

Hence, I urge upon the hon. Minister of Industry to grant permission forthwith for running Sugar Mills on new augmented crushing capacity.

(vi) Need to Improve Postal Services in Different Parts of West Bengal Particularly in Calcutta

[English]

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh) : Sir, the postal service in West Bengal is deteriorating. Even the postcards, letters etc. posted at the G.P.O., Calcutta take more than a month to reach New Delhi. Money orders sent from Delhi to Calcutta or vice-versa hardly reach even after lapse of a month. Public at large, specially the poor people who cannot afford the private courier service, suffer immensely due to the deteriorating of postal service which has become worst for the last two months.

In view of the above, I urge upon the Government of India to take immediate remedial measures to check deterioration of postal services in Calcutta and other areas of the state of West Bengal so that poorer sections of people do not suffer further.

(vii) Need to have A Central Flood Control Programme for Bihar

[Translation]

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE RAI (Sitamarhi) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Bihar is the most flood-prone State of the country. About 40 percent of food affected people live in this state. No other state of the country is probably confronted with the problem of floods of such a magnitude. Almost all the rivers traversing the plains of Northern Bihar originate from the foot hills of Nepal Himalayas. Prominent among these are the Kosi, the Gandak, the Bagmati, the Kamala Balan, the Mahananda and the Adhabara. The area of Northern Bihar gets fully affected by the scourage of the catchment area of above mentioned rivers which bring silt with them in huge quantity. There is a lot of difference in the maximum and minimum flow of these rivers and due to this peculiar characteristic these rivers are responsible for unprecedented erosion of their banks and generally go on changing their path. As a result, all the developmental works of this state come to a standstill. In order to check the tendency of these rivers of changing the direction of their flow, it becomes necessary to undertake anti-erosion works on a large scale every year which besides being cumbersome are expensive too. In order to evolve a long term solution of this problem of floods, it is extremely imperative to construct a chain of reservoirs along all the rivers and implement soil-conservation programmes on a large scale. Hence, I urge upon the Central Government to oblige the citizens of Bihar by adopting the flood control programme of the State as a national programme on the pattern of Assam in order to protect the flood affected people of Bihar.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY PRESIDENT IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH

[English]

15.32 hrs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we shall take up the Statutory Resolution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the proclamation issued by the President on the 18th October, 1995 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh."

As the hon. Members are aware, elections to the Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh were held in November, 1993. After these elections, the Samajwadi Party and the Bahujan samaj Party, with the outside support of the Congress (I), had formed the Government in the State with Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav as the Chief Minister. Following withdrawal from the coalition Government by the Bahujan Samaj Party and a series of political developments in the State, the Government of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav was dismissed by the Governor of Uttar Pradesh on 3rd June, 1995. Kumari Mayawati of the Bahujan Samaj Party was sworn in as the Chief Minister by the Governor on the above date in the light of the support extended to her by the Bharatiya Janata Party. The Chief Minister proved her majority in the State Assembly within the period stipulated by the Governor.

In a report dated 17th October, 1995 to the President, the Governor of Uttar Pradesh intimated that the Bharatiya Janata Party had withdrawn support to the Government of Kumari Mayawati, following which the Chief Minister had tendered her resignation to the Governor. It was further stated that the resignation had been accepted and the Chief Minister had been asked to continue until alternative arrangements were made. The Governor had also stated in his report that in so far as the formation of an alternative Government was concerned, the Bharatiya Janata Party with 176 seats and the samajwadi Party with 126 seats in the Assembly had not staked any claim to form a Government in the State and, on that basis, the Governor had reported that no party was in a position to form a stable Government in Uttar Pradesh. The Governor had concluded that the governance of the State could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and the recommended recourse to article 356(1) while keeping the Assembly in a state of suspended animation.

The Union Government considered the report of

the Governor and the situation in Uttar Pradesh and decided to recommend to the President to issue a Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution, keeping the Legislative Assembly under suspended animation. The Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution was issued by the President on the 18th October, 1995.

The Union Government was kept apprised by the Governor of the subsequent political developments in the State including staking of claims by various political parties to form a Government in the State.

The overall assessment of the Governor, however, was that no party was in a position to form a stable Government in the State and that it would be advisable in the circumstances to dissolve the Assembly, to prevent what was termed by the Governor as 'fierce horse trading'.

The Union Government considered the Reports of the Governor of Uttar Pradesh and decided that recommendation be made to the President to issue an Order dissolving the Legislative Assembly of Uttar Pradesh. The President has been pleased to dissolve the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly with effect from the 28th October, 1995.

By all accounts, the administrative machinery in Uttar Pradesh had lately been under considerable strain and its effectiveness was being steadily eroded, with the result that the implementation of development programmes was suffering. The State Administration is gradually limping back to normalcy under President's Rule and the endeavour of the Central Government will be to see that development programmes, maintenance of law and order and grievance redressal receive necessary priority. The Government would be requiring the cooperation of all concerned in these endeavors.

With these words, I commend, Sir, that the Proclamation issued on the 18th October, 1995 under Article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh be approved by this august House. A copy of the Proclamation, as stipulated under the Constitution, along with the consequential order, is also placed on the Table of the House. In Keeping with convention, a copy of the Governor's Report recommending issuance of the Proclamation is also placed on the Table of the House. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That this House approves the proclamation issued by the President on the 18th October, 1995 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh."

The time allotted to this subject is four hours. The time allotted to Congress Party is 108 minutes, B.J.P., 49 minutes, C.P.I (M), 15 minutes, Janata Dal 10 minutes and so on. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to start the discussion.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAAE (Lucknow) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Hon. Home Minister. India is the largest democracy of the world and Uttar Pradesh is the largest State of our country.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dum Dum) : But there is no democracy.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I have not said anything about democracy there. Instead I have said that it is the largest State in size and in population but democracy had not been functioning there properly. Imposing of President's Rule there is not a welcome step.

Election to Legislative Assembly were conducted there in 1993 and Bhartiya Janata Party had emerged there as the majority party but we did not get absolute majority and therefore, we did not made a claim to form Government there. Then a coalition Government was formed there by Samajwadi Party and Bahujan Samaj Party. I would not like to comment on the activities of that Government. Instead of the rule of law, "Jungle law" prevailed in that regime. The situation there worsened to such extent that the Bahujan Samaj Party had to break up its alliance with Samajwadi Party. Instead of cooperating with the Samajwadi Party the Bahujan Samaj Party started over powering. The Bahujan Samaj Party felt that its very existence was in danger. The Bhartiya Janta Party gave as assurance to support Bahujan Samaj Party so as to replace a corrupt Government there. Though there MLAs were less in number, yet we wanted them to run the Government properly in Uttar Pradesh and thereby create communal harmony and effect improvements in law and order situation and check corruption there. Therefore, we did not impose any condition to extend them support. The largest State of the country having a dalit woman as its Chief Minister, is in itself an achievement. But that experiment proved to be futile.

When the leaders of BSP started criticising Lord Ram and Gandhiji and efforts were made to demoralise the services and possibility of Mafia rule was looming large, then, we were compelled to withdraw the support from the Government. Kumari Mayavati did one good thing by tendering her resignation immediately after that when she learnt that the Bhartiya Janta Party has withdrawn its support from her Government. Unlike the former Chief Minister Mulayam Singh ji she did not wait for her termination.

Now a new situation has come up in Uttar Pradesh. The Bahujan Samaj Party Government has bowed out of power and that apart none of the other parties made a claim to form the Government. There was no other option left with the Governor but to recommend imposition of the President's Rule there, but he did not feel the necessity to dissolve the Legislative Assembly. In this connection, I would like

to cite a paragraph from the letter of the Governor addressed to the hon. President. It has been laid on the table of the House and distributed also, but I do not know how may hon. Members have gone through it as it has been circulated among the hon. Members a little while ago. I am citing :

[English]

"The present Legislative Assembly was constituted in December 1993 and three years in its period are still remaining. Hence it will be proper to make continuous efforts for forming alternative stable Government before dissolving the Legislative Assembly. Consequently, I am of the opinion that it will be proper to keep the Legislative Assembly in a State of suspended animation instead of dissolving it. It will be equitable in the perspective of the decision of the Supreme Court delivered in the case of S.R. Bomai Versus UOI AIR 1994-SC, 1918. In the circumstances cited above...

[Translation]

It is the last but important paragraph.

[English]

"In the circumstances cited above, until it is not possible to form a stable Government by either of the parties, I recommend that a Declaration regarding imposition of President's Rule in the State under Article 356 of the Constitution of India may be issued."

[Translation]

This letter was written on 17th October and later the assembly was dissolved on 28th October. Why all this was done in a hurry? Whether sufficient time was given to those who wanted to make efforts to form an alternate Government. I am of the view that sufficient time was not given. My submission is that at one stage Bhartiya Janta Party was in a position to form majority. The Smajwadi Party had also made such a claim. It is alright that both these parties could not form the Government at their own and they needed the support but the Members of Legislative Assembly, who were elected two years back did not want the elections to be conducted again. It is neither essential nor proper to hold elections time and again. It is very expensive and gives way to political instability. But when the Governor decided not to dissolve the Assembly and to keep it in suspended animation his decision was welcomed. In his letter dated 17th October, the Governor had made a promise to ponder seriously on the proposals of setting up of an alternative Government but when it appeared that the Government was going to be formed and that could be formed, at that very moment the assembly was dissolved, because the Congress Party did not want that any other party should form the Government in Uttar Pradesh.

