as the principles and progressive policies dedicated for the welfare of the people for growth, for socialism and for secularism are concerned. I can understand that the BJP has differences on certain respects particularly on Article 370,

[Sh. Vasant Sathe]

Ram Janambhoomi, etc. Unfortunately Sir, as far as the BJP is concerned, their history stops with Aurangazeb... (*Interruptions*) ... If you see that latest cassette and hear the latest cassette by one of your most eloquent lady speakers, you will find that the history end with Aurangazeb. And therefore, whatever was done by Aurangazeb and his predecessors must be undone now after 300 or 400 years. This is, in short, their philosophy... (*Interruptions*) ... Sir, if they want to divide this country, I would beg of them to consider whether by this movement are they going to provide one single job to an unemployed young man in this country, are they going to provide any growth in the edible oil or the necessities of life required by the people. For what are you provoking the people? To fight for what? Emotionally, in the name of religion, you are acting contrary not the entire ethos and cultural heritage of India. He is talking of "Vasudhaiv Kutumbkam" I am really surprised that those who talk in the name of Hindu culture and heritage are going totally contrary to the basic tenets as propounded by Swami Vivekananda.

Just read Vivekanand and you will know how he propagated the unity of Islam and Hinduism. He said the soul of Hinduism and body of Islam must be synthesised... (*Interruptions*) These people sometimes talk of Vivekanand, but when it is not convenient to them, they forget him. They are willing to swear by Gandhi, go to Rajghat, but in their later speeches these days they have said that Gandhi is also irrelevant. These are the words used by them.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Rajiv Gandhi and not Gandhi brought it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: No, Mahatma Gandhi's name was mentioned. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

I do not want to give the name of the hon. lady Member.

[*Translation*]

Listen, these are the words of woman member from your party that Gandhi brought the ruin. You listen it, it is the voice of a person from B.J.P.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: From B.J.P.? No mention the name, please.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Uma Bharti.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: You are misleading the hours it is not Uma Bharti's voice.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: We are bringing the 'Rama Rajya' of Mahatma Gandhi.

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I would like to know from our leftist friends, what is the strange alignment they have discovered suddenly with the BJP. Which policy do they want to pursue now? Today, the question is: What did the people want? They gave the mandate for five years. They said: "We want you, the leaders of various parties to give us a stable Government which will solve our economic problems, and the problems concerning our day to day life." This is the minimum that the people of this country expect from their elected representatives...

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

the only difference is that Bajpaiji has said that the army of Rama went to Lanka to defeat Ravana and their army returned to Ayodhya instead. Ayodhya itself means where there is no war and these are the first people, the sons of the soil, modern monkeys

who reached Ayodhya with stones to set it aflame. Rama had not done so.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: You don't know history. First you read it. This has already happened there sixteen times. Now it happened for the seventeenth time. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SINGH: I would like to say that the primary duty of the Members of Parliament elected by the people is to ensure that the people get a stable Government, a Government believing in the progressive policies enshrined not only in their manifesto, but also in the Preamble of the Constitution, and therefore, such a Government for a period of five years must be assured. It is a sign of sagacity shown by the Congress that we have not talked of untouchability. Right from beginning we said that for Mr. V.P. Singh there was no love last. He was our own man, whom, we had trusted so much.

[*Translation*]

Where should we go to complain. The person we trusted as our friend, deceived us. We had made him number two. We had really such a good opinion for a person whom he called his mother. Do you know what has pained me most. Vishwanath Pratap Singhji? It is this that you have these days never uttered the name of Indiraji.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

16.35 hrs.

You take names of all great leaders but the woman who made you what you are today and did virtually everything for you—she gave you the membership in fact she gave you everything—and you used to call her mother, you have never taken her name. I have not forgotten the AICC meeting where you said "after Ram and Krishna if there is anybody it is Rajiv and I am totally devoted and loyal to his and I shall remain totally loyal and devoted to him." These are your words but what happened. You trust such a person and you think that you believe him in his

sincerety and in his honesty, he betrays you. There is a famous saying in Sanskrit:

*"Ankam aaruhay suptam hi,
hatvo kim nama paurusham."*

[*Translation*]

If you kill or slay a person who slumbers on your shoulder in good faith, it is neither fortitude nor manliness.

[*English*]

This is what V.P. Singh has done to Rajiv Gandhi and our party.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is way you did to Charan Singh.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: No, we did not do that (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVI LAL: Tell them what was done to me (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Habits dies hard. A person's nature continues to be the same. You have also seen the result. All that we were saying in these days was that this gentleman who was with us, as Devi Lalji rightly said

[*Translation*]

Congressmen were running the Government... (*Interruptions*)... we only said that save this country from this madness, the country is being cast into fire of madness. Save us from this and ask these people to resign so that new people are elected. We are happy if Madhu Dandavate would be elected. We were only saying that anybody may be elected. You elect any person of your choice but they should be removed. You may elect the Home Minister Mufti Mohammad Sahib, who is present here. If you could have done this all the one hundred

[Sh. Vasant Sathe]

forty five members of your party would have been remained united...*(Interruptions)*

ANHONOURABLE MEMBER: Devi Lalji could be elected. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Devi Lalji had refused, Even today he has said that he was ready to step down on the condition that Parliament would be dissolved. He wanted that all these people should resign from their membership. Later on Devi Lalji said that they can't come back if they are not elected as Members. This was done only to put them in difficulty. Even today we say that a stable Government should govern our country. We are not doing in it deliberately and our party leader has said that we are not in a hurry and we don't intend to join the Government. We will come only through mandate ...*(Interruptions)*... There is no question of renunciation in this...*(Interruptions)* ...

[English]

I tell you, we are very honest in this matter. Right from the beginning we have been saying that we do not have the mandate to form the Government on our own, therefore, there is no question of our forming the Government. Whenever people will give us the mandate we will take up the responsibility. But, today we not want the country to be plunged in a communal anarchy. The President also said it in a communique and I should not quote the President. But, today the situation is such where one man is on the Rath Yatra-on the pivotal Rath-and the another man wants to plunge the country on casteist carnage. This is not a correct atmosphere in which free and fair elections can take place. That is what the President himself has said in the communique.

Therefore today the condition is that we must try to ensure a stable government and a progressive government. And the policy that would be pursued is entirely for Chandra Shekharji. It may be the policy which he has accepted in the manifesto of the Janata

Party. We have absolutely no quarrel withit and we are not going to interfere in any away with what he does. He is totally free.

Those of you who are in the BJP, who had agreed to support the Janata Party on the basis of that policy, why should you not reconsider you stand? Your issue is very small. You are concerned mainly with the Ayodhya Problem and if that is solved, I think you should not have any other problem.

[Translation]

Advaniji, then you will not have any other problem. Then what about the Left? I have no doubt, the Left will never want to be left out. If the Janata Party under the leadership of Chandra Shekharji gives a stable and progressive government based on those policies which are keeping in line with the policies of the Leftists, why should they not support him? Why should they not support unless they have some other purpose? Your purpose is that you can abuse us. Your policy is only anti-congressism. We are not forming the Government. We are quite happy to stay out of the whole thing. You support to stay out of the whole thing. You support. Come along and do it. We do not mind. Give us a stable government and save this country from madness. That is all that we are requesting. That is all we have been saying. That is all that the people of this country, particularly the youth of this country want.

That is why we are supporting this Government.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Sir, I crave the indulgence of you and the whole house because this is likely to be last speech in the Parliament.

I want to place before this House why my party is voting again the Confidence Motion, the main reason behind this is that the proposed Government do not enjoy people's mandate and it is formed by unscrupulous defectors.

We have given an amendment which

the Speaker himself in this wisdom rejected already. But in any case I shall read it out. Instead of 'Council of Ministers', the words should be 'Proposed Council of Ministers'.

On 7th November on the day of the motion of confidence in Shri V.P. Singh's Government, I was surcharged with emotion and you yourself and a large number of members here were worried and appealed to me several times not to be so. I could not respond to those affectionate appeals for which I apologise now.

Sir, today I want to remain as calm as possible and want to put just a few questions to the different political leaders, who I find are all present here. It may be my good fortune. Sir, I will not try to answer anybody today. I will just ask a few questions. First, a few questions to the present 'proposed' Prime Minister. I have learnt about an episode from one who should know—which I want to relate. If what I have heard is incorrect, I expect the proposed Prime Minister to say so, at the time of his reply. Some of you surely know that the late Bachwan Singh of Bihar who died some months ago, was a member of Shaheed Bhagat Singh's Hindustan Republican Army, and had to spend 17 years in *danda beri* i.e. in shackles during the British days. Before his death, when Chandra Shekhar ji went to meet him, Shri Bachwan appealed to him: "Chandra Shekhar ji, i.e. 'Whatever happens, don't break the party.' To this, the proposed, i.e. the present Prime Minister responded:

'What has the party given me, that I should keep it in tact' Is that a fact?

The second question is the same as what I had asked on the 7th November. I was excited more then, and so it could not be heard by many, in that din and bustle. If the hon. proposed Prime Minister was so concerned about high prices due to the then Government's failure, why did he not at that time join the movement against price rise conducted by all the Left parties and thereby strengthen it and help the poor?

My next question: it may not concern him alone, but some others as well. The Bengali daily 'Aajkal' reported that in the then prevailing fish market, which is here generally referred to as the hourse-trading market, there were transactions upto Rs. 5 crores per head, for purchasing some honourable gentlemen. I am yet to see an contradiction of that news. In that case, was it a fact, and can anybody say what the price is, now?

My fourth question to Shri Chandra Shekhar: will he do away with the Industrial Policy which was adopted by the earlier Government? Will he follow a policy based on self-reliance, commanding heights for the public sector and curbing multi-nationals in the sphere of goods which can be produced in our country? Of course, the previous Government failed to check the price rise. Does Shri Chandra Shekhar expect that he can rectify the situation?

Last, but not the last, is the question of Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid. What will be his policy?

The third question to him is about the fate of the Bofors case. Since already a lot of discussion had taken place on it, I do not want to refer to it again. I only appeal to the nation to keep a vigil on the points raised by me here.

Now, a question to hon. Shri Lal Krishna Advani. Let me, first of all, make it clear that whatever I am saying I never had any discussion about it with Shri V.P. Singh nor did I try to know about it from him. It is all my own inference. On 29th October at the conclusion of a padayatra for communal unity—organised by my party in Calcutta, a written speech of mine was read out at the public meeting at Beliaghata because I was too ill to speak myself. Incidentally, Beliaghata was the place where Gandhiji had fasted in 1947 for an end to communal riots. I had the proud privilege of being one of the participants of a huge demonstration of students which went to Beliaghata to give backing to him. A number of Bengali Papers quoted parts of my speech

[Smt. Geeta Mukherjee]

where I had stated, on the basis of some reliable information, that in a meeting of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad workers held in Delhi, awkward questions were raised as to how rupees three hundred crores collected for the construction of Ram Temple in Ayodhya had been distributed. The VHP leaders had quitted their angry workers by promising that the money question would be satisfactorily settled in the future. However, for the present, a lesson must be taught to Shri Advani for his audacity in conducting his Rath Yatra with BJP's party symbol and flag, ignoring the VHP. Afterwards, the five Shankaracharyas were seen on the TV on 16th October at Vishwanath Pratapji's residence. It was learnt that they communicated a proposal to the then Prime Minister that they would jointly make a public appeal to Shri Advani to stop his Rath Yatra in the interest of the nation. But the next day, all the media reported that the talks had failed; the Shankaracharyas were returning to their respective places. And then we found that on that very day, Advaniji also happened to be in Delhi—Advaniji remembers our conversation, I believe—and the VHP and BJP leaders all started taking in one voice. So my question is, was Advaniji's presence just a coincidence or did it have anything to do with the failure of the efforts of the Shankaracharyas? Was there any blackmail involved regarding the disposal of the huge funds? This question raised in my speech and reported in the Press in Calcutta, has neither been answered nor my inferences contradicted.

