

# **LOK SABHA DEBATES**

## **(English Version)**

**Fourth Session**  
**(Part II)**  
**(Eleventh Lok Sabha)**



*(Vol. XII contains No. 1)*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*Price: Rs. 50.00*

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

---

**Shri S. Gopalan**  
Secretary-General  
Lok Sabha

**Shri Surendra Mishra**  
Additional Secretary  
Lok Sabha Secretariat

**Shri P.C. Bhatt**  
Chief Editor  
Lok Sabha Secretariat

**Shri Y.K. Abrol**  
Senior Editor

**Shrimati Kamla Sharma**  
Editor

**Shri Bal Ram Suri**  
Assistant Editor

**Shri S.C. Kala**  
Assistant Editor

# CONTENTS

*Eleventh Series, Vol. XII, Fourth Session (Part-II) 1997/1919 (Saka)*

**No. 1, Friday, April 11, 1997/Chaitra 21, 1919 (Saka)**

SUBJECT	COLUMN
OBITUARY REFERENCE .....	1
PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE .....	2
ASSENT TO BILLS .....	3
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE	
Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Reports— <i>Presented</i> .....	3—4
STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE	
Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports— <i>Presented</i> .....	4
STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT	
Sixth and Seventh Reports and Minutes— <i>Presented</i> .....	4
MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS— <i>Negatived</i> .....	5—200
Shri H.D. Deve Gowda .....	5—11 167—186
Shri Jaswant Singh .....	12—21
Shri P.R. Dasmunsi .....	21—30
Shri I.K. Gujral .....	31—41
Shri Somnath Chatterjee .....	41—53
Shri Chandra Shekhar .....	53—58
Shri Madhukar Sarpotdar .....	58—70
Shri Ram Vilas Paswan .....	70—79
Shri Pramed Mahajan .....	79—92
Shri Shivraj V. Patil .....	92—97
Shri P. Chidambaram .....	97—107
Shri Nitish Kumar .....	107—115
Kumari Uma Bharati .....	115—123
Shri Rajesh Pilot .....	123—130
Shri Kanshi Ram .....	130—132
Sardar Surjeet Singh Barnala .....	134—137
Shri Chitta Basu .....	137—140
Shri P.N. Siva .....	140—143
Shri N.K. Premchandran .....	143—145
Shri Jai Prakash .....	145—147
Shri G.M. Banatwalla .....	147—150
Prof. Saifuddin Soz .....	150—152
Dr Prabin Chandra Sarma .....	153—154
Shri Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi .....	154—155
Shri Indrajit Gupta .....	156—160
Shri Atal Bihan Vajpayee .....	163—167

# LOK SABHA DEBATES

## LOK SABHA

[English]

11.03 hrs.

Friday, April 11, 1997/Chaitra 21, 1919 (Saka)

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

(The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock)

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

### Proclamation issued by the President

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Proclamation (Hindi and English versions) dated the 21st March, 1997 issued by the President under clause (2) of article 356 of the Constitution revoking the earlier proclamation issued by him on the 17th October, 1996 in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh published in Notification No. G.S.R. 165(E) in Gazette of India dated the 21st March, 1997, under article 356 (3) of the Constitution.

[English]

### OBITUARY REFERENCE

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I have to inform the House about the demise of our esteemed friend Shri Vishveshvar Rao Raje.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1797/97]

Shri Vishveshvar Rao Raje was a Member of the Sixth Lok Sabha representing Chandrapur Parliamentary Constituency of Maharashtra during 1977 to 1979.

### Notification under Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951

Earlier he had been a Member of Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 1957 to 1977.

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI T.G. VENKATRAMAN): On behalf of Shri Murasoli Maran, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Notification No. S.O. 298(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 3rd April, 1997 making certain amendments in the Notification No. S.O. 477(E) dated the 25th July, 1991, under sub-section (2H) of section 29B of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, together with a corrigendum thereto published in Notification No. S.O. 306(E) dated the 7th April, 1997.

A dedicated political and social worker Shri Vishveshvar Rao Raje was associated with various social organisations and worked hard for improving the lot of labourers and other weaker sections of the society. He took special interest in the spread of education in the rural areas particularly amongst Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1798/97]

A man of letters, Shri Vishveshvar Rao Raje started a Marathi weekly "Gondwana".