If the hon. Governor had sent any report in this connection to the Central Government then it was not laid on the table of the House. We were not taken into confidence in that respect. In the letter dated 17th October, it has been stated that the assembly is not going to be dissolved and they will wait for an alternate Government. But after 10 days, i.e. on the 11th day the assembly is dissolved. Whether even the decision of the Supreme Court in Bomai's Case did not hinder him from doing so, the opinion of the Government changed? The Government might have ignored the courts decision in Bomai case just to see that Bhartiya Janta Party does not form the Government in Uttar Pradesh the largest State of the country. Therefore the Legislative Assembly was dissolved just to forestall any such possibility. People will go on playing their own trumpet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is a very serious issue. My allegation against the Central Government is that earlier the hon. Governor had taken the right step and later on he decided to dissolve the Legislative assembly under pressure. It is alright that the Constitution empowers the Governor to dissolve the Legislative Assembly but on what basis and on what grounds? How the situation changed in 10 days. Ten days before that the hon. Governor had said that he would look into the possibility to forming of an alternative Government and that was essential as the members of the Legislative Assembly did not want elections to be conducted and elections were conducted only two years back and therefore three more years were still there. But after 10 days, he changed his opinion and took the step to dissolve the Legislative Assembly. The Central Government spoke just ditto to him. They might have applauded Shri Motilal Vohrahad for that. I am otherwise an admirer of Motilal Vohraji. He is a very shrewd person. He keeps himself in touch with the public in Uttar Pradesh. He also tried to act within his political limitations. But when there was pressure from the Central Government then what Moti Lal ji do. I hold him in high esteem.

I could not understand it and my submission to the hon. Home Minister is that he should make it clear as to what happened within those 10 days? The hon. Home Minister will give the stereotyped reply that the members of Legislative Assembly were defecting from this to that side and if a Government would have been formed at all, that could not have run for long. It is the general practice, such thing generally happen. It happened here also and even then the Government is running. The Government could have run only after its formation or it should have started running before its formation. No chance was given to form the Government there. If the Government had been formed and it could not have run, then there was a firm ground for you to claim that you gave an opportunity to make the democracy a success but the opposition parties were so useless that they could not manage to run the Government. Had they missed the

second chance as well, then it could have some justification. But it was not done. No chance was given to form the Government and the President's Rule was imposed there. I would like to submit that in future, such mistake should not be repeated.

There is a long story behind the misuse of Article 356 of the Constitution. I would not like to go into its details. Whosoever comes to power in the Centre, he does not strengthen the democracy and misuses the Article 356.

Now my submission is that elections should be conducted at the earliest in Uttar Pradesh. At least, the elections for Legislative Assembly should be conducted simultaneously with the Lok Sabha polls. Now there is no reason to keep these pending.

Secondly, I would like to submit that the uncertainty, dilemma, contradiction in reports and dates of the Lok Sabha elections should be removed. It is alright that this issue is not related to the State Government but it concerns the entire country. When will the elections for the next Lok Sabha be conducted? Sometimes it is said that these would be held in March or February or April or sometimes it is said that our colleagues of Congress Party would run the Government till May. They will have try to serve the nation till the last day of their term. A particular date should be fixed, but it should be 'definite one'. The hon. Home Minister should make a promise regarding Uttar Pradesh that both the elections should be conducted there simultaneously. It will be good from the point of law and order also. Earlier, i.e. since the Constitution come in effect, the elections for both the Legislative Assemblies and the Lok Sabha used to be conducted simultaneously. Now efforts should be made to do revive that practice.

Secondly, the opportunity available during the President Rule, should be availed, Hon. Home Minister too has stated that this item should be utilised to expedite the developmental works. The development works in Uttar Pradesh has come to a standstill. The politics of transfers prevailed there, the costism was being stoked. The administration had low morale. Officers were in dilemma. No developmental work was taken up there I myself, am a Member of Parliament from Uttar Pradesh and I represent the Lucknow constituency. The State Capital is faced with shortage of drinking water but the State Government is not concerned at all. These problems were there when we supported the Mayawati Government and it was also one of the reasons for withdrawing our support. I do not say that all the problems would be solved during the President Rule. Even if they would do so, they cannot. But the developmental works can be expedited in the remaining period and mopish morale of administration can be rejuvenated. Justice must be done to Uttaranchal. Injustice is being done to Uttaranchal in the present regime there and resentment is breeding among the people of

Uttaranchal. Steps are being taken to persuade the people of Uttaranchal to support the Government's stand and I hope such effort will deliver to goods. I know that my friend Shri Khanduri ji who is elected from Uttaranchal, would like to speak in detail on this issue. But I want to embolden his voice by standing by his side on this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am going to conclude my speech. I could not make out one thing, that is as to why the advisers of hon. Governor were not appointed this time? Advisers are appointed to advise and assist in the administration of States where President rule has been imposed. I noted that no such appointment has been made in Uttar Pradesh. Even it hon. President does not consider it necessary, advisers are needed to share the burden of administration of the whole State which has fallen on his shoulders. Advice of many people should be sought. It is customary to constitute an Advisory Committee consisting of Members of Parliament of the State where the President Rule has been imposed. Elections are to be held after a couple of month and thus still there is time to constitute an Advisory Committee consisting of Members of Parliament of Uttar Pradesh and hon. Governor should run the state with their advice.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North) : Hon. Governor should also be felicitated. He, in the election of corporations very efficiently(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Which way the wind is blowing in Uttar Pradesh, is evident from the analysis of recent elections including election held in mega cities.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this proposal. It is a big opportunity that to speak on a proposal after hon. Atalji as he represents Lucknow which is the heart of Uttar Pradesh. It is unfortunate that elections have been held three times in the last six years and now demand is being raised for holding elections for the 4th time. President rule has been imposed two times in Uttar Pradesh. He threw some light on the situation which led to imposition of President rule there.

Sir, I believe that Atal Bihariji has raised some such points which can be replied to by the hon. Home Minister only and definitely he will reply to those. But in regard to Uttar Pradesh I would like to say that I have got an opportunity to draw attention of all the hon. Members to the situation prevailing in Uttar Pradesh.

15.56 hrs.

(Shri Peter G. Marbaniang in the Chair)

Today, there is shortage of Potable water in Uttar

Pradesh and it is not a matter of concern for one party only but the entire population of Uttar Pradesh whether it is rural or urban is affected by this shortage. The water level is declining there. All old wells have dried up. According to the latest position 8 to 10 thousand India Mark-II handpumps should be made available in each Parliamentary Constituency, then only we will be able to make available drinking water to our people.

The condition of women in Uttar Pradesh is very bad. I feel ashamed while saying that if we go through the rural areas of Uttar Pradesh at night then we will find that they do not have basic necessary facilities to maintain their dignity and privacy. Besides that, there is acute power shortage in Uttar Pradesh and factories remain closed for want of power. I am not criticising any Party. Whenever political leaders talk of politics then it is considered that they are doing politics of police. We have heard hundreds of times that if one wants to do politics, he should have firm grip on police. Therefore, the transfer of police officers is given much importance. Whenever change in Government takes place and a new Government is formed then first of all transfers of officers are made. It is unfortunate that our Party is not in power in Uttar Pradesh for the last six years. Therefore, atleast our Party is not accountable for the complaints made by the people there during this period. Only those Parties are responsible for that who had been in power there. But today, to all my friends.....

MAJ. GEN. (RETD). BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal) : Your Party supported the Mulayam Singh Government for 18 months ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : This is the only problem in regard to Uttar Pradesh that some people see only Mulayam Singh there and not Ayodhya and some ... (Interruptions)

A mention has been made just now about the political trend in Uttar Pradesh but I think that there is no such leader available so far who can understand that trend.

16.00 hrs

It was claimed that the people of Uttar Pradesh were with them but later the trend was found quite opposite in the elections held in Uttar Pradesh ... (Interruptions)

Sir, I do not understand as to whether in a democratic country elections are held every week or every month. Those who want elections every week should become Pollsters. But such people cannot do politics seriously in any country as well as they cannot sustain the tradition of any country.

I assure you that in coming elections even if we are elected to Parliament in less number, say 5 or 15 from Uttar Pradesh, we are ready to pick up the

gauntlet flung at us. Let the time of elections come and we will prove a hard nut to crack... (Interruptions) Before any applause, do not look towards Uttar Pradesh only, you should pay your attention towards Maharashtra and Gujarat also to ascertain as to which side the wind is blowing there. We have led this nation from Uttar Pradesh, we have given leadership to this nation therefrom and our misfortune is that today we are not in a position to give leadership to the nation therefrom and this is because, ... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla) : He is saying that he is Prime Minister today, then it is his misfortune. This is what he is saying.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : If the meaning of leadership is limited to premiership only, in your dictionary, then I do not think that your politics can be termed as politics. There leadership is given by sitting here, people leading the entire nation are sitting on this side. Merely a Prime Minister or a Minister does not lead India. This may be so in your party. Those who do politics at the dictates of R.S.S. cannot understand the democratic system ... (Interruptions)... Today. Before you contend that President Rule should not have been imposed in Uttar Pradesh, I would like to ask you whether situation has not come to such a sorry pass with you at the helm of affairs that rallies and demonstration are being organised by various castes separately at the places where once rallies by youth, Women and revolutionaries and patriotic people used to be organised. Why you want to divide the heart and mind of India. You people first wanted to break Hindu Muslim Unity, but when despite that you could not get into power, you wanted to divide the entire society in Uttar Pradesh in various fragments. Now I will reiterate one thing only -

"Tum Nahak Turke Chun-Chun Kar Daman Main Chhipaye Baithe Ho,

Shishe Ka Maseeha Koi Nahin Kyon As Lagaye Baithe Ho." You think over it. But today the decision to be taken is as to who will rule over Uttar Pradesh and run administration there for the next five years. Let that time come and that would also be decided and we all are supposed to accede to that decision. But today, the point is that go for self-introspection. You will be given time enough to speak and I will listen to you sitting here because whatever you will speak, that will help me in judging how to drive you out from Uttar Pradesh. But first you listen to me and because a question is confronting this nation.

You have discussed the problem of Jammu and Kashmir for 2-3 hours and you all have admitted in this House that an important question has come up before us. It is being raised not because we could not hold an election there. The question has arisen with regard to which direction we have to take Kashmir and this country, its mentality and its dignity in universal forum.