I fully realise the difficulty of Vishwanath Pratap Singhji to reply as he still hopes that there will be an amicable settlement of the Mandir-Masjid dispute. I myself, my party and for that matter I believe that most of the peace-loving people of our country also want a negotiated settlement or adherence to the courts' verdict. And, from that very concern may I ask Advaniji either to confirm or contradict?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I deny.

SHRIMATIGEETAMUKHERJEE: A few questions now to the former Leader of the Opposition, Rajiv Gandhi.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I deny totally.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: Former Leader of the Opposition Rajiv Gandhi, the most powerful back seat driver of the new minuscule Government. On the 7th November, he lamented that during the anti-reservation movement many young lives were lost due to the failure of Vishwanath Pratap Singhji's eleven month old Government. Doubtlessly, these deaths are lamentable and Parliament proceedings of either the 2nd or the 3rd October will show that I was the first person who raised this matter of these sad deaths in this House and appealed to all parties to issue a joint call to the students, either pro or anti-reservations, to shun the path of violence. I also appealed to the Government to talk with the leaders of the anti-reservationist movement. Unfortunately, none paid heed at that time to the appeal of this poor soul.

But may I ask Rajivji, while making this criticism, did he even once remember how many precious lives were lost due to the police firing during the four decades of post-Independence India, in which his party was in the saddle for most of the time?

Another question to him, partly already addressed earlier to the present Prime Minister. Was it not his Government, which, immediately after their installation rushed to pass the Anti-Defection Law with highly moralistic rhetorics. Leaving aside the question of arithmetic, what does he now have to say about the morals of those today involved in engineering the 'Aya Ram Garyaam' business on the eve of the 7th November and also after-wards? Doubtlessly, a huge amount was involved. May I ask where this money came from? Is it not the money fleeced from the ordinary people by the black-marketing barons?

Last but not the least, another question to Rajivji. During my countless interventions

on the debate on the 7th November I had already asked him whether he had forgotten the secular traditions of his illustrious grandfather? Has he any explanation for the fact that at the time of the last election in the Faizabad constituency form where Shri Mitra Sen Yadav of CPI was elected, had not the BJP candidate withdrawn in favour of the Congress(I) party's candidate? Did he object or encourage?

17.00 hrs.

Is it also not a fact that when, in this very House, I had demanded the arrest of the Shankaracharya of Dwarkapith and denunciation of a Congress (I) leader of East Delhi for participation in a VHP Press Conference. Satheji moved a privilege motion against me and my privilege motion against Mr. Kurien is still pending. And may I appeal also to him in all sincerity at my command to lead his party in the spirit of secularism to which his Party is formerly committed not only in words, but also in deeds, as followed by Panditji, on whose grave Rajivji and many others placed wreath only day before yesterday?

Now a question to several leading newspapers who were kind enough to give unusually prominent publicity that on the 7th November Geeta Mukherjee rushed to Rajivji, broke down in tears, and Rajivji consoled her. Probably I should thank them for such attention. But did any one of them enquire from me what was the issue involved? Since they did not, may I now inform them and the House the reason why I rushed to him? As his party would now be the main crutch to keep the miniscule Government in power, I wanted to know whether he would use his influence to punish one of the high officers in the former Prime Minister's Office, now obviously turned hostile to Vishwanath Pratapji because of his policy on Mandal Report. This unscrupulous officer refused to place before the then Prime Minister my appeal for Government help to a poor young girl of my constituency awaiting an urgent heart transplant operation at the AIIMS, despite the fact that the former Prime Minister agreed to do so much earlier. Thrice this man pleaded

that the necessary papers could not be traced, although those were submitted by me earlier. On that fateful day of 7th November I myself rushed to his office and again handed over the necessary papers personally to him. Despite his promise, there was no action till the former Government fell. I wanted to know from Rajivji whether such officer who played with the life of a very young girl just because of political vendetta, would be punished? I gave his name and designation to Rajivji. I believe Rajivji himself will bear me out.

It would be unfair on my part if I do not mention here that Rajivji offered to bear the entire expense for the patient. Since I could manage to collect the necessary sum through the efforts of the friends, of the patient, from the help of the then Health Minister of the Central Government Masoodji, my own contribution and the help from the West Bengal Government, I thankfully declined his offer.

But I shall still await his action on my main complaint. And I leave it to the newspapers to decide what ethics they should follow. That is no my business.

Sir, without taxing the patience of the House any longer, I would like to conclude with two quotations from two of Bengal's greatest sons, Kazi Nazrul Islam and Vishwakavi Rabindranath Tagore.

Firstly, from Nagrul—

"Phansir Manche geye gele jara jiboner joygan,

Oshi olokhe darayeche tara dibekon bolidan?

Aaji parikha jatir ayothoba jater karibe tran?

Duliteche tori phuliteche jo, kandari hunsiyar."

The poet calls on the boatman at the helm of our country's boat to recall the battlefield of Plassey, where Mirzafar's betrayal led to the loss of our independence. The poet warns that although the sun of freedom had set for the time being, it would

[Smt. Geeta Mukherjee]

dawn again reddened with our blood. And those who went singing to their death on the gallows are watching how we act.

Sir, the Mirzafars—whether of the past of the present must not be tolerated any longer.

Finally, to conclude with Rabindra Nath's clarion call—

"Eso he Arya, eso Ayonarya-Hindu
Musolman eso

eso aaj tumie, raj, eso eso khristan,

Eso Brahaman, suchi kori mon dhara
hat sobakar.

Eso he potit, hok opnita sob opaman
bhar.

Mar abhisheke eso eso twara,
mongalghat hoini je bhora,

Sobar poroshe pobitra kora tirthanire—
Aji Bharater Mahanaber Sagartire."

This is the Poet's call to the Aryas and Anaryas, Hindus Muslims and Christians, and all the oppressed determined to overcome the indignity forced on them, to come forth to expedite the coronation of our Mother India.

I still hope and trust that the people of our great motherland will respond to this call because the situation is too grave and it brooks no delay.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Geetaji mentioned my name and referred to some meeting of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad on the 17th of October. I would like to make it clear and set the record straight that I have no idea of any such meeting. To the best of my knowledge no such meeting took place. 18th was Diwali day. In accordance with the schedule of five weeks that I had drawn up for yatra in September itself I was to be in Delhi on those days. Also I would like to add that to the best of my knowledge, the Vishwa Hindu Parishad is punctilious and particular about the maintenance of its accounts.

[Translation]

*SHRIMATIRAJINDERKAURBULARA (Ludhiana): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today we all have gathered here for passing vote of confidence. There is no doubt that Shri Chandra Shekhar is the most beloved leader of Sikhs and at the time of Blue Star Operation in 1984 he had said many things in favour of Sikhs. But today our party has decided to cast vote neither in his favour nor against him. Our party will stand neutral. We will not cast vote in his favour because his party has taken support from Congress. The policies of Congress have made thousand of my sisters widow in Punjab. Thousands of children have been killed there. Prof. Saheb, Congress' policies and their hands are stained with the blood of my husband. Whole Sikh world respects Shri Chandra Shekhar because he was the firstman who raised his voice at the time of the Blue Star Operation. Shri Chandra Shekhar has said today that we should give a healing touch to the wounded sikh psyche. I fail understand what he means by that. When Shri V.P. Singh became the Prime Minister he had also expressed similar feelings. But what happened later in Punjab. Instead of providing healing touch the wounds became sore and none can describe the agony of the people of Punjab. Even during Shri V.P. Singh's rule fake police encounters continued and parents were harassed. Nothing was changed there. Later, Shri Virendra Verma was sent to Punjab as Governor. The Government was not happy with Shri Nirmal Kumar Mukherjee as he was working sincerely. He was declared unfit as he was not in favour of fake police encounters. Shri Virendra Verma repeated the same words that he had to give a healing touch to wounded sentiments of the Punjabis. But nobody knows where and when he will do that. Today, Shri Chandra Shekhar has also expressed same feelings. I urge him to be true to his word. He should not toe the line of his predecessors.

After your Government came to power the first gift that the Sikhs got was that copies of holy 'Guru Granth Saheb' were burnt in

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

Delhi and Jalandhar. You very well know how much this hurt the Sikhs. The matter should be handed over to CBI for inquiry so that those behind it are exposed. There was a conspiracy as it happened at both the places simultaneously. Will it not create bad blood in the sikhs for other communities. Election in Punjab were held in a democratic manner and many MPs of Mann group got elected. We came here as we have faith in the constitution whereas many groups opposed us. But Shri V.P. Singh's Government did not give us democratic structure. The police raj is continuing there even after amendment was made in the Constitution twice. The police raj is continuing there since May, 11, 1987 and this Government did not change it. Kindly include my submissions in your manifesto. Firstly, you add in your manifesto that fake police encounters should not take place in Punjab. Half of your problems will be solved the day when fake police encounters will stop, we do not regret if a youth is caught for his misdeeds. He should be imprisoned but police raj in Punjab which is actually butcher's raj should be stopped so that we may not lose the support of Punjabi sikhs which is a brave caste. Shri Simranjit Singh Mann raised his voice for self determination only then when we felt insecure in the present political and democratic structure. Only then he expressed his desire of approaching the U.N.O. Suppose there are 4-5 sons of a father and they do not have good relations with each other and father does not take interest in sorting out their quarrels, then it becomes essential for them to take the help from outsiders.

Therefore, it must be added to your manifesto that fake police encounters should not take place in Punjab. The parents are being harrassed, it should also be stopped. If someone's child is run away from home, his parents are sent behind the bars? The parents do not know the whereabouts of their children for 3-4 months. Not only this, some people are still behind the bars without any trial. For example, the Jawans of 32 battalion

of C.R.P., Jalandhar or the people about whom Congress people know better. They should also be released. They should be imprisoned after trial.

All the C.R.P. and B.S.F. force should be removed from Punjab and Punjab should be free from Police rule. It must be added in your manifesto, if you really want to give healing touch to the people of Punjab.

Besides this, Rath yatra of Shri Advani's has brought the country to the verge of destruction. It is said about sikhs that they demand Khalistan but just see the way a learned man is trying to flare up sentiments and thereby dividing the Hindus and Muslims. They are trying to flare up between the two communities. It is wrong. This should not be done by those who teach others.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will now please conclude.

[Translation]

*SHRIMATI RAJINDER KAUR BULARA: Shri Advani has said that many innocent Hindus have been killed there. I agree that many innocent Hindus were killed there but Muslims were also among them. Today, Shri Advaniji has said that Police blindly fired on innocent people but in 1984 when 'Blue Star Operation' took place and all of you invaded Harminder Saheb, then nobody thought that you were doing injustice, what was your common policy then, you have discriminated against the Sikhs. Shri Chandra Shekharji, I want to appeal that you must keep your word and apply the much needed balm to the wounded Sikh psyche.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no, no, Madan, you must finish now. No more please.

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

[*Translation*]

Madam, I have given you lot of time.

*SHRIMATI RAJINDERA KAUR BULARA: Excuse me, only last point. Our attention has been diverted by Rath yatra inspite of paying attention on development of country. you may visit Punjab and see long queues for diesel. It is not available there. I want to urge how can Punjab and Haryana produce 65 per cent of the total production, if there is lack of diesel.

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Nani Bhattacharya. You will please conclude in five minutes because there are many others who want to speak.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Berhampore): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the outset I should say that I am opposed to the motion moved by the Prime Minister. Already I have raised a point of order and in raising the point of order, I have explained the position. So, I will not dwell upon that issue again. I would ask—it was better if the Prime Minister was here—why there are only two Ministers. Will the Prime Minister explain the circumstances why his Cabinet has not yet been formed, why more Ministers have not been inducted? I am telling you (Speaker) in the absence of the Prime Minister that this a serious question—Constitutional question, legal question—and also it concerns the people very much in the sense that the Government is practically in a standstill position because the Ministers are not there. Secretaries are idle there awaiting for the Ministers. Since there is no signing of files by the Ministers, so, no orders are being issued. Actually the position is this that if we go to any office, the work is at a standstill. So, this is another aspect of the Administration, in the interest of which the Council of Ministers must be formed to include many more Ministers for the immediate distribution of portfolios. This is one part of the thing.