### Export and Import Policy and Handbook of Procedures (Vol. I)

Shri Vishveshvar Rao Raje passed away at Aheri on 27 March, 1997 at the age of 71 years.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH): I beg to lay on the Table—

We deeply mourn the loss of this friend and I am sure the House will join me in conveying our condolences to the bereaved family.

- (1) A copy of the Export and Import Policy (1 April, 1997—31 March, 2002) (Hindi and English versions).

The House may now stand in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the deceased.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1799/97]

11.02 hrs.

- (2) Handbook of Procedures (Volume I) (1 April, 1997—31 March, 2002) (Hindi and English versions).

*The Members then stood in silence for a short while.*

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1800/97]

11.03 $\frac{1}{4}$  hrs.

## ASSENT TO BILLS

*[English]*

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I lay on the Table the following thirteen Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session and assented to since a report was last made to the House on the 21st February, 1997:—

- (1) The Appropriation (Railways) Vote on Account Bill, 1997;
- (2) The Appropriation (Railways) Bill, 1997;
- (3) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2 Bill, 1997;
- (4) The Uttar Pradesh Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1997;
- (5) The Uttar Pradesh Appropriation Bill, 1997;
- (6) The Income-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1997;
- (7) The Port Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1997;
- (8) The National Highways Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1997;
- (9) The Lalit Kala Akademi (Taking over of Management) Bill, 1997;
- (10) The National Commission for Safai Karamcharis (Amendment) Bill, 1997;
- (11) The Appropriation Bill, 1997;
- (12) The Appropriation (No. 2), Bill, 1997; and
- (13) The Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1997.

11.03 $\frac{1}{2}$  hrs.

## ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

## Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Reports

*[English]*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly): I beg to present the following Reports (Hindi and English versions) of the Estimates Committee:

- (1) Fourth Report on Ministry of Home Affairs—Laying of Annual General Administration Report of Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the Budget Session of Parliament.
- (2) Fifth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Fifty-second Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) on Ministry

of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs—Banking Division)—Credit Facilities to Weaker Sections of the Society.

- (3) Sixth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Forty-eighth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) on Ministry of Home Affairs—Modernisation of Police and Para-Military Forces.

*[Translation]*

11.04 hrs.

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

## Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): I beg to present the following reports (Hindi & English versions) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture:

- (1) 9th Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture & Cooperation).
- (2) 10th Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education).
- (3) 11th Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying).
- (4) 12th Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Ministry of Water Resources.
- (5) 13th Report on Demands for Grants (1997-98) of the Ministry of Food Processing Industries.

*[English]*11.04 $\frac{1}{2}$  hrs.STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

## Sixth and Seventh Reports and Minutes

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar): I beg to present the following Reports and Minutes (Hindi and English versions) of the Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development:

- (1) Sixth Report on Mega City Scheme; and
- (2) Seventh Report on Allocation/Utilisation of Central Funds by States under various Schemes.

11.05 hrs.

## MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA):  
Sir, I beg to move:

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

Sir, with your permission, I would like to move a Confidence Motion for the second time in the last ten months.

On the 12th of June 1996, in this very same House, a Confidence Motion was moved and it was carried by this very same House. Today again, I have come before this House to take a vote of confidence because of certain new developments which took place.

On that day, that is, 12th June, 1996, when the Confidence Motion was carried though, 13 parties including the national and regional parties combined together formed the United Front and, at that time, the United Front had got only about 192 Members. The supporting party, the Congress (I), under the leadership of Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao on the 12th May, 1996, took a unanimous decision—the decision was spontaneously taken by the Congress that: 'If the third Front is prepared to form the Government, we are going to extend the support'. That was on the 12th May, 1996. After that, all the regional and national parties got combined, they elected a leader among themselves—and the new political force, the third force, which we called the United Front was established—and on the 15th May, 1996, I was elected as the Leader of the United Front. Rashtrapatiiji called me after Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had tendered his resignation on 28th May, 1996. He called me to form the Government and he gave me a deadline that before 12th June, 1996, I should go before this House and obtain the mandate of the House.

Sir, I do not want to blame anybody or cast aspersions against any individual or any political party. But I would like to just narrate as to what has happened.