I do concede that we are going to ensure rule of justice and clean administration in Uttar Pradesh. We are going to separate religion from politics because some people have a tendency to use religion for getting into power and the entire nation is looking at us as to what action we are going to take in this connection. May be that the entire India might get inspired from our action or might say that if even Uttar Pradesh is not prepared to do this, then what the other small Indian states can do.

Uttar Pradesh is the heart of India. If you all are really worried about Uttar Pradesh, then you may come and sit together to discuss as to what mistake we have committed. We and you as well might have committed certain mistakes. We have not committed any such thing so as to be held responsible for present scenario in Uttar Pradesh of which you are taking. There results are indicative of fact that we have been able to put anxiety tear and horror to an end. We like Lord shiva, consumed the poison that was spread out in Uttar Pradesh, with the conviction that we might die but even then would not let Uttar Pradesh die. We have consumed the venom spread out in Uttar Pradesh. So that Uttar Pradesh once again could say that [Translation] we are one and believe in unity and integrity of the country. We would not allow the Hindus and Muslims to divide and therefore, we have shouldered the responsibility of communal harmony in Uttar Pradesh and we will continue to work for that. Now do not say that on what basis we survive. It is very unfortunate that due to our ignorance the secular forces in Uttar Pradesh have been divided. Though, you have won the election but that too by a very thin margin. The day when secular forces would unite in Uttar Pradesh, forget their political interests and have common target then they would understand that their fight is against you and not with one-another. Then you would know about the political wave and the direction to which it is flowing.

You should not forget Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh is the region where Yamuna and Ganga rivers meet. You should take inspiration from this union of rivers Ganga and Yamuna which reveals that the people of Uttar Pradesh cannot be divided. Your political ideology keeps on changing. Your party had given an assurance that Mayavati was being given support to fight criminalisation and it was not for supporting bureaucracy but the transfers on later stage, other activities and announcements reveal a different story. You can find out as to whether such things were listed in your party's manifesto or their party's manifesto. You can ask this question to yourself and then tell us that to whom you extended your support. Our party had given support to them because at that time you had put a question mark before the Country. You can say anything here but among your party workers, you say that it was a wrong decision and it was done to get the power at centre but it could not be done or

would not happen in near future also. You can say to your friends- 'Gunuji Delhi door Ast' which means that your cannot come to power at centre. Not only in Delhi but people throughout the country are becoming aware about the policies of our party. Today, you have some important and basic question before you. Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Kerala and Haryana are making progress throughout but I would like to ask as to whether you are happy that our region is not prosperous, people are not educated, employment opportunities are not available and factories are lying closed for the last 15-20 years.

Let us now discuss the issue of criminalisation. For the last six years ten thousand persons have been murdered in Uttar Pradesh annually. You discuss the problem of terrorism in Kashmir and Punjab but in Uttar Pradesh 10 thousand persons are murdered every year in broad daylight and only one percent of the guilty are punished in the name of action taken afterwards. This one percent includes the thieves, pick-pockets and persons imprisoned for involvement in some conflicts. Ten thousand persons are killed and you are taking it as a political issue. I would like to say that condition of Uttar Pradesh will not be favourable for anyone of us if you will not make improvement in the situation created there by you six years ago. You might have adopted this path in the hope that if one structure is demolished today then tomorrow you will be able to demolish the second one and later on the third one. Being a Muslim I would like to say that every Muslim in Uttar Pradesh regards the Hindu God Ram and consider him omnipresent. Then why are you trying to confine the God to one political party's flag and to a small place. Why are you trying to say that lord Rama belongs to you only. Please try to understand the religious, cultural, historical and social structure of Uttar Pradesh which is being disturbed by you.

There are many people sitting here who have reigned over the state and were responsible for establishing institutions there. But whether today anyone can hope that he would get justice by going to any police station. Firstly they ask the caste of the SSP and in case he is of some different caste, they go to another SSP. Has it not happened? Whether any officer is happy in Uttar Pradesh. None of the institution is working properly in Uttar Pradesh. All the educational institutions have become shops where degrees are available in abundance. Is it not a matter of dispute that whose signatures should be taken so that the Education Officers agrees and who will start getting the funds? Has the Government of Uttar Pradesh not been given lakhs and crores of rupees? We have never thought on these lines that we are not in power there. When the proposal for MPs Local Area Fund was brought before Shri Manmohan Singh, we had only 5 members of Parliament and yours were 50-60 members from Uttar Pradesh. We knew that

you would get more money but we supported the proposal as we knew that money was being given for Uttar Pradesh and not for any particular party. The people of Uttar Pradesh as well as you people are being benefitted by that.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH : You are speaking about Uttar Pradesh MPs fund was not for Uttar Pradesh only but for the entire country. The hon. Minister is very wise and therefore, he has delivered as good speech. Why is he giving so fierce speech.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : May I say that each hon. Member will get a chance to speak on this Resolution? Please do not disturb the Minister who is speaking now. Please sit down.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH : I have reminded him that the M.P.s fund was meant for the entire country and not for Uttar Pradesh alone. Much of the hon. Members belonged to your party. If they were less in number, you increased their number by indulging yourself in horse trading.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : You have reminded me a good thing but might be remembering that our Government was not a majority Government. Therefore, those who belonged to our party were less in number even then we arranged the fund for all. Specially the people of Uttar Pradesh could have said that they would suffer, if we had talked about our own interest.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH : The Parliament had passed a resolution unanimously. The entire House, the people of Congress Party and every one wanted so. You are speaking time and again about Uttar Pradesh.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : On seeing him it does not appear to me that the trend is in their favour, that is why he is becoming so restless and shouting again and again. Otherwise, why he is listening to me patiently. If he is that much sure why does not he wait for the day when everything would become clear.

One more important thing I would like to mention, is that they made Ayodhya, Kashi and Mathura as their platform. If Congress Party is in power there, then they make it a point to criticise it in the name of Ayodhya, Kashi and Mathura.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR (Faizabad) : The structure there was demolished at the time of your Government only.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : I wanted to listen this much only that their Government demolished the structure. Sometimes they deny it and now they are saying that they had demolished the structure.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : I am not saying so. I am asking whose Government was there at that time ?

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : Sir, I regret just one thing ..(Interruptions)

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : You feel regret while I am proud of it.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : I would like to know, why do you feel proud.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : At that time our Government was in power.

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN : You feel proud in demolishing the structure.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : I am not discussing it.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : Sir, my colleague had said a good thing but when the hon. Home Minister raised one more question, he backed out. Either he wants to say that he had demolished the structure or it was demolished during the regime of their Government or the Government was incompetent or he is guilty of demolishing the structure. Besides, it, there is no reply from his side.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR : Apart from it, I would like to submit one more thing.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do not write down...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Do not write anything...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Have you not yet finished ?

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : I had yielded to him.

Mr. Chairman : Do not yield to anyone.

[Translation]

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED : Sir, the hon. Member has said two other things. On one hand he has said that he feels proud. Perhaps he feels proud of it that we had sent the security forces from here or he feels proud of it that the security forces did not do anything there or he feels proud of it that it was our mistake. How his pride is associated with us ? I am at a loss to know about it. Why did he feel proud ? He has said that their Government demolished the structure and he also took part in it. My submission is that we want to construct the structure of Uttar Pradesh while he wants to demolish the structure of Uttar Pradesh. They want destruction while we want construction. We want development and but they want that we may revert to the conditions prevailing prior to 19th Century. We want to lead Uttar Pradesh towards the 21st century. Therefore, my humble submission is that there will be differences among us and we will contest elections but we should express

* Not recorded

our views to the extent by which we will be able to unite Uttar Pradesh and the entire country together. We should not speak in such a way which at first disintegrates Uttar Pradesh and then the entire country.

Sir, my last submission is that Shri Khanduri ji is present here. I have full sympathy with him because all the people of Utrakhand are in trouble. The reason behind it is that they want separation from Uttar Pradesh. My submission is that this problem should be pondered over seriously. Is there any conspiracy behind it? It is said that we are opposing it. Both the Bhartiya Janta Party and Mulayam Singh thinks on the same line. They want that Utrakhand should be a separate state but we do not want so. If the people there are in trouble then all of us are ready to sit together to solve their problems. If the people there are unable to arrange two square meals then we are ready to curtail our food to feed them. We will sit together to solve any problem. This is not because of that we have less seats in the list or we can have more seats or the seats will decrease but it is an important problem. Khanduri Sahib had been in military and he has served the nation as a member of Armed Forces. Lakhs of people like him are serving in Armed Forces. If he has anything in heart then why should not we sit together to solve the problem through discussion? When the Palestine-Israeli can sit together and find a solution, Bosnia agreement can be signed then why can not the problem of two parts of Uttar Pradesh be solved? It can be solved and it will be solved. We take Utrakhand as our crown and whatever blessings, we have, have been received from Utrakhand. If the hill area of Uttar Pradesh separates from us then Uttar Pradesh will also not be in existence and it will have adverse affects on the other parts of the country. We are ready to sit together to solve their genuine problems. If you represent the hill areas, we represent the plains. We belong not one family and one group then why should we ask for separation and create such situations that we will never be able to sit together in future. I understand that the hon. Members from Uttar Pradesh should sit together to ponder over it.

At last, my submission is that be it the issue of Ayodhya or the issue of fight against criminalisation on the issue of development of Utrakhand, the people of Uttar Pradesh have a big responsibility. The entire country is looking towards us. It is the heart of the nation. If the heart gets weak then our hand will also be weak. Therefore, before saying so we must ponder over, whether it will cause any damage to Uttar Pradesh and the entire nation? We must keep it in mind that the dreams of Mahatama Gandhi are fulfilled.

Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. I fully support this resolution.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia) : Hon. Chairman, Sir, we are discussing today this question. It is the misfortune of this House that we have to approve President's Rule time and again. The Constitution makers had visualised that this type of situation may arise and therefore, it would be the compulsion of the Government to invoke article 356. But, they had never visualised at that time that the Constitution may fall in the hands of the criminals and vested interests. Our constitution has fallen into the hands of separatist forces of the country and narrow minded people. We had never anticipated such a kind of assault on our Constitution. This is the misfortune of their next generation that persistent assault is being made on our Constitution by betraying their sentiments and the very spirit of our constitution. We support the President Rule imposed in Uttar Pradesh because we had no other alternative besides this. This incident has already taken place, and we have to just put our stamp on that.

I want to speak about the way the Provisions of Proclamation of President's Rule are being used as the Hon. Home Minister and Hon. Governor have also said that horse-trading was taking place there, though this has not been mentioned in the report but he has said this in his speech on which Hon. Vajpayee ji has raised objection that as to why the Assembly was dissolved after ten days. We were of the view that BJP was a disciplined Party but this discipline was not maintained in Gujarat and when Uttar Pradesh was also affected by this indiscipline then they got scared. Earlier, B.J.P. was not in a position to form its Government there but by the time they noticed that they could form a Government they did not remain a disciplined party..(Interruptions)

SHRI KARIYA MUNDA (Khunti) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, whatever the hon. Member is speaking here does not relate to statutory resolution. The incidents that happened there have no relation with this resolution.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : We are discussing the Statutory Resolution here. Please do not criticise this party or that party.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH : They had tried to form their Government there.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (AJMER) : Perhaps, they are extending their hand of friendship, that is why they are supporting ..(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Otherwise confusion will prevail. Please speak on the Statutory Resolution that is being discussed.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HANNA MOLLAH : I have to ask as to what was the intention of BJP to support Mayawati when she formed the Government in Uttar Pradesh. Now it is clear to everyone. The BJP at that time boasted that they had put forward an example by giving an opportunity to a dalit woman to form a Government but their intentions were totally different. They supported her due to their political motives and narrow mindedness. It has been proved before the people of Uttar Pradesh that their talks about their ideology, principles and issues are hollow and are not true ...*(Interruptions)* Besides, I want to criticise the Central Government also for the policy that was adopted in proclaiming the President's Rule in Uttar Pradesh. First, the Mulayam Singh Government was reduced minority and he asked for a chance to prove his majority in the Assembly, but he was not given a chance to prove his majority. But when the similar situation arose in Manipur and when it was noticed that the Congress was in a position to form its Government, they were given the chance. I want to say that the opportunistic policy of the Congress is ruining the country. This dual policy is destroying the country. I want to remind you that you have done many wrongs over the last 50 years, now you may give up this policy, if you want to save this country. Salman Sahib should also think and please leave this dual policy. If you want to save this country, then you may give up this policy of duplicity.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : Now you are talking of the policy of duplicity, What was your policy towards China, please tell.. *(Interruptions)* What were Lalsena and Muktisena ?

Shri Hannan Mollah : I do not want to go into what was our policy with regard to China. I want to say that the way the Governor of Manipur behaved at the instance of the Central Government, was not right. The way you had allowed the Assembly to function for the next 10 days was wrong. You have referred to some case of Supreme Court, but really the intention behind that was malafide. We are opposed to the culture of Horse-trading set up by the Congress Party. But , now the President Rule has been imposed there. It is your duty to utilize properly the time, you have got upto the next election because President's Rule is in a way rule by the Central Government. The first objective is to set right the circumstances in Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh is the biggest state of India. The objective is to wipe out the communal disharmony created there over the last 5-6 years. The step taken to unite Uttar Pradesh will prove beneficial for the whole country. The division among the people results in his division of the country. The same was the case with the creation of Hindustan and Pakistan. Today, the people are divided in the name of caste, religion and language. Therefore, it is the right opportunity to utilize the President's rule in the state for making an improvement in the situation and generate the feeling of unity among people. This can be implemented through the Government programmes.

The question of Mathura and Kashi was also raised. It will be the duty of the Central Government and President Rule to check the recurrence of such an unfortunate incident like Ayodhya one. You had promised here that the structure would not be demolished, Prime Minister had stood up and reaffirmed that the structure would not be demolished. But it was demolished. Therefore, please make it a point to implement what you promised here. This is my humble request.

You have said about giving punishment to the accused of Muzzaffarnagar incident. This is a good step, we welcome this. Such type of criminals who perpetrate atrocities on dalits, backward and minority people, should be given a deterrant punishment so that no one could indulge in such activities in future.

We should also take care of the problem of Uttrakhand. Our party has also demanded time and again that is not good to divide Uttar Pradesh. Autonomy should be given to the hilly region of Uttar Pradesh. We should repose confidence among the people of this region that they too are part of the population of the country and they too have got their share in the administration of this country. Such type of circumstances should be created. There can be an autonomous Council also for them. This has been created in the various parts of our country also. We should examine the Pros and Cons of this proposal and this idea of autonomy should be executed as soon as possible by preparing a programme to this affect. This will generate confidence among the people of this hilly region and strengthen the unity of Uttar Pradesh.

The third problem is that atrocities are still being committed on poor people. Assault was made on women and poor people during the tenure of dalit Chief Minister as well and BJP supported this. The BJP had withdrawn its support on making charges that.

[English]

BSP Govt.. not observing its own declaration, increasing corruption, bungling and crimes, exploiting the Dalits and ladies devaluating the Government machinery and disrespecting Ram and Gandhi..."

[Translation]

This has become clear that they had done this with a set objective. This is opportunism. This was never the fact that it was not known to them. It was known to them earlier also and they had given their support with a objective behind it.

Now this has become clear that the redemption of Dalit is not possible even when the Chief Minister herself is dalit. As a matter of fact, we should have administered speedy justice to dalits in the event of any injustice to them. If assault is being made on any body, then the accused should be put on trial in the special cell and he should be given punishment so

that even dalits and poor people, primitive castes and SC and ST could feel that they too are citizens of this country.

There was a proposal to give land to the people belonging to scheduled caste but this could not be done. They were not given the land on lease. We talk of landless people, we talk of land reforms, but there was no land reform and landless people have not been given lease of the land so far. Justice does not reach just by raising one's voice of protest. No social justice is possible unless people get their share. No social justice is possible just by raising one's voice of protest.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have got my own experience in this regard that there is a Maharaja of Benaras. He has encroached upon one thousand five hundred acres of land belonging to the most poor people and Musahar community. When Musahars went there to cultivate their land, they were attacked but the State Government stood by the side of Maharaj. Though the Maharaj does not possess any document, yet he has forcibly occupied their land. The landless Musahars of Chakla have been denied justice. Moreover, these poor people have not got lease deeds to their land. The Authorities act as middlemen for landlords in the name of poor framers and grab their land. The State Government should stop such acts in the State.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the entire Uttar Pradesh is experiencing acute shortage of water. Now-a-days sowing season is going on but water is not available. The farmer is wandering about in search of water. Drinking water is also not available. Complaints are being received from everywhere but no one is ready to hear them. Such a situation is prevailing in bureaucracy. Unless people's representatives are elected, nobody will be available to solve the problem of shortage of water there. Since there is now Central rule in the State, the Centre will have to resolve this problem. It should be ensured that each farmer gets water in this sowing season and nobody suffers any loss.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to state that recently, elections were held for Municipalities and Corporations. But the post of a Mayor has been degraded to the post of a peon. I mean to say that this type of decentralisation will not do. Laws should be amended properly and the local Governments should be given sufficient powers.

Then only we can sustain democracy. The devaluation of power to the people of this country by way of holding Panchayat elections, should be done honestly. I am compelled to support this Resolution but at the same time, I hope that the Government will think over this problem. With these words, I conclude.

DR. S.P. YADAV (Sambhal) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are compelled to support the Resolution moved by

the Government regarding President's rule in Uttar Pradesh because the State Assembly has already been dissolved under Rule 356 and Resolution has been moved now.

Mr. Chairman Sir, unfortunately, elections have been held in Uttar Pradesh thrice within the period of 6 years i.e. from 1989 to 1995. Lok Sabha and Assembly elections were held simultaneously in Uttar Pradesh and all over the country in 1989. Janta Dal had formed its Government in the Centre with the support of two Parties but in Uttar Pradesh it had full majority. The Minister in the Congress Government Shri Salman Khursheed was just now saying that they want to make Uttar Pradesh prosperous. I would like to submit that it was his Party which let the V.P. Singh Government fall in the Centre with the help of mafias and extended support to the Government formed by Samajwadi Party merely with 62 M.Ps. The Congress was also responsible for the disintegration of Janta Dal in Uttar Pradesh. It supported the break away group of Janta Dal, who formed a Government in Uttar Pradesh for four months. You may remember that late Rajiv Gandhi had admitted the fact that it was his first mistake in his political life to extend support to a Government formed by Samajwadi Party in the Centre. First, mistakes are committed by them and later, they lament over them. We should not take such a decision in this House which may prove harmful to our country. The Members of Congress Party and Bhartiya Janta Party had created such a situation here as if no discussion worth a name was taking place. My submission is that we all should do self-introspection. A lot of mistakes have been committed. Great leaders have also been murdered in this country. Today terrorism is dominant at international level also. Definitely, there have been some mistakes on our part which motivated these people to resort to terrorism or make attempts on the life of great leaders. It's a matter of serious concern. I want to say that there is no Government in India, the Mafia is ruling the country. In 1989-1990, when our Government was made to fall, people were seen wandering in North Avenue and South Avenue with the suitcases in their hands. They were indulging in breaking away the Members of Parliament. Again, Election to Loke Sabha as well as State Assemblies were held in 1991. Bhartiya Janta Party got full opportunity and it bagged 225 seats in Uttar Pradesh. The people voted them to power in the State to work for the welfare of the society and prosperity of the States. Instead, they got embroiled in the Babri Mosque and Ram Janm Bhoomi dispute. At that time, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh did not see the condition of the road from Atrauli to Alighrah. He engaged himself in the Ramjanam Bhoomi in Aayodhya and later faced its consequences. They were under the impression that they will enhance their vote bank by raising this issue time and again and demolishing the structure but it boomeranged. They should realise their mistake. This incident led to riots all over the State and many people were killed.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to state that only a person who loses his/her brother or son or father feels the agony left-behind by riots. A person who stoke riot and does not lose any of his near and dear ones, does not know its agony. In my constituency, 22 people were killed. I had urged upon the hon. Home Minister and the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Shri Sayeed in this House that there were eight persons of my constituency who have neither been declared dead nor alive. In response to our requests, simple acknowledgment is received. On the other hand, the hon. Prime Minister had made an announcement that the families of deceased will be given Rs. two lakh each. A poor beggar was killed in the riots but no money was given to his next of kin. Moreover, family members were told nothing about his dead body. I hold the Central Government responsible for the situation prevailing in Uttar Pradesh because when Bhartiya Janta Party was in power in Uttar Pradesh and Babri Mosque was being demolished in Ayodhya, our Prime Minister was ignorant of the developments there. In the evening, when the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh resigned, our Prime Minister recommended dissolution of the Legislative Assembly. It was like flogging a dead horse. The Central Government boasts of its super alertness. I would like to state that due to policy adopted by the Central Government, Bhartiya Janta Party bagged the large number of seats in the elections held in 1991 and 1993 in Uttar Pradesh. The Bhartiya Janta Party, Samajwadi Party, Bahujan Samaj Party, Congress and Janta Dal bagged 177 seats, 107, 69, 28 and 27 seats respectively. Independents and others also bagged some seats.