May, I ask this question through you, Sir, what has caused the delay? Is it because Rajiv Gandhi and the Congress are not of one opinion regarding the selection of the Ministers? There are many rumours afloat amongst the public that Shekharji and Devilal are making certain suggestions but Rajivji and Congress are turning them down.

Is it because that there is no unity of opinion in matters of selection of Ministers? At least the Prime Minister should explain positively the reason why the formation of the Council of Ministers is held up.

Secondly, I was all the time patiently hearing what Mr. Vasant Satheji was telling. I understand fully, he was just telling that congress got higher percentage of votes and that they are the single largest party and all those things. He was pleading in favour of the Congress. He also explained that because they are not in a position to form a stable government, they did not respond to the request of the President. I fully understand that. But has the Congress headed by Rajiv Gandhi taken a stance of destabilising this government also? They already tried to destabilise the Janata Government headed by V.P. Singhji. There is no denying the fact. Even the common people, the newspaper reading people, those who hear the news on the Radio and TV, have fully realised the situation. So, has the Congress come forward with this idea that when they are not in a position to form a stable government, the other government must be destabilised and they are determining the policy accordingly? Otherwise it is very difficult to explain the present position of the Government.

The third point is—I am just quoting the opinion of some of the constitutional experts as published in *The Statesman* today about only two or three points below:

"First of all, the portfolios of the Ministers have not been announced, and secondly, the President has not notified the portfolios on the advice of the Prime

*Translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

Minister. They therefore held that the entire thing was invalid under the Constitution."

I am not happy about the present situation. But I have to abide by the Ruling of the Speaker. I know the earlier career of Mr. Chandra Shekhar also. But it is a matter of surprise and shock to all of us that he has taken such a peculiar stand as to aspire for the post of Prime Ministership. On several occasions he has made such statements in the press. Everybody knows that. So, that is the position. (*Interruptions*) Why are you having impatience? You, the Congress people have destabilised the other government (*Interruptions*) But I should say, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that a very bad example has been set and the manner in which this government is being formed, has dangerous import. That strikes at the root of parliamentary democracy. There lies the danger. It is the travesty of parliamentary democracy all parliamentary norms have been given a go-by and Mr. Chandra Shekhar has taken the lead. Devi Lalji is quite different. He has given some idea about the inner working of their organisation, about the Congress and as to what consultations were made with this Congress leader and that Congress leader. He has given some idea about the internal problems. I understand that and I appreciate him. But a very bad example is set and a very bad instance which is a shame for us, which a Member of Parliament feels hesitant also to speak about everything to the people whom they represent. We have been placed in such a position; everybody has been placed in a precarious position. A shady game is going on; manipulation is going on and the people are not going to swallow all these things. I would like to bring, through you Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Members and to the people.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we, as one of those who jealously protect the tradition, convention and the basic norms of the parliamentary democracy in this country would feel sad to find that there is today, a Motion of Confidence to be discussed in this House. To me, it is the

saddest possible event in the annals of the history of India's Parliament.

Sir, confidence is being sought of the House by a set of people who have defected, who have violated the basic norm of people's mandate. I quite agree with Mr. Vasant Sathe when he says that the Ninth Lok Saha election did not give the clearest possible mandate in favour of one party. This is a truth which is accepted by all of us. But one basic fact is clear and that basic fact is that the people voted against the then ruling party and therefore, the then ruling party, that is the Congress-I, had received no mandate from the people to form the Government. In the peculiar circumstances the National Front Government was brought into being. I am not going into the details of it. But what we see today is a saddest possible spectacle when a 61 member party born of defection, born of contrivances, born of manipulation and born of evil designs, if I am permitted to say that, has been turned into a ruling party with the help and assistance and collaboration of the single largest party having a command over 193 Members. This is the sad spectacle that we see today. The largest single party does not endeavour to take the responsibility of the Government. But a party which has born of defections, which has born of contrivances has got the adventure to run the Government and not only to run the Government but to meet all the national problems which are facing the nation. This is a very weak adventure. I wish them well. They have violated the people's mandate. I only want to quote the manifesto of the National Front of which both Mr. Devi Lal and Mr. Chandra Shekhar were architects. It concludes:—

"The National Front reiterates its commitment to the policies and programmes spelt out in the manifesto. Burdened by the price rise, hurt by violence, fractured by communalism and shamed by corruption at the top, the nation longs for relief. At last, the hour of change has struck. It is for the people of India to ring it in with their votes."

[Sh. Chiatta Basu]

Now to my great surprise, I find that Mr. Chandrashekhar Prime Minister of this country in an interview says: "If the interests of Rajiv Gandhi in politics and mine converge on a point, what is wrong in that?"

This manifesto was there to fight against the Congress and this manifesto promises to the people that all the items that have been included in the manifesto would be implemented to the fullest possible extent. Now, after getting elected on the basis of the people's mandate against the Congress-I, Mr. Chandrashekhar has chosen to seek alliance with the Congress-I against whom he has fought the elections. This is the tragic of the Young Turk turned into an old political fossil. This Government is nothing but the Government by proxy; this Government is merely a Government of make-shift arrangement. If you allow me to say, this Government is a grotesque chameleon. On the one side, there is the Congress-I; I can understand their policy. We have been fighting against their policies. I shall be fighting yours. Then, you will also have the opportunity to fight against us. You also want us to be eliminated from the political field. We shall survive because of our internal strength, ideological strength and ideological commitment. But what sort of people are they? Are you paying for their sins? Why are you taking the burden of their sins? That is why, I say, you have the courage and form the Government, run the Government in the way you like.

The National Front Government led by Mr. V.P. Singh could have survived had it chosen to concede the demands of the communal forces in the country. Those communal forces forced this National Front Government to sacrifice the Government. Otherwise it could be at the cost of the principles. The principles are for the protection of minorities, for upholding the principles of secularism and democracy.

You may say something against us. But so far as the Leftists are concerned, we have

extended our support to the National Front Government not on the basis of any consideration, not on the basis of any political benefit to be derived from them. We have extended our support to them on the basis of principle, on the basis of commitment, on the basis of ideological position that we have taken. I am sorry to see the change. Once upon a time, the young Turk of our country was there to be inspired by many of us in our country, to fight against your leadership. Now, he has sunk up to the pressure, not for the noble cause, not for great national concern. Had it been so, you could have fought ideologically within the Party, you could have mobilised the people all over the country, you could have mobilised your support on your behalf. But instead of taking recourse to that process, you have taken to the process of contrivance and manipulations. This is the saddening part of the impasse that we find today. Even at this late stage, the point I want to make before the Prime Minister is: There is the anti-Defection Act. But, in spite of that Anti-Defection Act, I feel particularly at this stage the need to give to the electorate the right to recall. If the Prime Minister really wants to build up a country based on moral values and banish all defections, one of the surest and successful methods is the right to allow the electorate to recall, because he has violated the mandate of the people.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Basu, you had your time.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: This is my last and concluding point. At this last stage, would the Prime Minister assure the House that the positive steps already taken by the national Government on the basis of its election manifesto will be continued and will not be disturbed and will not be put an end to and, if they further improve upon it, the countrymen will be very much grateful to you? But, whatever commitment has been made in this election manifesto and, to the extent it has been implemented, to the extent the policy formulations have been made, please see that those policy commitments are not reversed.

Even now, I have cent per cent satisfaction as a Leftist party which extended support to the Government. True, there are many shortcomings. But there was a pronounced policy formulation. There was pronounced policy direction. Please see that the manifesto you adhere to is not further eroded and the policy formulations which are politically made by the erstwhile Government should be pursued without further erosion.

I oppose the confidence motion.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Baramulla):
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, kindly give me proper interpretation as I have to offer two couplets in Urdu.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister had rightly said in the very beginning that such words should not be uttered which will invite stiff response. At that moment Shri Arif intervened and told him that he was free to say whatever he wanted to. Thereafter I thought that I should also say something in this regard. I am pained to hear whatever has been said today during the course of this discussion. I wonder how a person like Shri Madhu Dandavate could commit such a mistake while speaking. It appears that the level of the debate has gone down. The Deputy-Prime-Minister had to exercise a great restraint on that occasion but later on even he was compelled to say something which he did not want to. Dear friends, the impression that has been created on me has reminded me of a urdu couplet. Whether persons like Arif Sahib or legal experts like Shri Unnikrishnan are there I feel it was not correct on their part to have quoted from the constitution. Did not Shri Devi Lal plainly remind you that the aircraft was sent to pick him up? We know everything. When one speaks of principles one should be very careful. I reminded of a couplet written by Faiz:

"Aap khud hi judge bante hain, khud hi muddai bante hain

Bane hain ahle awas, muddsi bhi munsifi bhi

Kise vakeel karien kis se munsifi chahen."

[English]

You think you are the only honest people in this country. you think you are the only people who work for Sidhant. That assertion is wrong. I know some facts. I am here for the third term. I have met people. I know facts.

[Translation]

In the very beginning Shri Devi Lal made a very interesting remark, I am not very close to him. At the time of the meeting of the Presidium, The Minister incharge of television, who was responsible the extensive misuse of Doordarshan, who is not present now, someone asked Shri Devi Lal, why did he not attend the meeting of National Front, Shri Unnikrishnan and the president of his party were also there at that time Shri Devi Lal, in his simple style which has a touch of sarcasm in it replied which National Front? Only one or two members are there, perhaps he wanted to save the honour of the Pressidium, otherwise there is nothing such as Presidium. Even a single member in Lok Sabha claims to have formed a party.

Any how, now the question is, how the Government was run during the last eleven months. I would explain a little in a few minutes. The Government was formed with the support of BJP and the Communists Party. As there is paucity of time I would not like to go into the details. National Front was formed and Janata Dal was formed. But actually there was neither Janta Dal nor any National Front. In Janta Dal, Socialist group, the Jan Morcha and the Lok Dal had some internal strife with the result the party split. Now they have alleged that BJP is a communal party. I just do not agree to this. How can they say so. They should have thought about it the day they joined hands with leftists and the BJP. The greatest sin you committed was that you did not run the Government in consultation with others. I

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

would like to give an example in this regard. When Advaniji spoke on the provision of reservation, the then Prime Minister Shri V.P. Singh was also present in the House for whom I have a great regard because whenever I have met him for any purpose he has never disappointed me. He is a very honest man and a noble person, but I fail to understand why he gave so much liberty to Shri Paswan and Shri Sharad Yadav. Shri Paswan who is a friend of mine asserted in the House that the reservation policy which had been formulated much earlier will be implemented and this House is not the country. Shri Advaniji at that time was forced to oppose it.

[English]

It is Mr. Paswan who pushed Shri Advani to the wall.

[Translation]

Advaniji asked him how can he say that the recommendations will be implemented without consulting the other parties. The words which he used were:

[English]

This minority Government cannot take such a big decision."

[Translation]

The main cause of the fall of this Government has been that they did not consult each other, besides, Janata Dal itself had been split into various factions within. How can the people who are divided within themselves can take the country to the right direction...*(Interruptions)* ...I would like to submit that they have done injustice to the communists. I accept the principles of communism.

[English]

Often I feel I belong to leftist.

[Translation]

The injustice they did to the communists was that they had different policies for the leftists and for the B.J.P. You will have to explain it...*(Interruptions)* ...Shri V.P. Singh will not tell but other persons who have lost ministership will come out. I ask them will not put all the questions. I felt very sorry after hearing the speech of Shri Madhu Dandavate.