On the day when the discussions took place on the Confidence Motion, the then C.P.P. President and the Congress (I) leader, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao had categorically mentioned the following in his speech.

I would just like to quote from his own speech:

"Anyone, any forces or combination of forces on the basis of secularism, on the basis of accepted principles, we are prepared to cooperate, we are prepared to support from outside."

Now it so happened that after 3-4 days of suspicion, Deve Gowda was chosen and was called by Rashtrapatiiji to form a Government. Then he said:

"My understanding about Shri Deve Gowda is that this party will not allow this Government to fall under any circumstances. History will not say that it was because of the Congress Party that Gowda's Government had fallen."

I am quoting this just to draw the attention of this august House to the stand taken by the then Congress President and the CPP leader on that day and to the assurance given to the nation. I am only trying to refresh the memory of this august House about what had happened on that day. I do not want to narrate what had been said by other friends. Shri A.R. Antulay had said at the very same place that "the question of withdrawing the support from our side is ruled out. We will stand by him, stand by this Government till the end". I think I am correct. What Shri Sharad Pawar, while addressing this House on the Motion of Thanks on Rashtrapatiiji's Address to both the Houses, had said in his speech, I do not want to narrate again. A copy of his speech is with me.

In the last ten months, the Government, with the support of thirteen parties, was asked to run this Government. Subsequently, the National Conference also joined. Mainly two supporting parties from outside, the Congress and the CPI(M), extended their cooperation in the last ten months. Otherwise, whatever achievements we have made in the last ten months, we would not have been able to make. Some of the achievements I am going to spell out, taking advantage of this Confidence Motion. This achievement is not by me, this achievement is not by my colleagues alone, this achievement in particular is because of the cooperation extended by the supporting parties and the parties which are in the Government sharing power, and in general, the House also has extended its full cooperation to achieve some of the objects to which we have committed ourselves in our Common Minimum Programme.

On the day when the supporting parties and the other national and regional parties came together, there was some sort of a natural suspicion in the minds of the people in the country whether the national parties or the regional parties could go together, whether they could discharge the responsibilities, whether the regional parties had got the experience about the national issues or the national outlook, as they had no experience of running a Government at the national level and may try to confine to their own States.

This was the sort of suspicion in the minds of the people of this country and some of the intellectuals also expressed their feelings while we were asked to shoulder the responsibility. I am glad to say that in the last ten

[Shri H.D. Deve Gowda]

months all the steps that we have taken have clearly proved that the national parties as well as the regional parties, combined, had run the Government better than the previous regimes. I can say this without doubt. In the last ten months and on the day when I replied to the Confidence Motion—I repeat on the day when I replied to the Confidence Motion—I said:

"How long will I continue in office is not my concern—whether it is for five days or five months or five years. I am not going to worry. But my concern is that as long as I am going to be here, I must work to the best of the ability with my experience to solve the problems of the nation'.

You can also go through my speech. With this background I started my work with the cooperation of my colleagues.

Sir, I would like to just narrate to this august House all the steps that we have taken in the last ten months because it is very essential to know where I have gone wrong and betrayed the confidence of the people of this country or betrayed the confidence reposed by the supporting parties in this Government. I would like to bring this to the notice of this hon. House.

Sir, the first decision that we took was to revive some of the institutions which were very much essential for cooperation between the States and the Centre while running the administration. A meeting of the Inter-State Council was not held for six years. We tried to revive the Inter-State Council meetings and we had two sittings. In the two sittings the main issue that was discussed was the Sarkaria Commission's report. The recommendation of the Sarkaria Commission was to share not only political power but also economic power. Some of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission were accepted in the Inter-State Council meeting and where we were unable to come to a unanimous decision, in the Chief Ministers' Conference we have agreed to constitute a Standing Committee under the chairmanship of the Home Minister.

Why I am mentioning this is we tried to revive some of these bodies which were very essential for a proper understanding between the States and the Centre. With this background the first decision which we had taken was that we want the cooperation of the Chief Ministers of all the States, within the Common Minimum Programme.