Shri Salman Khursheed was just speaking of criminalisation. I would like to make it clear that the people sitting in the front benches are solely responsible for the criminalisation of politics. Leaders of all Parties are involved in it. As, I had said that in the elections held in Uttar Pradesh in 1993, 177 candidates of Bhartiya Janta Party won out of which 45 candidates were criminals. Out of 107 candidates of Samajwadi Party, 44 candidates were criminals. Bahujan Samaj Party won 69 seats and out of them 18 candidates were criminals. 28 candidates of Congress Party won the elections out of which 8 candidates were criminals. Similarly, my Party i.e. Janta Dal and CPI got 27 and 3 seats respectively. Out of them 11 candidates of my Party and one of CPI were criminals. I want to say that we must do self-inspection.

"Dosh Paraye Dekhkar Chala Hans Hasant,
Aur Apne Chit Na Dekhain Jinmein Dosh Anant".

In the elections held in 1993, 144 criminals had been elected to the Legislative Assembly. In the scuffle which had taken place in the Assembly on 19th December, 1993 all were equally faulty. The then speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Shri Kesari Nath

Tripathi was also not spared. He sustained serious head injuries. A number of people had received wounds. They were removed on stretchers. The Members sitting here think that we are not encouraging criminalisation. I do not want to name anyone. But later I will reveal their names also. There is a member of Bhartiya Janta Party who is involved in 18 cases. Samajwadi Party has one member who is involved in 36 cases and the Congress has one member who is involved in 44 cases. They are not involved in petty cases but there are serious cases of abduction, decoity, road-hold-up, murder and rape are registered against them. If persons involved in such serious crimes would be elected to Legislative Assemblies and Lok Sabha. Then what will be the fate of this country. Have you ever pondered over it? Congress is the ruling party at present and about 4½ years have passed. Again the election are to be held in the country. I would like to make a submission that such criminals should not be encouraged because other political parties follow the similar path. The political party in power for a longer period commits more mistakes in comparison with others and has more responsibility. Therefore, I request you to ponder over this matter with the Cabinet Ministers. Hon. Prime Minister is also an able wise and elderly person, he should think over it and take initiatives to change this situations, otherwise the incident of Uttar Pradesh Assembly can be repeated in the Parliament also. Though I would not like to say something special on this subject because there was change of Government twice there in Uttar Pradesh. Earlier there was the Government of Socialist Party, supported by Bahujan Samaj Party, Congress and Janata Dal. We all know that how that Government functioned. The provisions of the Constitutions were violated and the Government was sacked. The Leader of Socialist Party, Shri Mulayam Singh who was Chief Minister at that time should have been given a chance to prove his majority in Legislative Assembly. In 1990 our party was in power and Shri V.P. Singh was the Prime Minister. At that time we knew that the support of Bhartiya Janata Party(Interruptions)

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH (Mirzapur) : In the context of what has been said by Professor Sahib, I would like to inform this House that, at the time of the dismissal of Mulayam Singh Government, all these persons ... (Interruptions)

DR. S.P. YADAV : The clear reply to your question is that it was the case of Bommai Saheb. Atalji was also mentioning it. I would also like to cite that example. We read in newspapers that Bommaiji is the President of the Party. In this matter he has become a living example and people have started quoting him. In his case Hon. Supreme Court gave a judgement that he should have been given a chance to prove his majority in the House. I do not say that majority could be proved but chance should have been given to him. But he was not given a chance which was unconstitutional. I would not like to say about the developments in relations between Mulayam

Singhji. Mayawati and Kashiramji but I would definitely like to say about the role played by the BJP in it. These people have very cleverly hatched a conspiracy for two three months to topple this Government. At that time they suddenly developed an affection for Dalits to such an extent that on 'Rakshabandhan' in August 95 rakhi was tied and sweets were eaten. But this affection did not last for long and only after passing August and September ..(Interruptions) The affection developed in August came to an end on 18th October. The brother and sister were separated. Just now Shri Mollah was speaking about some issues on which the support was withdrawn. But I would like to say that there was no such point. The only reason behind it was that on 19th Mayavati and her 5-6 colleagues, would have become M.L.Cs as elections for M.L.Cs were due on 19th and their names were sent already. Had the Legislative Assembly been dissolved after her election as M.L.C. She would have remained as Chief Minister of caretaker Government. Thus 18th October was a dead line for them and in the evening of that day the support was withdrawn and their affection for dalits was finished. Mayavati Government was toppled. I would like to say that three Chief Ministers were changed during 1989 to 1995. But Mayavati Government tried to do something. During the Four and half months period of her Chief Ministership she controlled the bureaucracy, the administration and started developmental work whereas Samajvadi and BJP Governments could not control bureaucracy and take up developmental works. But that Government was toppled and she could not become M.L.C. President's rule was imposed in Uttar Pradesh under the Article 356. This Article 356 was opposed by us in this House and criticized the Central Government for its use in various States but here we ourselves given the way for use of this Article. I request the Members of all political parties whether it is BJP, CPI, CPM, Congress or Janata Dal that they all should work for development of Uttar Pradesh and for holding fair elections in the State. I would like to say to the hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Home Affairs that your Kashmir package and efforts for holding elections in Kashmir have been thwarted by Election Commission. Now other persons are ruling over you. Earlier you were trying to use Election Commission against us for not holding elections in Bihar but now Election Commission has stopped the elections in Kashmir which were announced by you. Somehow elections should have been held there but your statement has not been given any weightage. The Government has failed on this matter. Though, it may not have happened in this House but the Election Commission has lowered your credibility among the people and you could not hold elections there.

President's Rule was imposed in Uttar Pradesh on 18th October 1995 and its period will complete on 18th April, 1996. Therefore, I request you to hold

elections for Legislative Assembly in the State and these should be held alongwith the Lok Sabha elections. Though I have read in the newspaper that the Government has expressed the possibility of holding elections there after elections for Lok Sabha. Though, I have no objection in it but I would like you to be in the fray. The people would elect those whom they would like. There is no use of fighting with each other in this House. Therefore, I request you that Legislative Assembly elections should be held in Uttar Pradesh at proper time.

A mention about Uttrakhand was also made here. With great regret I have to state that a large scale atrocities have been committed on our friends from Uttrakhand. On that day I was in Uttrakhand only. I would like to say only one thing that if you intend to make a separate state of Uttrakhand then I would demand on behalf of my party and myself that Uttar Pradesh should be bifurcated into three parts. Uttrakhand Eastern Uttar Pradesh and western Uttar Pradesh should be made three separate States. There are 67 districts in Uttar Pradesh at present. If Haryana consisting of only 14-15 districts can be a separate State in the country then why not Uttar Pradesh. We have no objection if this State is bifurcated in three parts but we will oppose and request you that head should not be chopped off. It will be good if all parts of a person remains together. Though I am not against separate Uttrakhand because two Governments have already passed it. BJP and socialist party Government have already announced the constitution of Uttrakhand. But I have seen the situation myself and found that people of Uttrakhand are not recognising these parties at all.

I would also like to say another thing to my colleagues. My friends from Bhartiya Janata Party should not take it otherwise ...(interruptions)

17.00 hrs.

Your party has tried to raise a communal point during its general session held in Bombay. You have performed 'Ashwamedha Yagna' and left the horse to wonder throughout the country for making an announcement that BJP is coming into power in Centre. This horse should not be left with religious sentiments otherwise National Front and Left Front are ready to catch it. They would clear the dues in forthcoming election. Under the President's Rule the administration and progress of developmental work in Uttar Pradesh has slackened. Officers have left the work of looking after the development work going under the Ambedkar schemes, District schemes or developmental work going on under the M.P. Local Area Development Schemes. They are not visiting the site. The works under the supervision of PWD, Commissioner or D.M. have come to standstill. I agree with the proposal given by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for constituting a committee of MPs. It is correct that the State is under President's rule and Governor's rule but Legislative

Council also exists there. The Members of Legislative Council are paid T.D., D.A. and all other facilities. Their committee should be constituted. Except the Ministers, help of all the MPs should be sought in developmental works. We are much more familiar to the geographical area of our State. We can offer our co-operation in selection of the type of developmental work in specific geographical area. In 1992, when the State was under the President's rule the Governor visited Badaun and given assurance for construction of a bridge but it has not been constructed so far. He belongs to Madhya Pradesh and knows about the developmental works to that extent only as has been told by his secretary. But Legislators of Legislative Council can give better suggestions. I agree with the suggestion given by Shri Atal ji while connecting MLCs to it. It will reveal the clear intention of the Government if the hon. Minister sitting here give assurance to this effect that committee will be constituted otherwise we will think that you are not caring for development of Uttar Pradesh and then Public of the State will not cooperate with you. With these words I conclude.