[English]

Madhuji, I know, you are a professor of physics. But I have been a student of economics. Even then I may tell you what is the growth of index? What is the rate of inflation? You are selling *Tambaku* at the rate of Rs. 40 per kilogram. There is no agency to even assess the index at the grassroot level. Madhuji, perhaps, I feel that you have lost your elegance the moment you joined the Government. When he was in the opposition, he was our leader. He lost that elegance because he misled this House. He misled the then Prime Minister by saying that within a month the prices would come down. I raised that question here. I raised that question in the Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Petroleum. I asked the question from the then Prime Minister, 'are you befooling us? Can prices come down? At this point of time, how the prices would come down? Therefore, what is the position in respect of balance of foreign exchange?' We know the kind of legacy that you have left for Mr. Chandra Shekhar. I will come again to the policy on Kashmir.

[Translation]

What is their policy about Kashmir Shri V.P. Singh handed over the charge of Kashmir to his worthy Ministry of Home Affairs. All the memorandum we used to give him were handed over to Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayed. Kashmir was completely destroyed during the regime of the previous Government. What did not happened there? The person who was sent there was responsible for its destruction you talk of principles—*(Interruptions)* ...You are sup-

posed to safeguard the Constitution of India. But article 370 was totally ignored and in such circumstances that person was sent there who brought destruction there. After that Shri Farooq was murdered, incidents of firing took place in Kashmir, the same day. Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri Somnath Chatterjee demanded that he should be called back. However, the members of Janata Dal comprising of Jan Morcha and others, excluding of course of BJP, suggested that he should be rewarded and thus he was rewarded in the other house. Shri V.P. Singh, did not visit Kashmir once even despite a number of memorandum given to him, to pay at least a short visit to the valley to console the people. (*Interruptions*) Why didn't you go to Kashmir? Instead the Minister of Home Affairs has got passed two draconian laws here and as a sequel to it incidents of arsons, killings and rape and other illegal things took place. We even told you that the journalists have taken a risk in going there. Had our journalist colleagues and people like Tarkunde, Sarkatdah and others of Human Rights Organisation and people of the Initiative Group not gone there, then Amnesty and other American organisations established for restoration of human rights would have blamed us and our nation. Today we can reiterate that there were certain people who had sympathised with them. I had requested Shri V.P. Singh to send a Parliamentary delegation to look into it but he did not dare to send the same. While appointing Shri George Fernandes as the Minister of Kashmir Affairs, Government had obtained mandate from all political parties and had asked for the support of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. The issue was settled with the support of Somnath Chatterjee, Indrajit Gupta and Advaniji and orders of the President were obtained in that respect. But Mr. Fernandes was removed because he had started understanding and sharing the problems of Kashmiris. He was removed in an uncalled for manner, without discussing it with anyone you dismissed him. No order of President were obtained in doing so. You never invited the political parties for a discussion on this issue. Mr. Fernandes was simply intimidated on telephone that he was

no longer the Minister of Kashmir Affairs (*Interruptions*) I want to ask them that under what authority it was done. They used to say on the day when the vote of confidence was sought that their Government should get majority. Today, I whole-heartedly welcome this new Government and the new Prime Minister and support the motion they have brought here.

During the last two days I requested the Home Minister and the Prime Minister Chandra Shekharji to withdraw TADA Act which was enforced in Kashmir at the instance of Jagmohan with the sole purpose of taking revenge upon the people of Kashmir but they turned a deaf ear to it. The court has given a verdict that in Srinagar too the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act should be enforced because there too innocent people may be implicated. They immediately reacted to it. The Government wanted to take the credit. I foiled their foul game and said that the new Prime Minister has done so on our request and TADA force was deployed in Srinagar. For the last two months the employees right from Peon to the Chief Secretary in the State are on strike. But this Government is not taking the trouble to ascertain the problems of its employees. The Chief Secretary of the State said that the employees would be compelled to call off their strike and resume their duty. Will this act of compelling the two lakhs employees of the State to resume their duty prove helpful in creating a harmonious relationship. I apprised the new Prime Minister of my suggestion and perception that the employees would resume their duty willingly only when they were asked to do so with honour. (*Interruptions*) I want to say something about Ram Janambhoomi-Babri Masjid issue. (*Interruptions*) I want to recite a couplet to Advaniji and it is as follows (*Interruptions*) I am submitting it for the attention of Advaniji. It is telecast on Television also:—

"Uske Faroge Husan Se, Jhamke Hain
Sub Mein Noon,
Shamme Haran Ho Ya Ki Diya Somnath
Ka."

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

This is a couplet composed of by Mir Takimiri and I want to tell him that this is the voice of a Muslim. Its meaning is that it is the God whom you call Rama and whom you defame. The beauty of God shines everywhere. May it be in the premises of Mecca or Somnath. You listen to it on Radio and Television in the morning but you do not pause to give a thought to it. (*Interruptions*) Advaniji your Rath Yatra has been termed by us as Vote yatra. You have highlighted your symbol.

Now it is my earnest appeal to you not to make the question of Babri Masjid and Ram Janambhoomi an issue Babar and Rama. It will be an act of great injustice to the Muslims. It is not an issue related to Rama and Babar. Because God Rama is a divine power. Allama Iqbal has called Rama as 'Imame Hind'.

[*English*]

He is the leader, the philosopher and the guide for all the people. This is Allama Iqbal. Could there be a better Muslim than Allama Iqbal? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please conclude. There are other Members to speak.

[*Translation*]

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Thus, Advaniji, please do not try to be unjust to the Muslims and try to resolve this issue through negotiations.

Now I want to recite a couplet to attract the attention of Shri V.P. Singh, Dandavateji and their colleagues.

[*English*]

They are presenting themselves before the nation as saints.

[*Translation*]

I want to say it in Urdu. (*Interruptions*)

To err is human. Thus the new Prime Minister had warned that nothing derogatory should be said which compels him to make a statement. I am reciting the couplet.

[*English*]

I want somebody to interpret it into English.

Itni Na Barah Pakaye ?Daman Ki Kihayat." Your are all clean, don't prolong this story; don't magnify the conceit of your own cleanliness. Don't make it something very big.

Itni Na Barah Pakaye Daman Ki Himayat, Daman Ko Jara Dekh Zara Bande Kaba Ko Dekh."

[*English*]

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to extend the support and cooperation on behalf of my party, the Muslim League to Shri Chandra Shekhar Government. I feel, as far as Mr. Chandra Shekhar is concerned, he has secular credentials and nobody can doubt about it. When I say, "let us support this Government", I have got valid reasons for the same and I do so, in the interest of the nation.

Let us make it very clear that we do not feel shy of elections. In a democratic set up, everybody has to face elections today or tomorrow. None can run away from the same. But what is disturbing me equally today is that, it is not the appropriate time to go in for a mid-term poll. This is a very valid factor which everyone has to remember. If we hold the elections today, let me tell you honestly and sincerely, the country will face blood-bath. Holding elections today under the circumstances, will be a disaster. All our ideals of secularism, all our ideals of national integrity, all our ideals of communal harmony will be shattered completely, if we go to polls today. Therefore one has to understand this: If anybody is going to gain today by elections, it will only be the aggressive, fascist, com-

munal forces and its success is going to destroy the country in future. We must also understand that today the entire country is surcharged with emotions. You all know what is happening in our country. Last month and this month also riots were there in Godhra in Gujarat; Jaipur and Udaipur in Rajasthan; Indore in Madhya Pradesh, not to speak of the curfew in 33 towns in UP. In Bijnore, hundreds of Muslims were killed, surpassing the genocide of Bagalpur, last year. We cannot ignore all these. These are the result of the notorious *Rath Yatra* and nobody can dispute it. (*Interruptions*) This is the result of the notorious *Rath Yatra*. Today I cannot forget the communal violence in Delhi, yesterday and the day before. There have been killings, arson and looting; and tension still prevails. It is a conspiracy of the fascist communal forces. The atmosphere was already poisoned by the *Rath Yatra* throughout the length and breadth of the country.

18.00 hrs.

All this was the result of the *Rathyatra*. There was violence in the country.

I cannot remain without mentioning the communal violence in Delhi yesterday and day before yesterday. The Government should find out who is responsible for all this. The administration and the police failed there. There were killings, arson and complete disaster because of burning of the houses and looting of business establishments. The situation has been badly handled by the local police force. I am happy that the Prime Minister visited the disturbed area yesterday. Today, he has declared in the House that to establish peace, he will not hesitate to take action against anybody however high he might be. I am sure, he must have directed the administrative machinery to be vigilant to restore peace, and to give justice to the minorities. He should take action against those found responsible for such violence in the country and for disturbing the peace in the country. I hope the Prime Minister would in future remember the solemn declaration made in this august House today.

It is extremely painful that under such an

alarming and critical situation, again our friends of BJP are starting a campaign for *Kar Seva* from the 6th of next month. They have seen the disaster of the *Rathyatra* last month and today they are talking of *Kar Seva* to start from the 6th December. I shudder to imagine what is going to happen to our country under such a situation. (*Interruptions*)

One more thing I would like to say is that when the situation is very serious, a declaration has been made by a leader of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad that if one mosque is not surrendered to them, then, they will occupy 3,000 mosques forcibly and no Government will be able to save the Muslims. (*Interruptions*) I want the Prime Minister should also consider this declaration and its many-faceted elements. I am pained at this declaration. I am deeply pained when I think of the present situation.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (Calcutta South): What is the policy of the Prime Minister? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: I must tell you all that we have had enough of bloodshed and devastation. Let us call a halt to it. Let us live in peace in this country. All of us are brothers. Therefore, as a Musalman... (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You do not represent the Muslims.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Who says? (*Interruptions*) Nobody can speak against me. (*Interruptions*) I would urge the Prime Minister to take a serious note of these threats to the country and the people and take adequate steps for protection of the minorities and the nation in future.

Unfortunately, my illustrious friend, Shri Advani, is not here. I honestly and sincerely appeal to my friends from the BJP to convey to Shri Advani. I want them to reconsider their decision to start the *Kar Seva* from the 6th of next month. I appeal to him to please give it up. That would be disastrous for the country. I appeal to them to give up this path of violence and intransigence and agree to

[Sh. Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait]

sit round a table and try to solve this very very sensitive and provocative issue of Babri Masjid-Ramjanambhoomi problem. Let us all sit together and with all sincerity and loyalty, we will be able to settle this issue and then we can go again to the judicial body. The political situation in this country is worst, whether the situation in Kashmir or in Punjab or in Assam or in Tamil Nadu. Everywhere there is terrorism and fear. How many people have been killed. Can we have elections in this situation? Is it possible? By holding elections, do you want to destroy the country?

Now, the economic situation is in a mess. We have the Gulf crisis and due to this Gulf crisis, our economy is going to suffer very badly as there are potentialities of war. May God save us from war. So, in this international situation, economic situation and political situation, all want that in the interest of the country there should not be elections today. Now, in the circumstances, priority should not be for elections. Priority should be for establishing peace and communal harmony and solving the problems. Let us therefore have an alternative Government. We have to explore the means of establishing an alternative and stable Government. The Leader of Opposition, Shri Rajiv Gandhi was invited to form the Government and he could not form the Government. There was no other possibility and finally, a solution has come that Shri Chandra Shekhar alone can form the Government. This solution is very clear. Therefore, a Government has to be established. Nobody else can do it except Mr. Chandra Shekhar to whom we give our support. I hope that this Government will be stable for at least some years so that they can solve the problems and normalise the present situation and then all of us can go for elections. Today, the only alternative Government possible, after all the efforts of the President, is the Chandra Shekhar Government. I only hope that all of us will join in the endeavour to establish communal harmony and save the integrity of the country. And then, we shall face elections in a better atmosphere. Another thing which I want to

say is that stability should be at the Centre and in the States also. The largest State according to the population is UP. Therefore, I feel that Mulayam Singh Yadav Government should not be disturbed and it should continue to be in power. Whatever our friends of BJP might misrepresent that all governments follow a policy of appeasement of Muslims, they are false and baseless. The reality is that Muslims have been discriminated and they never got justice. Therefore, I appeal to the Prime Minister that Muslims should be given justice. They should be given equality; they must have dignity; they must have protection and identity; Lastly, I want to quote a couplet of a famous poet, Jigar Moradabadi.