There was a peculiar situation after the general elections to the Eleventh Lok Sabha. With the mandate given by the people of this country in this very same House there were about 32 political parties. If you take the smaller parties, regional parties and national parties, all put together, it may be that 32 or 33 political parties are there. With this background, it is rather difficult to face the House and it is not a simple task to run the country also.

When we accepted the challenge for a smooth functioning of the Government, we had adopted the Common Minimum Programme by all the parties including the C.P.i.(M) which is a supporting party and which is not participating in the Government, barring the Congress.

After adopting the Common Minimum Programme, we took a decision that to implement this, the cooperation of all the Chief Ministers was to be solicited. That is why, I called the Chief Ministers' Conference. The Chief Ministers' Conference was held for two days and a decision was taken unanimously about the areas where we could implement this Programme without any difference of opinion. The decision was taken unanimously by identifying about seven priority sectors. I am glad to say that almost all the Chief Ministers agreed for these seven priority areas, to be completed in a time-bound programme by 2000 A.D.

The other issue was that the National Development Council had also not met for several years. We called a meeting of the National Development Council. There also, we took a decision about the Ninth Plan. The Approach Paper for the Ninth Plan was also approved. Of course, it is not brought before this House because of the other formalities to be completed. For the first time, the Approach Paper for the Ninth Five Year Plan was finalised in a short span of four or five months. The document was placed before the Cabinet and the Cabinet had taken a decision about the Approach Paper for the Ninth Plan. The NDC had also met and we adopted the Approach Paper for the Ninth Plan. Of course, this has to be discussed in the very same House to give it a final touch.

We have agreed in the Common Minimum Programme about the Lokpal Bill. The Lokpal Bill was also introduced. It is now before the Standing Committee, if I am correct. We were very much anxious to pass that Bill and I also requested you that this Bill should be passed in this Session, but anyway in the present political situation, it may not be possible for me to get the Bill passed unless the House agrees.

The issue of stability was one of the issues which was in the mind of everybody. In the last ten months, I have never felt that there is any instability in the Government. I must be fair. The Congress Party or the supporting parties have never interfered in our taking any decisions. Almost all the decisions which were taken in the Cabinet in the last ten months were unanimous. There may be some expression of difference of opinion by my colleagues or by the supporting parties. It is quite but natural. The supporting parties must have their own say because with different political ideologies and with different manifestos when they have come together under a special circumstance, they have got their own rights. Their manifestos are different and the ideologies differ from one party to the other.

When we had all come together with a specific purpose to strengthen the secular democracy in this country, then, naturally, we had agreed for a certain minimum programme where there should not be any difference of opinion. So, when we had accepted that Common Minimum Programme with regard to other issues, it is quite but natural for them to express their difference of opinion on a par with their party manifestos or ideologies. I do not find fault with that. I must say that in all the decisions which we had taken in the last ten months, there was no interference. That is why, I was able to achieve something in the last ten months.

The Cabinet had taken almost all the decisions unanimously which, in my opinion, was a progressive step. I am going to place the steps taken by us and the achievements of this Government in the last 10 months one by one before this House and, through this House, to the nation.

Sir, the 1997-98 Budget was appreciated by almost all the sections of the society. We have not taken care of any particular section only in this Budget. But we have taken sufficient precautions not to neglect the industrial sector, not to neglect the agricultural sector and not to neglect the social welfare sector. At the same time, we also gave sufficient initiatives to give encouragement to the private investments. We have given sufficient scope for that in our Budget. The reason why I am saying this is, we need resources to successfully achieve some of the programmes which we have launched. The resources have to be mobilised by our own internal resource mobilisation programme and in addition to that, the private sector and the global investments should also be attracted on the basis of the new economic philosophy. The new economic philosophy has given a wide scope for attracting private and public investments. With this background, the Budget was presented this time before this House and, through this House, to the whole nation.

Sir, the Budget presented by the Finance Minister of the United Front Government reflects our commitment to the economic reforms, but ensures that the poor and the disadvantaged sections of the society are not by-passed in the process of development. The 1997-98 Budget, in many ways, represents a watershed. With this reference point for the reform process on which India has embarked and has shifted from 1991 to 1997, in a bold move the Budget has significantly reduced the corporate and personal income tax rates. Domestic company tax rates have been lowered from 43 per cent to a fairly competitive 35 per cent. Foreign companies will be taxed at the rate of 48 per cent which is less by five per cent than before. The individual tax payers will now pay 30 per cent tax at the margin which is a hefty reduction of 25 per cent.