[English]

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Statutory Resolution moved by the Home Minister approving the Proclamation issued by the President on the 18th October, 1995 under article 356 of the Constitution of India in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh.

To my mind the scope of discussion on this Statutory Resolution is very limited. Many friends have gone through the whole politics of Uttar Pradesh and several problems of that State. But the real point before this House today is whether when the proclamation was issued the circumstances had existed in which the Government of that State could not be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. As a matter of fact, nobody has opposed the issuance of proclamation as far as Uttar Pradesh is concerned.

The Opposition Leader, Shri Vajpayee, who opened the debate, also in fact did not oppose the issuance of this Proclamation. He made certain constructive suggestions that development of the State should be looked after urgently. He also made a suggestion that MPs may be involved with the Advisory Committee of the Governor. He took real exception to the dissolution of Assembly which at the initial stage was kept in suspended animation, relying upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in Bommai's case.

Therefore, he, in fact, demanded the causes or the reasons which took place subsequent to the Proclamation of the President's rule where, at that stage, the dissolution of the Assembly was not done, relying upon that Supreme Court judgement. That is a different matter altogether. According to me, dissolution of

Assembly is different from issuing Proclamation for imposing President's rule. These are two separate powers of the President and there are separate legal provisions as far as both these are concerned. This Parliament has a right to approve or disapprove the Proclamation regarding imposition of President's rule but according to me, there is no provision in the Constitution by which we can disapprove the dissolution of Assembly. The Bommai's case which decided that after issuing Proclamation, unless it is approved by Parliament the Assembly should not be dissolved, has also laid down that Parliament has no right to disapprove the dissolution of Assembly. In the A.I.R. 1994 of the Supreme Court, where in this Bommai's case has been reported on page 1918, in that very judgment, at page 1984, paragraph 73, it has been stated, and I quote :

"As regards the third class of cases where the Proclamation is held valid but is not approved by either or both Houses of Parliament, the consequence of the same would be the same as where the Proclamation is revoked subsequently or is not laid before each House of the Parliament before the expiration of two months or where it is revoked after its approval by the Parliament, or ceases to operate on the expiration of a period of six months from the date of issue or of the further permissible period under clause (4) of article 356, it does not, however, appear from the provisions of article 356 or any other provision of the Constitution that mere non-approval of a valid Proclamation by the Parliament or its revocation or cessation will have the effect either of restoring the Council of Ministers or the Legislative Assembly. The inevitable consequence in such a situation is fresh elections and the constitution of the new Legislative Assembly and the Ministry in the State."

In fact, technically speaking, this House is unnecessarily referring to the dissolution of Assembly. Whether it was legal or illegal, that is for the court to decide ultimately, if anybody takes exception. The fact remains that at the time of imposing President's rule, a situation had arisen in which the Government of that State could not be carried on in accordance with the Constitution. The Report of the Governor is very clear on this point that the support of this Government was withdrawn by BJP and then it was reduced to a hopeless minority and, therefore, no Government could be carried on by that party itself. And that has been admitted by the then Chief Minister herself.

Therefore, she herself resigned saying that she would not be able to carry on because the support has been withdrawn. Now it is also made clear in the Governor's report that at that stage no party was prepared to stake its claim for formation of Government. Even the B.J.P. or Shri Mulayam Singh's party,

everybody has refused to stake the claim as far as the formation of the Government was concerned. Therefore, the situation was such that no elected party was staking its claim to form the Government and there was no alternative before the Governor but to report to the President that the government cannot be carried on and, therefore, it was quite proper and legal that the President had imposed the Presidents rule at that time. As I said, the dissolution of the assembly is a different issue altogether and has no relevance as far as this Statutory Resolution is concerned.

Now, several suggestions have been made regarding the situation in U.P. There is a suggestion that the elections should be held immediately or they should be held along with the Lok Sabha elections. That is for the Government to decide after considering the political situation and other factors altogether. A reference has been made to Uttarakhand issue and all other problems of development of Uttar Pradesh. That is also a different matter and I will appeal to the Government to take into consideration all these suggestions while carrying on the governance of the State.

[Translation]

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion presented by hon. Home Minister.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, before taking up this issue, I would like to say something about comments of Shri Salman Khursheed about me. He had said something about Uttaranchal. Would that he were here in the House. However, I would say 2-3 things about utterances made by him.

Mr. Chairman, Sir I personally know Shri Khursheed Saheb. He is a good man with good thoughts but the way in which he was putting forth his opinion, gave me an impression as if a child is lost in the wilderness and does not know the way out. He had a good intention but did not know the way out and what to say and how to say? So, he has expressed his views in a confused manner which suggests that he is aggrieved to see inadequate development of Uttar Pradesh, and the manner in which goons, castism and religion are being used to serve vested interests but when there comes the question of accepting the reality, he somehow tries to incriminate others and always claims in his every statement that whatever has happened there during the last six years that is because of others; I wonder he does not know as to who has been there in power during the last six years. It was Congress Party which ruled the State for 40 years out of 48 years of independence. But now Congress wants to absolve itself of the blame that the Congress is responsible for present plight of the State. Since 1980 till date, BJP Government had been in power for 18 months and Mayavati Government for the remaining term of 4 months It was Mulayam Singh

Government or the Government supported by Congress which had been in power there during rest of the period. Then why the Government is making allegation on others? Why does the Government not resort to self retrospection and confess the misdeeds boldly. Only then some positive thinking is possible. Merely making allegations on others will not do. Therefore, hon. Khursheedji should think over as to what he is stating, to whom he is stating and whom he is blaming? Unless you make self restrospection, just resorting to tall talks on the development of Uttar Pradesh, cast and creed will not do.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, second thing stated by him was about Uttaranchal. I will take up it a bit later in detail. He had extended an invitation to sort out the problem across the table. Perhaps Khursheed ji alone know as to who talked him, how much he talked to him and who wants to talk to him? We are tired in waiting for such parleys but to whom to talk? Government is not ready to hold discussion. The Government is playing a shoddy politics in dealing with this issue which has neither any justification nor any moral value. But the Government is sticking to one line and treading on that only. I and hon. Salman Khursheed ji had visited the earthquake hit Uttarkashi in 1991 in the same helicopter but you all played politics in that case too. The issue of Calamity Relief Fund was taken up this morning but the Government played politics when Uttarkashi was hit by earthquake and now it invites us to sit together and discuss the issue. Political attitude on each and every issue is not going to solve the problem of that area. I shall take up the issue after some time.

We have before us two important dates of October i.e. October 18 and October 28. The President Rule was imposed on Uttar Pradesh on October 18 and Legislative Assembly was dissolved on October 28. Much has been said on that issue by Shri Atal ji and other hon. Members. Shri Sharad Dighe ji is a senior Member. [English] I do not want to join the issue with you.

[Translation]

But it is not a question of its being legal or illegal, instead it pertains to morality or immorality involved in it. The Government, on October 18, quotes the case of Bommai and after 10 days forgets it. Previously, the Government had stated that they could not dissolve the Assembly since court order had not allowed them to do so in Bommai case, inspite of the fact that no party wanted to form the Government there. Perhaps, it was the first such instance in the history of India because whenever President's Rule is imposed on any State, every party wants to form its Government by hook or crook. You had clear instruction. You observed that no party wanted to form its Government there but you wanted that horse trading should be resorted to so that a Government of your choice could be formed there. For this

purpose, you quoted the Bommai case on October, 18 but you overlooked the same on October 28. The very day, hon. Prime Minister returns to the country, the Assembly is dissolved while BJP was in a position to form the Government. It is not fair. You could have dissolved the Assembly on October 18, itself but 10 days taken by you were used just to vitiate the atmosphere and that did heavy loss besides, no one was benefited from that.

At last, the question of sincerity comes, that is how sincere and dedicated you are in solving the problems and how to you wish to solve them? But you try our level best to play politics on each and every issue. You try to solve the problem which, you think, can benefit your party but you linger on the problem which, in your opinion, does not seem beneficial to your party, be it Kashmir issue or the issue of Uttarakhand. You allow a problem to take alarming proportions but when it goes out of control, you completely dissociate yourself from it.

17.18 hrs.

(Shri Sharad Dighe *in the Chair*)

I would like to discuss specially Utranchal issue. Hon. Home Minister is well aware of the issue and we have taken this matter with him time and again but I would like to cite some instances of injustice done by his party's Government which has completed just two months to Uttaranchal since October last. You have been instrumental in abetting Mulayam Singh committing atrocities on us since he had full support of your party. Your party continued to support Mulayam Singh Government even after he committed atrocities on us at first in Khatima and Mussorie and thereafter in Muzaffarpur where modesty of not only the women of Uttaranchal, but of whole India was outraged. What to talk of dissolving the Government there, you did not even withdraw your support from that Government and thus you have been instrumental in committing atrocities by Mulayam Singh on us. That time you had an excuse that Mulayam Singh Government was in power during that period.