"Chaman-Chaman Hi Nahin, Jiske
Goshe Goshe Mein,
Kahin Bhar Na Aye, Kahin Bahar Aye,
Ye Meinkade Ki Saki Gari Ki Hai Tauhin,
Koi Ho Jame Bakf, Koi Sharmsar Aye."

Therefore, I appeal to the Prime Minister that Muslims should be given justice, equality, dignity and identity. I hope Babri Masjid issue will be settled soon. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mayawati ji, I am giving you five minutes to speak.

KUMARI MAYAWATI (Bijnore): Three members from our party have been elected... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will be grateful to you if you resume your seat immediately after I ring the bell.

KUMARI MAYAWATI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, before making my party's stand clear over the motion of confidence moved by the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Chandra Shekhar, I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister and apprise the entire House of an incident that took place at my residence after I criticised the dual policy of Shri V.P. Singh, the hon. Ex-Prime Minister in the House on the 7th November. (*Interruptions*) Please listen, if you do not know, we shall open a

school for your learning. I want to submit that on the 12th November when I came back from Bijnor, I came to know from my family members that some anti-social elements were sent at my residence after the 7th November, who threatened them of serious consequences if I did not support Shri V.P. Singh. A report against some of them whom my family members could identify had also been lodged.

Now, I would like to tell the hon. Prime Minister that there has been the Government of Janata Dal during the past 11 months and at present also the name of the party which is going to form the Government is Janata Dal. The only difference between the two Governments is that the former had been supported by the B.J.P. and the leftist parties while the latter is being supported by the Congress, the largest party in the House, and other parties. Hon Shri V.P. Singh might be knowing well though he could not admit earnestly in the House that whatever steps did he like to initiate in favour of the poor and helpless people, the B.J.P. and the leftist group did not allow him to do so as his was the minority Government. Now another Government of Janata Dal has been formed with the support of Congress (I) party and some other groups. I want to say that had the earlier Government been able to fulfill even half of the assurances given to the S.C., S.T., O.B.C. and others, that Government headed by Shri V.P. Singh would not have been collapsed. So, I request the present Prime Minister not to follow the path of Shri V.P. Singh. Our party's policy is quite clear. We neither supported nor opposed the National Front Government and thus remained neutral. We supported that Government on their merits. Our policy is more or less the same but under the new circumstances a slight departure had to be made from the previous policy. Keeping in view the disturbed situation in the country during the last 11 months holding elections may not be practical. Although the B.J.P. and the Janata Dal were in favour of holding elections, yet our party president, Shri Kanshi Ram had decided that we shall support Shri V.P. Singh if he gets the vote of confidence and if he fails to get it and instead if Shri Chandra Shekhar gets a vote of confidence, we shall support

him and give our blessings but I..... (*Interruptions*) Why are you upset on my using the word 'blessing'. The B.J.P. seems to be more upset on my using this term. As the fact remains that cast Hindus will never like to accept the blessings of the persons who once upon a time were considered as untouchable. Not only that they would not even like to bless them as they were considered so low. So, they were always denied the opportunity of coming to the Assembly and the Parliament in the past. Rather one should be happy to know that today after a great effort of Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar the son of an untouchable, Shri Kanshi Ram stands in a position to bless the son of a Thakur. Now I have explained about my using the word 'blessing'..... (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, now I want to make my party's stand clear as the voting will take place after a short-while. As on the 7th November also over the motion of confidence moved by Shri V.P. Singh I had made it clear that all the three votes of the B.J.P. would be cast in his favour if his Government was to fall for want of only three votes but we would not spoil our votes if they need more than three votes to survive. The same thing I want to repeat here even today that our three votes are reserved for the hon. Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar if he really requires them in order to get vote of confidence, otherwise we would like to remain neutral even today. In this country, all the powers have been captured by a handful people, may be about 15 per cent of the total population. We after a hard struggle under the leadership of Dr. Ambedkar, Mahatama Phule, Shri Rama Swamy Naikar and Shri Kanshi Ram have got an opportunity to follow the path envisaged by them. We acknowledge only Shri Kanshi Ram as our present leader, not anyone else, because it is he who has provided us a right platform in the political arena to follow the path of our elders. I request the Hon. Prime Minister to take initiative for the welfare of the poor and depressed class. We shall always be ready to furnish the details about their conditions if he so desires so that something could be done for their welfare. With these words, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mahadikji, once you get up to speak, you do not sit. I am giving you two minutes time to express your views.

18.22 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

*SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK (Bombay-South Central): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to clarify the stand of my party and the party chief, Shri Thakare on the motion of Confidence in the Council of Ministers moved by Hon. Prime Minister when I opposed the motion expressing confidence in V.P. Singh Government, on the earlier occasion, it was interpreted that our party is going to support the break-away group of Janta Dal. I want to say that my speech was wrongly interpreted and false propaganda was made. Austerity of principles is pointed out by everybody. But everyone knows opportunism involved in politics. Whether it is Gujarat, Rajasthan or this august House, we know that cooperation is extended by the parties not on the basis of principles but on the basis of selfish political interests. So, even though there is an alliance, it can not be free from self-interest.

Sir, I want to make it clear that our party can think of extending support to the new Government only if it decides to rectify the mistakes committed by the previous Government. The Government headed by V.P. Singh neglected and insulted Hindus, 'Hindutva and Hinduism in its 11 month old regime. For appeasing the minority the Government declared 'Paigamber Jayanti' as Public Holiday. I want to know in the House, why such a holiday was not declared for Rama or Krishna Jayanti. I want to know what will be the policy of the new Government in this matter.

The issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi was raised in the House. I had requested the former Minister to telecast on Doordarshan the correct position regarding Babri mosque

and Ram Janam Bhoomi. According to my information, some parts of the mosque depict the pictures of pigs, tigers and peacocks. I want the society to think whether these pictures form part of muslim culture. I want to know whether the new Government will telecast on Doordarshan the correct position regarding Babri Masjid and Ram Janam Bhoomi so that the country knows the factual position.

Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav whose tough handling of the situation resulted in carnage in Ayodhya was compared to Gen. Dyer and Ayodhya situation to *Jalian wala Bagh*. If you are going to include Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav in your cabinet, then we have to think whether to extend support to your Government or not. If the interests of the Hindus are not protected in this country, we are not prepared to tolerate such a situation. When Hindu world was made orphan by 'Pravara', we are not convinced how Chandrashekhar holding 'Chandra' on his head is going to change the present situation.

Kashmir is a burning problem. If any dispute regarding Vaishno Devi arises, I do not know which 'Nath' is going to solve that problem. Similarly, problems of Punjab, Assam, Tamil Nadu are equally intractable and I do not know which "subodh" and which "Sahaya" (assistance) you are going to take while solving these problems unless we are told how this Government will remove injustice done to Hindus, we cannot support this Government.

Regarding Mandal Commission report, my party chief has said that reservation should not be caste based. Persons belonging to any caste have to face problem of hunger and starvation. Hunger knows no caste. It is above caste barrier. Therefore, equal justice should be given to the poor irrespective of their caste.

On the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi, BJP, Shivsena, Bajrang Dal and several religious saints have unitedly revolted and they have propogated 'Hindutva' in the new

light. This is the beginning of new revolution. If you want to avoid communal flare up by reactionary and terrorists forces arising from the failure of solving Ram Janam Bhoomi, Punjab and such communally sensitive issues, we have to check these forces. I may proudly mention that Maharashtra has successfully checked such aggressions of 'Shaks', 'Hoons', Muslims, and christians in the past. I want to know what is the policy of the Government for checking the attack of such communal, reactionary and terrorist forces and how the Government proposes to break the cast barriers causing turmoil in the country and build a casteless society. We want to know what is the difference between the old *Janata Dal* and the new group. As we do not know this, our party has decided to take a neutral stand on the issue of lending support to the new Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Now Shri A.K. Roy—only two minutes.

SHRI A.K. ROY (Dhanbad): Minutes for us, and hours for them. Sir, don't destabilise us.

The Motion before the House, seeking confidence by a mysterious Government, is an affront to all of us. If November 7th was a sad day—writing an obituary of a Government, this is a bad day—writing an obituary to all the values, about which I would like to appeal to all the people. What are we observing today? They say that the previous Government fell, as if to the relief of all. I want to know who are the people who celebrated the fall of the previous Government, and who are the people who are rejoicing about the installation of this Government. I have seen that all the elites, all the privileged, all the ruling people, all the people in the upper strata of the society are celebrating the fall of the previous Government, and the rise of the new Government.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in Dhanbad, only yesterday viz. the 15th November, it was a very sacred day, when the people of this area, the people of the Jharkhand area celebrate the birthday of Birsa Bhagwan; and for this purpose, a stage

was made, i.e. to celebrate this Birsa Munda's birthday. And Shri Laloo Yadav, the Chief Minister of Bihar was to come and address it. And in the night, all those who are for this new Government burnt the entire dais.... (*Interruptions*).... All that *pandal* was burnt; and in that burnt *pandal*, the entire celebration has to be conducted. This is only the beginning. I do not know where it will end.

I would like to say this: the Dalits, the poor, the exploited, the trampled and the down-trodden are not happy. They are not jubilant. But they will not forgive either. I would like to say this. What is the crime of that Government? The crimes of that Government are many; and the biggest crime is that it has dared to touch the entrenched interests, or the vested interests. That is the biggest crime it had committed. That is why it had to fall.

It did not fall when it compromised on the Punjab issue, though that was an Himalayan blunder; it did not fall when it compromised on Kashmir issue; it did not fall when it compromised on industrial policy issue; it did not fall when it compromised on giving concessions to the foreign monopolists. It fell when it refused to give concessions on the question of secularism; there it fell. That is why we were—all the Leftists—committed to support this Government and to continue it.

I have great admiration for Mr. Advani. I adore him. And by his reasonableness and by his self-restraint he does not look as a BJP's man... (*Interruptions*) So, he is a very wonderful man... (*Interruptions*)... He does not look as a BJP's man; he looks a perfect gentleman, the BJP leader: he criticised this Government. This is a defectors' Government. Charan Singh's defector Government is one thing: he did not trouble us to accept its prolonged existence.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: This Government has been brought by all those who did not realise that the only solution is a fresh mandate and in which perhaps you also contributed. Otherwise, my party is of the view that the only way is a fresh mandate...

(Interruptions)...

SHRI A.K. ROY: He knew that it was a minority Government when it was formed. When we amended the Constitution, we made a provision that arbitrarily no Government can recommend dissolution of the Parliament if it is in a minority. Even if V.P. Singh's Government had recommended the dissolution of Parliament, the President was not bound to listen to that; he could have offered it to the biggest party. That is the constitutional position. He knows it... *(Interruptions)...*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: His advice would not have been binding.

SHRI A.K. ROY: But the advice was not even given. This was significant... *(Interruptions)...* Why should an intelligent, sensible man give an advice which would not have been binding?... *(Interruptions)...* Our advice should not be that cheap. What did he do? The Rath of a man like Advaniji moved and this Government also moved to that position; both the movements took place simultaneously. What will the people understand? The people will understand that you, the BJP and the Congress (I) had a secret understanding and this produced this Government. This is the product... *(Interruptions)...* I would like to ask: why did you do this through the Congress (I), Janata Dal (S) and others? You could have directly formed the Government. Your 86 and their 192 could have given us a stable Government. "JAB PYAR KIYA TO DARNA KYA"... *(Interruptions)...* Why all these things? I am very much surprised that a party like BJP which talks of Hinduism, which talks of prolonged long-term national interest, has a plunge the entire country into such type of crisis only on the question of having election for Rama's Temple. Ram lives in the hearts of the people. "Where lies the Kingdom of Heaven," people ask? The Kingdom of Heaven lies in the hearts of the people. But these people think that Ram lives in that spot, nowhere else, not even in the heart of Mr. Advani. All these absurd things are going on.

Lastly, I will say something to Mr. Chandra Shekhar whom I used to know for a long time. Being a man from Dhanbad, he often used to grace or disgrace that place. Moon means Chandra. Moon is always a satellite; moon is not a star, not even a planet. So, there is no wonder that even in politics also he will remain as a satellite. Thank you.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel sad after hearing the whole debate. I shall not say a word about the speech of my friend, Mr. Sathe, because he has been kind enough to extend his support. I am glad that in spite of all anguish and anger, my friend from the CPM and CPI friends have raised the level of the debate. I shall not go into the acrimonious accusations; nor shall I like to answer them. But, definitely they have raised a very valid question. What is the programme before this Government? Or what are the issues on which we are going to run the nation in the coming days? In the very beginning of my speech this morning I said that we should not indulge in personal accusations. I really feel that times are grave, we have reached a perilous point in our history. I do not want to be prophet of doom because I know that because of cultural heritage, civilization and vitality of our people we can overcome all the difficulties with cohesion and hard working. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to find the areas of agreement, not areas of confrontation and conflict. This is true for all the countries which are fighting against poverty, squalour, misery and disease. This is true for the whole world and more true for this subcontinent. This is why I say that at this moment we should try to agree to work together on specific issues.

My friend Shri Somnath Chatterjee asked me what will be the manifesto. I shall like to keep aside the manifestoes of all the political parties. Today, can't we agree on three, four, five points where we can say that we shall work together in order to retrieve the situation? For that a new political climate has to be created in this country and that political climate can be initiated by understanding each other's problems, each other's aspirations. No use trying to call names. I know,

sometimes, that in the heat of the moment all of us lose our temper, try to call others names and I am sorry that in the course of this debate I also once or twice lost my temper. But when I see the problem as it comes, unfolds before me every day, I think that we just cannot afford and I cannot afford to lose temper while sitting in this chair, because, I want everybody's cooperation, everybody's support. If you want me to express my political philosophy, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, I am not a progressive man, I am a conservative person and as a conservative, I do not change every day. My philosophy is the same, what my friend Shri Chitta Basu says, when I was being called a Young Turk. And there is no alternative before this country, because we are a scarce resource society. If the resources are limited, we have to decide how to use our resources. We have to decide what is our asset and what is our strength. Nature has given us a fertile land, a good climate, all the types of fruits and crops can be produced in this country, almost all the minerals are found in this land, and above all there are more than 85 crore people in this country, who have got the strength to bring prosperity and progress to this nation. What has been our fault in the past? We have not been able to provide opportunity for these people, unfortunate people, who are ready to work hard, to utilise their strength for producing more. How can we do it? In a democratic society, Mr. Speaker, we cannot force them to work. We have to create their will power and how can you create that will power? That will power can be created, can be inspired, only by assuring them that what they produce will not go for the ostentatious living of the chosen few but for meeting the basic needs of our people. So, our investment has to be made in the areas which are essential for meeting the basic needs of our people and we will have to invest in man. When I talk of investment in man, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall like to emphasise that the child is the strength of today and the hope of tomorrow. Every child who is born has the right to get from the society clean drinking water, necessary calories to develop as a healthy citizen, elementary education, primary health services and when he grows into a citizen, 18 years of age, he should not

be discriminated against on the basis of caste, creed and religion. If you take these five points as our manifesto, as our destination, as our goal, is there any difference in this House? There cannot be any difference. Why can't you work on this? But if you work on these principles, we will have to make many changes in our approach towards the economic problem, towards the social problem and Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall like to emphasise if the resources are scarce and if the country is poor, every section of the society will have to share this poverty. It cannot be that those who are the toiling masses, our peasantry, our workers in the field and factories, they will be asked, they will be called upon, to go on making sacrifices. In the first four decades, since our independence we have been asking them to make sacrifices. How long more? They will have to be assured that this poverty will have to be shared by those who are the privileged in the society. So, I shall like to make this appeal to those who are elite, who are privileged. My friend Mr. A.K. Roy told me that they are very cooperative with me. I am very happy. If they want to cooperate with me, they should learn to make sacrifice in order to make the people, our poorer sections, happier and richer. That is a must that we should do. In this context, we shall have to revise our approach. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee asked me, "are you going to revise the Industrial Policy"? Was there any Industrial Policy adopted by the previous Government? Certain broad lines were given. I had some objections to that. And I think, Somnathji you had also those objections. Those objections are not based on personal prejudice. I have no preferences. I have no prejudice. But I think that in this country we cannot hope to be bailed out by forces outside. I do not say that we should not take help from outside. In today's world we will have to depend on outside help and support. In critical areas, we will have to invite new technology, modern technology and we shall have to open up those areas for those who can do better. But are you going to open up our whole area for producing more cosmetics, more ice-creams? Please see the collaboration arrangements that had been made during the last many years and even during these few months when we were ruling this

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

country. My objection is not against liberalisation. This question is being raised everywhere. If liberalisation means less of red-tapism, if liberalisation means no hurdle, no corruption, bureaucracy should not interfere, then liberalisation is a must. If liberalisation means to squander away the scarce resources for ostentatious living, I shall only plead with all humility, we are not in a position to afford it. I hope that we shall realise these limitations.

On the economic front, I think that those who are poor and especially those sections who had been neglected, remain oppressed and exploited, they should have our special preference. I know there are many doubts, there are many apprehensions. But, Mr. Speaker, through you I want to assure this nation. I may make any compromise but no compromise on the question of dignity of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. There will be no question of any compromise on the feeling of the backward and oppressed sections about their urge to get a life of dignity in this society.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, about minorities, minorities all over the world feel apprehensive. I shall beg of those who say that there should be no discrimination between the minority and majority. Why the founders of our Constitution inserted a minority clause in our Constitution? Minorities all over the world, whether they are religious minorities or ethnic minorities or linguistic minorities, react in a sharp way because they have apprehension and fear in their minds. If we go by the dictionary meaning of what they say, we shall always reach a wrong political decision. We should try to understand their aspirations, we should try to understand their apprehensions, we should try to understand that they have a psychology, a psyche where they feel that they are not assured about their security, about their prosperity and about their future. It is the responsibility of the nation, it is the responsibility of the State and more so the responsibility of the majority community to see that this fear is eliminated from their minds. This we will have to do.

I say that in the matter of religion everybody is free. Secularism does not mean that we should discard religion. Religion is an instrument of communion between man and God. As long as religion is used for communion between man and God, for religious pursuits, we should not quarrel.

We should be proud of our religious heritage in this country. I am a Hindu. I am proud of Rama; I am proud of Krishna; I am proud of the Vedas and our Arayan civilisation. But equally I am proud of the contribution made by other religions which came to this country. And this is the superiority of the Hindu religion over others because we have got the compassion and we have got the tolerance. If this tolerance and compassion go, the Hindu religion will lose its power, its superiority over all other religions.

I am not against building the temple. I shall not go into any controversy. But it is an emotive issue. The building should be constructed. In the birth place of Rama there should be a temple, magnificent, glorious and as big as we can make. But I shall appeal to my friends that in their enthusiasm to build the temple, do not try to demolish the mosque, because I tell you, no other matter can come in the way. Build the temple as you like and all of us will contribute. And if I remain Prime Minister, Mr. Advani, after a few minutes, I assure you that I shall cooperate in every way to build the temple. But the only thing is, assure the Muslim community that their pride, their self-respect will not be hurt. (*Interruptions*)

KUMARI UMA BHARATI (Khajuraho): The Vishwa Hindu Parishad have decided in their meeting that unless you condemn the massacre in Ayodhya and unless you show your regret for the praising you did of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, Vishwa Hindu Parishad people will not talk to you on this Ayodhya issue.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Even if they do not talk with me I shall go on trying to talk with them because I want to make it very clear that I shall talk with every citizen of

India howsoever on a wrong path he will be, but only on one condition that there will be no compromise with the sovereignty, unity and integrity of the country. This is the only one condition. If a son or a relative of my family goes wrong, do I say that I shall discard him all of a sudden?

I know, in this House and in the other House many a time I have seen people taking an extreme view. But parliamentary democracy means dialogue, discussion, persuasion of each other to come to some understanding. This is the essence of parliamentary democracy.

My friend, Somnathji asked me what is my understanding with Advaniji or the BJP. The only understanding is—I again repeat in spite of all protestation by the lady Member sitting on the front bench—that I consider Advaniji to be a patriot. I do not agree with his thinking about the social and political life of this country. And I shall go on appealing to Mr. Advani and his colleagues—I have gone to their houses and tell them that the country cannot afford to have confrontation, the country cannot indulge in fighting with each other. I am sorry for what happened in Ayodhya. Nobody wants that even a single man should die. I assure you that even if a single man or women dies in this country, I feel that a son or daughter of Mother India has died. Death is death whether it comes by the knife of a rioter or by the bullets of the police. There is no difference in death. So, I cannot say that death by rioting is wrong and death by police bullets is good. But, sometimes, the State has to perform unpleasant duties. I never said that Mr. Mulayam Singh should have done it in a more vigorous way. I ask you Mr. Speaker, Sir, if sometimes decision has to be made in order to protect the lives of thousands, in order to protect millions from going in the street and killing each other, if some action has to be taken it is with regret and if the lady Member thinks that my regret makes any difference, I express regret that what has happened should have been avoided. But the responsibility is not that of the State, this responsibility should be shared by all those who are concerned. I tell you that on this question I do not want to

stand on false prestige. I do not want to stand on prestige whether I should meet X, Y, Z or not. Whoever can contribute to peace, whoever can contribute to understanding I shall go and knock at his door. If the Muslim community agrees to build the temple on the very spot where the mosque is, I shall be very glad. But this should be with common consent. It should be by their mutual understanding. It should not be coerced on them. I shall appeal again to the religious leaders of the Muslim Community and also of the Hindu Community that they should sit together, try to find a solution. Let us not politicise this issue. This is not a political issue. This is a human issue. This is an issue which is going to have its bearing on the history for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question I am very clear. In the name of religion please do not kill each other, that is an antithesis of religion, that is against religion, whether it is Islam, whether it is Hinduism, whether it is Christianity or any other religion. This is way I say that traditions should be respected unless and until they come in the way of progress. My friend Prof. Madhu Dandavate was kind enough to refer to my stand taken at the time of operation Blue Star. I was one of the saddest persons at that time. I did not make any big statement. When some press men asked me, I just said, I still remember that sentence—it is unfortunate that we had to send the army to the Golden Temple and better withdraw it soon. This is what I said. There were comments all over the country. Editorials were written against me. Political leaders came down on me heavily and not only Rajivji who subsequently became Prime Minister but even the leaders of my own party condemned me. Mr. Dandavate, in all humility I shall say Shri Rajiv might have asked that action be taken against me. The former Prime Minister whom I supported for eleven months went to Ballia in the 1984 elections and said, "why this gentleman contesting election from here? He is a Bhindranwale of Ballia. He should go and contest election in Punjab." I did not take it as something personal when I supported him at the time when we chose him to be the Prime Minister of this country because I thought

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

that personal matters should not prejudice our political judgements. I might have criticised Rajivji and the Congress. He might have criticised me. But does it mean that when the country is in peril and in my assessment I may be totally wrong that elections at this moment—as many friends have said—will bring disaster to this country, I am not going to finish the work which has been started by the previous Prime Minister. I am not going to be a disaster to this country. I refuse to be so. And if it is a crime, I am ready to commit this crime. But in all humility I should like to say that I do not want cooperation from one section or one person or one party, I want cooperation from everybody. About other issues I am not finding myself to be free. But, I ask Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, through you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, eleven months back when we formed the Government, he was quoting our manifesto. Has he gone through that manifesto? What happened in Punjab? Has the situation brightened up there? What has happened in Kashmir? When Rajiv Gandhi left Kashmir...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What did you do?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Please hear me. If you want I can say... (*Interruptions*) I shall tell you. When Rajiv Gandhi left the Government, at least 25-30 per cent people were openly associating themselves with India. When our Government came, the first thing I got from the newspapers was that Mr. Jagmohan was going to be appointed as Governor. I wrote a slip to my Home Minister saying: "It will be a disaster, don't do it". Comrade Surjeet and Farooqi, and I pleaded with him saying don't do it. I said it not for personal reasons. I had no friendly relations with Shri Farooqi. I tried to persuade the Home Minister that we have gone all over the world telling that there is an autocratic regime in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, while we have got an elected Government. I had strong views about the Rajiv Gandhi Government. I never met Shri Rajiv Gandhi for five years when he was the Prime Minister. But Shri Rajiv Gandhi left the Government with all his

virtues and vices. WE could not afford to make the same speeches which we were making during the elections. This is not the way to run a nation—condemning Shri Rajiv Gandhi that there was rigging in the elections. And, rigging in the elections was known by Mr. Mufti when he became the Home Minister. When he was in the Congress, he never remembered about the rigging. Is it the way to run a nation?