But what is happening today? How is your Government understanding the sentiments of the people of Uttaranchal? You are putting thrust on conducting election in Kashmir even when it is plagued with terrorism, but why do you not intend to hold election in Uttarakhand? The elections of municipal councils and district Panchayats were cancelled on the day the President Rule was imposed on the State and Legislative Assembly was dissolved there. Mr. Minister, I would like to know as to why the elections were cancelled there? You talk of democracy, you are ready to conduct elections in Kashmir because your political interest is involved there, but you want the elections to be cancelled there by hon. President because Congress Party has lost its base there. During the regime of Mayavati

Government, electioneering process had been completed and election orders had been issued but hon. Governor on the very first day of withdrawal, cancelled the elections. Why did he cancel the elections? Is Uttaranchal affected by terrorism more than Jammu and Kashmir? Is your law and order system so weak there that you can conduct elections there. I met hon. Governor the very next day, discussed with him and humbly enquired how it happened? He replied to me that nominations had not been filed, so it was cancelled. Hon. Governor was not making a true statement. One can check that 8&10 persons have filed nominations. To benefit the Congress Party you are murdering the democracy. Hon. Home Minister, I would like to know as to why the elections were cancelled there? What message goes to the people thereby? Would you stop the whole electioneering process just on having seen tumultuous scene created by few persons? It is the first gift of President rule to us and you invite us for a discussion.

After the C.B.I. submitted its report on Uttarakhand, I requested the previous Government, the Mayavati Government as well as hon. Governor when the State came under the President rule that C.B.I. had identified some guilty officers and therefore they should be suspended with immediate effect. Enquiry should have been started against them or court order should have been issued against them. Mayavati had been evasive and that was one of the four reasons for withdrawal of support by B.J.P. She not only insulted the women of India but also did betrayal with justice. However, during the regime of hon. Governor, it was expected that orders would be issued within 24 hour. He took one month in doing so after considering all the pros and cons and including all aspects thereof which could prove politically beneficial or disadvantageous in terms of politics. But what has been done after a gap of one month except ordering a C.B.I. inquiry? What is the follow-up action taken? Why were not these officials suspended? Officials are suspended on trifled excuses at other place out in this case no cognizance of the self-esteem and feelings of the people including women folk of Uttarakhand has been taken. The Government is reluctant to punish the guilty officers even after lapse of one year and two months. They were responsible for openly raping the women in the buses and the Government is inviting us to hold talks in the air. Whom should we talk to and why? I would like to know why these officers have not been suspended so far? I may tell the hon. Home Minister that the story does not end here. It is an injustice to us by him, his party and his Government.

He might recall the incident of November, 10. The Uttarakhand activist were sitting on a fast at an island in the midst of river Alaknanda in Sirmagar in my constituency. On November, 10 they were attacked under a pre-planned strategy in broad daylight during the President's rule in fashion a similar to an army aggression against the enemy. The women were

beaten black and blue with rifle butts. The children and the aged people were chased away and the youth were beaten with rifles and butts and thrown into the river. On enquiry, the policemen, the D.M. and S.P. very proudly denied this charge and said that they had made a good police bandobast and that this was a bunch of lame excuses, a simple exaggeration.

Hon. Home Minister, Sir, the dead bodies of the two youth killed on 10th were found on 22nd in the river. According to the postmortem report, one person aged 24-25 years had died of baton-charge prior to being thrown into the river. I understand that people are hurt as they receive bullets in a police action but then, the injured are supposed to be taken to the hospital. These policemen beat one youth to death and other to unconsciousness and threw them into the river. The latter drowned and died. One of them was Rawat and the other, Banjol. Is this the kind of justice being done during President's rule? They said that it was not their Government there. Today, it is their former Chief Minister perpetrating injustice in the capacity of a Governor.

After the dead body was found on 22nd, I talked to the hon. Prime Minister on telephone who asked me to contact hon. Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi due to his pre-occupations. I am grateful to both for having listened to me and immediately contacting the Governor and taking some action. Like hon. Atal ji, I too hold hon. Moti Lal Vohra in high esteem. He is a noble person, but who owns the moral responsibility? Who is responsible for this cold blooded murder, for this man slaughter? He should have resigned in pursuit of owning the moral responsibility for such a massacre in the state during his regime.

We had demanded the suspension of these two officers. They were, instead, transferred. Today, transfers are a routine administrative exercise. Today, a D.M. is transferred if he does not conform to the wishes of a Chief Minister.

Ordering a judicial inquiry into the incident is a welcome step and in accordance with our demand but this should be expedited. The hon. Home Minister is adding salt to our wounds instead of solving this problem. How long can we endure such a treatment? I have, made repeated requests here but to no avail.

Just now, hon. Salman Khurshid was inviting us to hold talks. Have they ever initiated negotiations? The existing Minister of State for Home Shri Rajesh Pilot invited his friends and under the garb of a T.V. coverage tried to give the impression that negotiations were on with the people of Uttarakhand. All the four Members of Parliament are present here. Just tell me whether you ever talked to these people's representatives during the last four and half year's period? It seems that you are allergic and scared of Bhartiya Janta Party. I had written to the hon. Prime Minister that out of the total 19 M.L. As, 10 are of our

Bhartiya Janta Party in Uttar Pradesh. You atleast confer with them if not with us. Here, in your speech you ask us to hold talks with you. Who we ought to address? Should we address walls or stones here?

I feel pained and concerned to say that atmosphere is being vitiated in this way. I have stated here several time that my party and I myself are making efforts to maintain peace there. Perhaps, you know through your sources as to how we are striving to maintain peace there. But the hon. Minister and his Government are instigating the people to create chaos there simply to postpone elections after holding parley with few such person. But you do not know how to work with peace and in a constitutional manner. This is a matter of great concern.

The hon. Governor had declared 27 percent reservation to mislead us. I am not able to understand how such a responsible person is talking like this and thereby adding insult to our injuries? On one hand, he had made an announcement regarding reservation there but on the other hand he gives a contradictory statement here. What is that 27 percent? I will tell. This has been implemented in Pantnagar University only once. Here, in Delhi, he says that there are some legal and other implications in implementing 27 percent reservation and earlier he has not noticed those implications. I would like to know how he has made such announcement if he has not noticed those implications? You will not get any benefit by declaring 27 per cent reservation. You are simply misleading us. Unless you talk of making separate State, this problem cannot be solved. Politics of vote and election manifestos will not serve the purpose. I am stating this thing again and again that if you keep on following this policy, at one stage this boarder state will indeed be declared as disturbed area.

You have talked of creating two secretariats to mislead the people of that area. You may create there as many Secretariats as you wish but that will not help in solving this problem. When the Government of Bhartiya Janta Party was in power in that State, we introduced Hill Cadre there. But the present Government is not ready to do the same. The Government will not do any such thing in the State as might benefit the people of that area. The proposal regarding Hill cadre is pending since 1992. There had already been President's Rule for one year and it was imposed for the second time but even then proposal regarding Hill Cadre was not implemented. You will do only that which benefits you. You always mislead the people. Why do not you implement Hill Cadre? You are saying that you have created two Secretariats there but what is the benefit from it? We had started a process of shifting some offices there from Lucknow and Allahabad. You have discontinued that process.

Why don't you restart it ? You will not do any such thing which might benefit the people of that area. You will do only that which benefits you and strengthens your vote bank. But hon. Home Minister, you will not get any benefit of it because there is a great resentment among the People there.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, at last, I would like to state one or two more points. The manner in which you consider our problems is also very disappointing. We are right and you are also right but that is another thing. We can have different opinions. Hon-Salman Khursheed had said that a different way out can be found to this problem but do not go for carrying out a new State. Don't remove the crown from the head. Let the head be there in its place. The region which you term as 'head' has been treated by you worse than legs. The Government does not care for their 'head'. The Government wants to show off this crown before the world but infect it wants to mislead us by saying so. No. one will care for us. A discussion was held here for seven and half hour on our proposal for making Uttranchal a separate state. In 1993, when President's rule was imposed in the State Mr. Sayeed, who was then a Minister, had said in his reply that whenever an elected Government would come into power the Government would immediately consider this problem. I had told that time also that the same proposal was made by the Government of Bhartiya Janta Party which was also an elected Government but you were too scared of B.J.P. to accept that proposal. Thereafter in 1994, an elected Government came into power and it also submitted the same proposal, even then you are not taking action in this regard.

When President's rule was imposed again, hon. Home Minister said that he did not know whether that statement had been published correctly or wrongly. It is very surprising and I still think that you must not have said like that. You had given an assurance to consider that issue whenever a popular Government came into power. Do you want dozens of Government to come ? When several Governments will come with several proposals then what will you consider ? A Minister of your Party says in Rishikesh that when a elected Government will send a proposal, the Government will consider it. I do not know whether he knows or not as to what is Uttranchal. He does not know that two proposals are pending here. The hon. Minister, you are harassing us but thereby you are undermining the national interest. Please try to understand the situation. I am saying above Party lines that your attitude is not in the national interest. You should think that it is a boarder state from where majority of people are serving in the Army. From every family not even one or two, but three or four members are serving in Armed force or in Para Military forces. How long they will tolerate such injustice ? You are not ready even to talk to us. I have made several requests and written many letters but you have done nothing. I feel pained to say that all that is happening during President's rule should not have happened, Please stop it.

The Government is only making announcements with regard to Uttranchal. Hon. Prof. Yadavji said that the hon. Governor had made several announcements during the last one year. In my constituency also, announcements were made during that time but have not been implemented so far.

He had made announcements like opening some degree colleges etc. but nothing has been done so far. Now the people are well aware of the reality. The Government should pay attention to the basic issues on which people are agitated. The members of Uttranchal Pradesh Sangharsh Samiti have been sitting on Dharna throughout the winter session, i.e. from 27 November to 22nd December. We want to make the Government understand the fact that the condition has become out of control. Please do something atleast in the national interest even if you don't consider Uttranchal of any significance. Keeping in view all these things I can not support this motion.

SHRI VISHWANATH SHASTRI (Gazipur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir the Statutory Resolution moved by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs regarding proclamation of President's rule in Uttar Pradesh is being discussed. Under the circumstances prevailing then, there was no other alternative except imposing President's rule. It is the second time, since 1991, when President's rule has been imposed in the State. Unfortunately, both the times my friends sitting on the right side were mainly responsible for the imposition of President's rule in the State. Their party had come to power with clear majority after 1991 elections but their actions resulted in imposition of President's rule in the State.

Thereafter, the BSP and SP combine formed a new Government in the State. This Government totally changed the politics of the State and made an appeal in the name of principles, whereas the principles and policies of it were remotely related to each other. After the fall of this Government, a new government with the support of the BJP was formed. Just now Prof. S.P. Singh has said that the intention of the supporting party was very clear. It was an unconditional support and, to some extent, that party achieved its objectives. However, there is a limit also. They withdrew their support to the Government on some issues and it collapsed. At the time of imposition of President's rule, no political party was in a position to form the Government. Neither the BJP nor the S.P. Staked their claims to this effect. I do not understand why the Legislative Assembly was not immediately dissolved instead of creating a situation of horse trading. However, a good sense prevailed and the Legislative Assembly was dissolved after ten days. I would like to say that no developmental work has been taken up in Uttar Pradesh since 1991. The Governments kept on changing and they gave priority to other issues. The developmental issues remain unattended. They did not have time to formulate and

implement the schemes for the development of the State. Again with the imposition of President's rule, the developmental work in Uttar Pradesh has come to a standstill. Recently, the announcement regarding 'Gandhi Grams' and 'Ambedkar Grams' has been made. The fund meant for 'Poorvanchal Nidhi' or JRY have been diverted to these schemes. Except 'Gandhi Gram' and 'Ambedkar Gram' no other development work has been taken up in Uttar Pradesh. There is no agency to monitor the things there. The leader of Opposition has given a suggestion that an Advisory Committee of MPs should be constituted at State level. I would like to demand that with the help of all the recognised political parties in the State, Committees should be constituted at block level for speeding up development work in the State.

Secondly, I would like to say that just now Khanduriji was expressing his grief over Uttrakhand issue. It is not his grief only but it also reflects the grief of all the people of Uttar Pradesh. No political party in Uttar Pradesh opposes the creation of a separate Uttrakhand State. Unanimous resolutions to this affect have been sent twice to the Centre. By ignoring them, the Centre is ignoring the whole Uttar Pradesh as well as the sentiments of the people living there. The negligence of this State has resulted in the present situation there. My party supports the demand for a separate Uttrakhand State. We have already set up a separate Committee of Uttrakhand in our organisation. I earnestly demand that problems of Uttrakhand should be solved and it should be recognised as a separate State.

I would also like to make another demand that elections to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly should be held alongwith Lok Sabha elections because President's rule cannot be kept in force for a long time. The Government should also declare as to when it intends to hold Lok Sabha elections.

With these words, I support this Resolution and conclude.

SHRI RAMSAGAR (Barabanki) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the discussion on approval of proclamation of President's rule in Uttar Pradesh is being discussed. There are several problems in Uttar Pradesh and the problem of Uttrakhand is one of them. Just now hon. Khanduriji has expressed his anguish over the problem of Uttrakhand before this House. I feel that the Centre does not do any justice. The Uttar Pradesh Government has sent twice the unanimously passed Resolution regarding Uttrakhand and the Central Government has to take a final decision in this regard. Samajwadi Party is of the view that the problems of the people of Uttrakhand should be solved. We have accepted all their demands through our Resolutions.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the elected Government of UP and BSP combine was doing well in Uttar Pradesh. The Centre adopts dual approach. When an internal

conflict emerged in the BJP in Gujarat, the Centre gave them one month time to resolve the matter. But in Uttar Pradesh, the Government of Mulayam Singh Yadav was not given even 24 hours. It is true that the Bhartiya Janata Party was looking for an opportunity. Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav formed the Government after BJP Government and during a period of 1½ years, he improved his image and undertook several developmental works in the State. But due to differences, the other partner broke away. The BJP took advantage of this opportunity and a new Government was formed with its support. This Government claimed that it was the party of Dalits. Leaders of that party went there from Delhi to bless her and announced that the Government would last for five years.

The Government was sacked in between and it was said that the democratically elected Members of the Legislative Assembly should be given every chance to form majority. Mulayam Singhji kept on saying for 10 days that he had majority support. Thereafter also he claimed to have formed majority. But when there came the chance to prove the majority on the floor, the Legislative Assembly was dissolved at the behest of the Central Government so that Mulayam Singh Yadav's Samajwadi party might not get a chance to form the Government.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, not only Congress party was responsible for it but Bhartiya Janta Party was also involved in this conspiracy. Today, I have heard the hon. Leader of opposition and he calls it an irony to that the hon. Members of Lok Sabha will run the State Government. How long this hunger for power will go on. A Committee of the hon. Members of Parliament should be set up to look after the State Government's functioning...*(Interruptions)* My submission is that the elections for both the Lok Sabha and the Assembly should be conducted simultaneously...*(Interruptions)* There was a conspiracy to keep the elections in Uttar Pradesh pending for long by setting up an Advisory Committee. There are some set traditions for running the State Governments. There can be no undertaking system like this. Therefore my submission is that what is going on with Uttar Pradesh today. Some of the Congressmen alongwith some of the people from Bhartiya Janta Party are involved in the conspiracy that the Lok Sabha elections should be conducted alongwith the Legislative Assembly elections. *(Interruptions)*

MAJ. GEN.(RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: We clearly say that both the elections should be conducted simultaneously.

SHRI RAMSAGAR : Alright, you have admitted it but sometimes your doings belie your claims. You say somethings and to something else. Its good that you have said it here. We want that the President's rule should not continue for long there. Both the Lok

Sabha and Assembly polls should be conducted there simultaneously. I am saying so because where the members of Municipal Committees, the other representatives of the people, or the M.P.s approach even the petty officers, they say that the President's rule is there. If the President's rule does not mean that, you will do whatever you like and the representatives of the people will be neglected.

It is being said that autocracy is increasing and if elections are not conducted in time it will further increase and the development work will come to a stand-still. It was for the first time that the Samajwadi Parti gave 70 percent money for rural development and developmental work were undertaken at every step but today all these have come to a halt. Unless the elected Government comes to power the incomplete works can not be completed.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, to have a check on autocracy and to avoid hurdles in the developmental work President's rule should not last long there and the elections should be conducted there within six months. Besides Lok Sabha elections, we are in favour of conducting Assembly elections in Uttar Pradesh. Elections should not be kept pending for long in Uttar Pradesh. My only submission is that the democratically elected Government should be set up there soon.

[English]

SHRI YAIMA SING YUMNAM (Inner Manipur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Statutory Resolution moved by the hon. Home Minister in respect of the proclamation issued by the President in Uttar Pradesh.

I am prepared to appreciate the role played by the Governor in tackling the situation in the State. We know that the Governor has to play an important role to promote democracy which is so dear to us, in the country. The Governor of Uttar Pradesh played that role very effectively and purposefully. The Governor, after trying his best to find a party which will be able to form the Government in Uttar Pradesh recommended for the dissolution of the Assembly and Proclamations of the President's Rule in that State.

Uttar Pradesh is an ideal State in the country because it is a very big State. It is a State which produced many Prime Minister and national leaders as well. It is a State which sends the highest number of representatives to the Lok Sabha and so, it is an ideal State. I very much appreciate the role played by the Governor, even though some hon. Members here are against that role. Comparatively, in some States, including the State of Manipur, the time given to the Chief Minister to prove the majority was about one month or more than 30 days.

In Uttar Pradesh, the Governor gave, at the most, ten days. It is ideal. In Manipur, the Governor gave the Chief Minister more than 30 days, say a month,

to prove his majority. So, comparatively, please examine the difference. The Governor is the agent of the Central Government—the Home Ministry. He will act in consultation with the full understanding of the Home Ministry. But he should not expose himself that he is taking side with a party. That is objectionable. It will hamper the growth and promotion of democracy in the country. That is what we have experienced.

In the case of Manipur when we enquired about it, the reply of the Governor was that it was according to the Sarkaria Commission Report. It was brought to his notice that the Sarkaria Commission recommended only 10 percent for the Ministry. In a House of 60 MLAs in Manipur, there were 28 Ministers, one Deputy Speaker, one Speaker, two Parliamentary Secretaries of the rank of Minister of State, one Deputy Chairman of the rank of Cabinet Minister. So, automatically all the post-holders formed the majority. It has been allowed against the Report of the Commission. I would like to request the Home Minister to look into these affairs. Is it fair to have more than 28 Ministers in a House of 60 MLAs only ? Half of them are post-holders Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Speaker, Deputy Speaker ? In this way, I think, the Governor should not expose himself by taking side with a particular party. In the case of Uttar Pradesh, the Governor dealt with it fairly. It is therefore, I appreciate the role of the Governor.

As regards holding the elections, I would like to support the proposal of our hon. members that the Assembly elections must be held there along with the Lok Sabha election. We must try to restore democracy as soon as possible. We have experienced so much about the misdeeds during the President's Rule in a State. The people under the President's Rule feel that they are alien. They are being ruled by bureaucrats. So, let there not be so in the case of Uttar Pradesh.

What wrongs have been done by the national parties to the people of Uttar Pradesh ? It was a State where the national parties—the Congress Party, the BJP or the Janata Dal—had a command. But now it has gone to the regional parties. The change must be acknowledged.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM : I am concluding. We feel very much hurt when Miss Mayawati, the then Chief Minister, passed a remark against Mahatma Gandhi. It hurt us very much....(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let him conclude in one or two minutes.

(Interruptions)

18.00 hrs.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM : I shall conclude my speech.

337 *Statutory Resolution Re : Approval Proclamation issued by President in relation of the Uttar Pradesh*

AGRAHAYANA 7, 1917 (Saka)

Statutory Resolution Re : Approval Proclamation issued by President in relation of the Uttar Pradesh 338

My last point would be this. I would like to support the proposal for the creation of Uttarakhand State. I strongly support it. My party, although is a regional party, it supports the demand strongly because we are in favour of having small States.

With these few words, I support the Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now the House stands

adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. on 29th November, 1995.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, November 29, 1995/ Agrahayana 8, 1917 (Saka).