When I talk about Bofors, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, I want to tell you—this is not what I am saying today—that this is a peculiar country where you say that the Prime Minister was dishonest, the Finance Minister who framed the deal was the symbol of honesty... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: For the Prime Minister's information, if he looks at the file, the clearance was subject to commercial, technical and other clearances. After that, the file never returned to me.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I agree with him and I accept what he says. Should I take it that after having the contract approved, the Finance Minister never had a look at the file or he was denied to have a look into the file? Either the Prime Minister was so innocent that he did not know the implication or he was a collaborator in the whole deal. If he was innocent, the country was not safe in his hands as the Finance Minister. And this was proved subsequently that the country was not safe in his hands as the Prime Minister. It is nothing personal and I am saying this just because at that time I was not in the Government. I was not under the path of secrecy. Don't ask about the files. I shall never mention about files in this House. Unless and until, Mr. Speaker, you direct and this House wants the files, on my own I am not going to divulge the secrecy of this Government. But I want to tell you and assure you, Advaniji, that on Bofors or on any case of corruption, there will be no compromise. But I also want to tell very frankly that State power is not for personal vendetta. Nothing will be done against anybody because of personal prejudice. Nothing will be done in order to protect anybody for personal

friendship. This is what I feel should be the right course for a Government to adopt.

About Bofors I have said enough. What is the situation in Kashmir? What is the situation in Assam? What is the situation in Tamil Nadu? Assam, Kashmir and Punjab we inherited from Shri Rajiv Gandhi but who was brought about the situation to the brink in Assam and Tamil Nadu? A friend from that side asked me to do something. I assure you, Sir, and to the whole country that no compromise will be made about the integrity and sovereignty of the nation, whatever the consequences are there. I am already in touch with the Chief Minister of Assam and Tamil Nadu. I am going to discuss with them. I want that there should be proper action taken by them in order to restore peace and law and order in that part. Otherwise things will take their own course. I do not want to conceal anything because the Government of India is not so helpless. And if the Government of India here in Delhi is sitting helpless, there is no right for any of us to remain here, even for a minute. It is not the question of prejudice. It is not the question of challenging anybody. It is the question of discharging our duty I would not like to say anything more about that. All these questions I have tried to cover.

19.00 hrs.

About the economic position, gross mismanagement of the economy—I cannot say anything more and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we have given wrong signals to our people, to our industrialists, to our workers. People feel frustrated and desperate. The international community feels that India is on the verge of collapse. Our citizens who are outside Indian shores think that there is no hope for India. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that with your cooperation and the cooperation of these people, we shall lift this country from the muddy mire of misery, and we shall restore it to the glory that this nation deserves. We only require the open support from our toiling masses, from our peasantry, from our workers. We want the cooperation of all Indians who are outside India because they are as patriotic as we are. We want

cooperation with all friendly nations, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we can steer through this crisis only by tightening our belts. Austerity is a must. The slogan of austerity given by Mahatma Gandhi was not a slogan, it was a part of our economic strategy. Swadeshi and *swavalamban*—self-reliance and Swadeshi. By Gita Mukherjee I was asked this question. We had no other option but to resort to Swadeshi and *swavalamban* as much as is possible. But in critical areas we will have to get the cooperation from other nations.

This is in a broad way what we want to achieve. Whether we shall be able to achieve or not, only the future will tell. I do not want to make any tall claim. I know the limitations of this Government, but I tell you, my friend—Advaniji, you know me for quite some time. I can be anything, but I cannot be a puppet. I have not seen a person who can use me as a puppet. I have dealt with much bigger people in this country. So far if I was not reduced to a puppet, with your blessings and support, rest assured that even in future, nobody is going to use me as a puppet. But because some people are crying hoarse, I am not going to condemn those people who have come to support me, to help me in an hour of crisis, not my crisis, but the crisis of the nation and those who stand up to support me, I am grateful to them and I acknowledge that support. I do not want to do things in a clandestine manner. If I meet people, I meet them openly. Somebody said that I was meeting secretly. Why should I meet anybody secretly? Shri Rajiv Gandhi might have some hesitation in meeting me. But I had never any hesitation in meeting Shri Rajiv Gandhi. If I can go to anybody and everybody after becoming the Prime Minister, before becoming the Prime Minister, what was the hesitation before me to go to anybody's place? If occasion comes, I shall go to the doors of my worst critics. But I assure you, whether you are a critic or a supporter, don't try to remove me from the path which I have charted for myself. I shall like to use an Urdu couplet here:

"Mere Kadam Ke Saath Hai Manzil
Lagi Hui,

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

Manzil Jahan Nahi Wahan Mere Kadam Nahin."

You must start, I know my destination, I know my goal. If I cannot go to the goal, I am not going on any path just for the courtesy of a walker walking all alone.

Mr. Speaker, the last point that I should like to touch upon is defection. Morals have been given about defection. So many things have been mentioned, I don't want to go into them. But, Mr. Speaker, when the Anti-Defection law was passed, there was a moral in it that if one-third people go out of a party, it will not be treated as defection. It was not a concession to those who want to leave the party because it is not the defection. People should understand that there is another word which is called, 'dissent and protest'. Societies move forward only because of dissent and protest. If dissent and protest are not allowed, then society will stagnate and stagnation means sure death. When we see that something is going basically wrong and the whole country is being taken towards disaster, it is our national duty that we should dissent, that we should protest, and I am proud that my colleagues on this side protested against the things that were happening. I shall not go in to greater detail, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I crave the indulgence of all our Members. I ask for your support in this great endeavour, in this great task which is ahead of us in order to give this country the glory and prestige that it deserves. Thank you all.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the motion moved by Shri Chandra Shekhar to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against will

please say 'No'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be cleared—

Now, the Lobbies have been cleared. I hope the Members are in their allotted seats. I shall again put the motion moved by Shri Chandra Shekhar to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided

AYES

19.13 hrs.

Division No. 1

Adaikalaraj, Shri L.

Agarwal, Shri J.P.

Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin

Akbar, Shri M.J.

Amat, Shri D.

Anbarasu, Era Shri

Antony, Shri P.A.

Antulay, Shri A.R.

Arunachalam, Shri M.

Asokaraj, Shri A.

Athithan, Shri Dhanuskodi R.

Atinder Pal Singh, S.	Charles, Shri A.
Baga Reddy, Shri M.	Chaudhary, Shri Ram Prasad
Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari	Chaudhry, Shri Kamal
Bala Goud, Shri T.	Chauhan, Shri Prabhatsinh
Balaraman, Shri L.	Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai
Bali, Shrimati Vyjayantimala	Chennithala, Shri Ramesh
Banatwalla, Shri G.M.	Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya
Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh	Chidambaram, Shri P.
Bansi Lal, Shri	Chinta Mohan, Dr.
Basavaraj, Shri G.S.	Chowdhary, Shri Dasai
Basheer, Shri T.	Chowdhury, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan
Bengali Singh, Dr.	Commander, Shri Mohd. Hassan
Benjamin, Shri S.	Damor, Shri Somjibhai
Bhagat, Shri H.K.L.	Das, Shri Bhakta Charan
Bhagey Gobardhan, Shri	Deb Burman, Shri K.B.K.
Bhajan Lal, Shri	Delkar, Shri Monhanbhai Sanjibhai
Bhakata, Shri Manoranjan	Dennis, Shri N.
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram	Deora, Shri Murli
Bhatia, Shri Ram Sewak	Deshmukh, Shri Anantrao
Bhosle, Shri Prataprao Baburao	Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Bhoye, Shri Reshma Motiram	Devarajan, Shri B.
Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh	Devi Lal, Shri
Birender Singh, Rao	Dhakane, Shri Babanrao
Chand Ram, Shri	Dhankhar, Ch. Jagdeep
Chandra Shekhar, Shri	Dhawan, Shri Harmohan
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M.	Dinesh Singh, Shri
Chandrashekarappa, Shri T.V.	Dore, Shri Raja Ambanna Nayak

Faleiro, Shri Eduardo	Kalvi, Shri Kalyan Singh
Fernandes, Shri Oscar	Kamal Nath, Shri
Gadgil, Shri V.N.	Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram
Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao Nanasaheb	Kamson, Prof. Meijinlung
Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath	Kareddula, Kumari Kamalaji
Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai Devjibhai	Kasu, Shri Venkata Krishna Reddy
Gandhi, Shrimati Maneka	Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Gandhi, Shri Rajiv	Keshari Lal, Shri
Gangadhar, Shri S.	Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya	Kodikkunnil, Shri Suresh
Giriyappa, Shri C.P. Mudala	Konthala, Shri Rama Krishna
Gomango, Shri Giridhar	Kotadia, Shri Manubhai
Gounder, Shri A.S.	Krishna, Shri G.
Gowda, Shri D.M. Putte	Krishna Kumar, Shri S.
Gudadinni, Shri B.K.	Kumaramangalam, Shri P.R.
Gupta, Shri Janak Raj	Kuppuswamy, Shri C.K.
Handoo, Shri Piyare Lal	Kurien, Prof. P.J.
Het Ram, Shri	Kushwaha, Shri Jagdish Singh
Inder Jit, Shri	Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.	Made Gowda, Shri G.
Jag Pal Singh, Shri	Mahabir Prasad, Shri
Jamuna, Shrimati J.	Mallik, Shri Mangaraj
Janardhanan, Shri Kadambur M.R.	Mallikarjun, Shri
Jawali, Dr. Basavaraj	Mane, Shri R.S.
Jayamohan, Shri A.	Manemma, Shrimati T.
Jeevarathinam, Shri R.	Manvar, Shri Balvant
Jhikram, Shri Mohanlal	Marak, Shri Sanford

Marbaniang, Shri Peter G.	Patel, Shri Megenbhai Manibhai
Mishra, Shri Balgopal	Patel, Shri Shantilal Purushottam Das
Mishra, Shri Janeshwar	Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
Mishra, Shri Raj Mangal	Patil, Shri Basavaraj
Mohamed, Shri E.S.M. Pakeer	Patil, Shri Prakashbapu Vasantryao
Mohammad Shafi, Shri	Patil, Shri S.T.
Mujahid, Shri B.M.	Patil, Shri Shankarrao
Muralaødharan, Shri K.	Patil, Shri Shivraj V.
Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna	Patil, Shri Uttamrao
Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandra Shekara	Patil, Shri Yashwantrao
Muthiah, Shri R.	Penchalliah, Shri P.
Naik, Shri G. Devaraya	Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal
Naikar, Shri D.K.	Poojary, Shri Janardhana
Nandi, Shri Yellaiah	Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
Narayanan, Shri K.R.	Prabhu, Shri R.
Narayanan, Shri P.G.	Pradhani, Shri K.
Nayak, Shri Nakul	Prasad, Shri R.S.
Netam, Shri Arvind	Prasad, Shri V. Sreenivasa
Nikam, Shri Govindrao	Purohit, Shri Banwarilal
Odeyar, Shri Channaiah	Purushothaman, Shri Vakkom
Oraon, Shrimati Sumati	Rahi, Shri Ram Lal
Pal, Dr. Debi Prosad	Rai, Shri Kalp Nath
Palanisamy, Shri K.C.	Rajdev Singh, Shri
Pande, Shri Rajmangal	Rajeshwaran, Dr. V.
Pandian, Shri D.	Rajeswari, Shrimati Basava
Panja, Shri Ajit	Raju, Shri M.M. Pallam
Patel, Shri Arjunbhai	Raju, Shri S. Vijaya Rama

Raju, Shrimati Uma Gajapathi

Rakesh, Shri R.N.

Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.

Ram Prakash, Ch.

Ram Sagar, Shri (Bara Banki)

Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally

Ramadass, Dr. R.

Ramakrishna, Shri Y.

Ramamurthy, Shri K.

Ranga, Prof. N.G.

Rao, Shri J. Chokka

Rao, Shri J. Vengala

Rao, Shri K.S.

Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha

Rao, Shri R. Gundu

Rao, Shri Srinivas

Rao, Shri V. Krishna

Rathva, Shri N.J.

Rathod, Shri Uttam

Rathor, Dr. Bhagwan Dass

Rawat, Shri Harish

Reddy, Shri A. Venkata

Reddy, Shri Kotla Vijaya Bhaskara

Reddy, Shri M. G.

Reddy, Shri P. Narsa

Reddy, Shri R. Surender

Reddy, Shri Rajamohan

Reddy, Shri Y. S. Rajasekhar

Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya

Sahay, Shri Subodh Kant

Sai, Shri A. Pratap

Sait, Shri Ibrahim Sulaiman

Samad, Shri Abdul

Saran, Shri Daulat Ram

Sarwar Hussain, Shri

Sathe, Shri Vasant

Sayeed, Shri P. M.

Scindia, Shri Madhavrao

Sekhar, Shri M. G.

Selvam, Shri Kanci Panneer

Sema, shri Shikiho

Shah, shri Jayantilal Virchandbhai

Shakya, Shri Ram Singh

Shankaranand, Shri B.

Shanmugam, Shri P.

Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal

Sharma, Shri Dharm Pal

Shastri, Shri Kapil Dev

Shekhada, Shri Govindbhai Kanjibhai

Shingada, Shri D. B.

Shukla, Shri Vidyacharan

Sidnal, Shri S. B.

Silvera, Dr. C.

Singaravadivel, Shri S.

Singh, Shri Anand	Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan
Singh, Shri Dhanraj	Umbrey, Shri Laeta
Singh, Shri Dharmgaj	Varma, Shri B. Rajaravi
Singh, Shri K. Manvendra	Varma, Shri Dharmesh Prasad
Singh, Shri Lalit Vijoy	Venkatesan, Shri P. R. S.
Singh, Prof. N. Tombir	Venkatswamy, Shri G.
Singh, Shri Ram Bahadu	Verma, Shrimati Usha
Singh, Shri Uday Pratap	Viswanatham, Dr.
Singh Deo, Shri A. N.	Wadiyar, Shri Srikanta Datta Narasimha Raja
Sinha, Shrimati Usha	Yadav, Shri Baleshwar
Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu	Yadav, Shri Chhotey Singh
Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath	Yadav, Shri Hukumdeo Narayan
Soz, Prof. Saif-ud-din	Yadava, Shri Ramjilal
Srikantaiah, Shri H. C.	Yazdani, Dr. Golam
Sukhbuns Kaur, Shrimati	Yuvraj, Shri
Sultanpuri, Shri K. D.	
Suman, Shri Ramji Lal	
Sundararaj, Shri N.	
Sunil Dutt, Shri	
Suryawanshi, Shri Narsingrao	
Tandel, Shri D. J.	
Thambi Durai, Dr.	
Thapa, Shri Nandu	
Thomas, Prof. K. V.	
Thomas, Shri P. C.	
Thorat, Shri S. B.	
Thungon, Shri P. K.	

NQES

Abodya Nath, Mahant
Acharia, Shri Basudeb
Advani, Shri L. K.
Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra
Aher, Dr. Daulatrao Sonuji
Ahmed, Shri Anwar
Ajit Singh, Shri
Ali, Shrimati Subhashini
Argal, Shri Chhaviram
Baig, Shri Arif

Bais, Shri Ramesh

Dikshit, Shri Narsingh Rao

Baitha, Shri Mahendra

Dome, Dr. Ram Chandra

Bala, Dr. Asim

Fernandes, Shri George

Bankhele, Shri Kisanrao Baburao

Fernandez, Shri Joss

Barman, Shri Palas

Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar

Basu, Shri Anil

Giri, Shri Sudhir

Basu, Shri Chitta

Gujral, Shri I. K.

Behera, Shri Bhajaman

Gupta, Shri Dharmपाल Singh

Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal

Gupta, Shri Indrajit

Bhartiya, Shri Santosh

Hannan Mollah, Shri

Bhattacharya, Shrimati Malini

Hansda, Shri Matilal

Bhattacharya, Shri Nani

Harish Pal, Shri

Bopche, Dr. Khushal Parasram

Harsh Vardhan, Shri

Brahmbhatt, Shri Prakash Koko

Heera Bhai, Shri

Chakravorty, Shri Susanta

Hota, Shri Bhabani Shankar

Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kanti

Jangde, Shri Resham Lal

Chatterji, Shri Somnath

Jaswant Singh, Shri

Chavda, Shri Khemchandbhai Somabhai

Jatav, Shri Than Singh

Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin

Jatiya, Shri Satynarayan

Dandavate, Prof. Madhu

Jena, Shri Srikanta

Danwe, Shri Pundlik Hari

Jha, Shri Bhogendra

Das, Shri Anadi Charan

Jorawar Ram, Shri

Dasgupta, Dr. Biplab

Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal

Datta, Shri Amal

Ju Deo, Shri Dilip Singh

Deshmukh, Shri Chandubhai

Kabde, Dr. Venkatesh

Deshmukh, Shri Sudam Dattatrya

Kalka Das, Shri

Dhumal, Prof. Prem Kumar

Kapse, Prof. Ram Ganesh

Kataria, Shri Gulab Chand	Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Kaushik, Shri Purushottam	Misra, Shri Satyagopal
Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad	Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta
Khan, Haji G. M.	Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy
Khan, Shri Sukhendu	Munda, Shri Karia
Khandelwal, Shri Pyarelal	Munjare, Shri Kankar
Khanoria, Major D. D.	Naik, Shri Ram
Khurana, Shri Madan Lal	Nathu Singh, Shri
Kirpal Singh, Shri	Negi, Shri C. M.
Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra	Nehru, Shri Arun Kumar
Mahale, Shri Haribhau Shankar	Nitish Kumar, Shri
Mahata, Shri Chitta	Pacherwal, Shri Gopal
Maheshwar Singh, Shri	Pal, Shri M. S.
Makkasar, Shri Shopat Singh	Pal, Shri Rupchand
Malhotra, Prof. Vijay Kumar	Pandey, Prof. Yadu Nath
Malik, Shri Purna Chandra	Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan
Malik, Shri Satya Pal	Pani, Shri Ravi Narayan
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar	Panwar, Shri Harpal Singh
Manjay Lal, Shri	Paranjpe, Shri Baburao
Montosh, Shri Paul R.	Paswan, Shri Chhedi
Marandi, Shri Simon	Paswan, Shri Ramvilas
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed	Patel, Dr. A. K.
Meena, Dr. Kirodi Lal	Patel, Shri Chandresh
Meena, Shri Nandlal	Patel, Shri Natubhai M.
Meghwal, Shri Kailash	Patel, Shri Prahlad Singh
Mehta, Shrimati Jayawanti Navinchandra	Patel, Shri Ram Pujan
Mewar, Shri Mahendra Singh	Patel, Shri Somabhai

Pathak, Shri Harin	Saroj, Shri Sarju Prasad
Patidar, Shri Rameshwar	Sartaj Singh, Shri
Patil, Shri Uttamrao Lakmanrao	Sayeed, Shri Mufti Mohammad
Patnaik, Shri Sivaji	Selvarasu, Shri M.
Phundkar, Shri Bhaosaheb Pundlik	Shah, Shri Babubhai Meghji
Pramanik, Shri Radhika Ranjan	Shakeelur Rehman, Dr.
Prasad, Shri Hari Kewal	Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh
Prem Pradeep, Shri	Shastri, Shri Anil
Raghavji, Shri	Shiwankar, Prof. Mahadeo
Rai, Shri M. Ramanna	Shrivastava, Dr. Shailendranath
Raju, Shri Bh. Vijayakumar	Singh, Shri Ajay
Rajveer Singh, Shri	Singh, Shri Har Govind
Ram Awadh, Shri	Singh, Shri Hari Kishore
Ram Dhan, Shri	Singh, Shri Jagannath
Ram Sagar, Shri (Saidpur)	Singh, Shri Lokendra
Ram Singh, Shri	Singh, Shri Mandhata
Rana, Shri Kashiram Chhabildas	Singh, Shri Radha Mohan
Rao, Shri K. Rama Mohan	Singh, Shri Ram Naresh
Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh	Singh, Shri Ram Prasad
Ray, Dr. Sudhir	Singh, Shri Ramashray Prasad
Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan	Singh, Shri Ramdas
Routray, Shri Nilamani	Singh, Shri Sukhendra
Roy, Shri A. K.	Singh, Shri Surya Narayan
Roy, Shri Haradhan	Singh, Shri Tej Narayan
Roypradhan, Shri Amar	Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap ✓
Sai, Shri A. Larang	Soren, Shri Shibu
Sai, Shri Nand Kumar	Subedar, Shri

Sur, Shri Monoranjan	Yadav, Shri Devendra Prasad
Tarif Singh, Shri	Yadav, Shri Janardan
Tarwala, Shri Amratlal Vallabhdas	Yadav, Shri Kailash Nath Singh
Taslimudin, Shri	Yadav, Shri Mitra Sen
Thakore, Shri Gabbhaji Mangaji	Yadav, Shri Ram Sharan
Tiraky, Shri Plyus	Yadav, Shri Ramendra Kumar Ravi
Tiwari, Shri Janardan	Yadav, Dr. S. P.
Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran	Yadav, Shri Satyapal Singh
Tyagi, Shri K. C.	Yadav, Shri Sharad
Uma Bharati, Kumari	Yadav, Shri Surya Narayan
Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.	Yadvendra Datt, Shri
Vaghela, Shri Shankersinh	Zainal Abedin, Shri
Varma, Shri Ratilal Kalidas	MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction* the result of the division is:
Varma, Shri S. C.	Ayes : 269
Vekaria, Shri S. N.	Noes : 204
Verma, Shri Phool Chand	<i>The motion was adopted</i>
Verma, Shri R. L. P.	MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned <i>sine die</i> .
Verma, Shri Sheo Sharan	19.14 hrs.
Vijayaraghavan, Shri A.	<i>The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die</i>
Yadav, Shri Chun Chun Prasad	

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Shri Bega Ram, Dr. K. Kalimuthu, Sarvashri C. Srinivasan, Munnam Khan, Palai K. M. Mathew, Brahma Dutt, Mankuram Sodhi, Y.S. Mahajan, Basavapunnaiiah Singam, Jai Parkash and B.N. Reddy.

NOES: Sarvashri Rasheed Masood, Upendra Nath Verma, Samarendra Kundu, Ganga Charan Lodhi, Sukdeo Paswan, Guman Mai Lodha, Ishwar Chaudhary, Shrimati Vasundhara Raje, Sarvashri Rudrasen Chaudhary and Ram Saiwan