Sir, coupled with the rationalisation of the direct tax rates, the Budget has also announced a 20 per cent

reduction in customs duty across the board. The dual philosophy underpins this approach to increasingly allow the tax rates in India to be in line with those prevailing in other Asian countries and a conviction that lower tax rates will encourage increasingly greater level of compliances. The Budget has a number of measures aimed at stimulating the vital infrastructure sectors through a combination of fiscal and policy initiatives. The Government has sought to attract private investments in telecommunication, oil and gas, roads and tourism. These are some of the areas which we have tried to open up for the private sector.

Sir, the import duty on coal has been reduced. Some of the decisions that we have taken in our Budget proposals are from the point of view of growth and I would again highlight them. The telecommunication service providers have been accorded the infrastructure status and granted a complete tax holiday for a period of five years with 30 per cent tax holiday for a further five years' period. The licence fee can now be amortized and licences can be assigned clearing the way for a number of projects to reach financial closure. The oil and gas sector has been subjected to a comprehensive review. An attempt has been made to further revive the capital market. Major amendments in the Companies Act are proposed and the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1973 is to be replaced. There ought to be statutory measures to deal with money laundering.

Similarly, the Budget reflects our concern for the poor and the disadvantaged section. There are enhancements in the provision for the basic minimum services. The outlays for the rural areas, employment and for social services have been made. The provision for the basic minimum service has been increased from Rs. 2,466 crore to Rs. 3,300 crore. This includes Rs. 330 crore for slum clearing. The provision for the accelerated irrigation for which we had provided Rs. 900 crore in the last year's Budget has been increased to Rs. 1,300 crore in 1997-98. Rupees two hundred crore has been provided for small irrigation projects and works like Ganga Kalyan to help the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, weaker sections of the society and the small farmers. We have provided Rs. 250 crore for Kasturba Gandhi Shiksha Yojana. We wanted to start 258 residential schools for the girls living in the tribal areas and where the literacy rate is below national average.

I am only mentioning some of these highlights and the achievements of this Government in the last ten months. We have been committed to the assurances that we had given to the nation through our Common Minimum Programme. We tried to take certain steps by making necessary provisions in the Budget for the year 1997-98. We have launched rural housing programme where about 50,000 houses are to be given in the rural areas

[Shri H.D. Deve Gowda]

This scheme has been launched for the first time. Hitherto there was no such scheme for the farmers. Funds will be provided at the rate of Rs. 2 lakh per house. This was one of the new schemes that has been launched for the rural housing programme. The Jawahar Rozgar Yojana and Ambedkar Awas Yojana are meant for the weaker sections or the homeless people or the siteless people. We have launched this scheme for the farming community also.

In addition to this, there are some of the other important issues like PDS and fertilizer subsidy. All these steps which we have taken in the last ten months are only from the point of view of helping the farming community and for helping the weaker sections of the society. In the PDS itself, only two-three States had all along been implementing the scheme of providing subsidised essential food articles. We took a decision that this scheme should be enlarged and the whole nation should be covered. For this scheme under PDS, we have provided about Rs. 7,500 crore. This scheme is going to cover a population of about 32 crore of this country.

The fertilizer subsidy has been increased. We had made an additional allocation of about Rs. 2,500 crore last year for the fertilizers to help the farming community. This year also it has been further increased. Even on the imported fertilizer, we have given a subsidy component of Rs. 1,700 crore.

The total worth of the PDS system and the subsidy on agricultural sector comes to about Rs. 17,500 crore. The very purpose of taking certain steps is to help the agricultural sector and also some of the poorer sections of the society, who are below the poverty line and who have no purchasing capacity. We have taken the decision to launch the new scheme nation-wide.

Sir, there are other issues, and I am going to deal with them after the views from all sides of the House are expressed.

In the end, I am going to cover all other points. Now, I would request the House to deliberate on this Motion, which I have just now moved with your kind permission. I would request the House to ponder over this issue—whether any skirmishes were born by our decisions in the last ten months, where this Government has gone wrong, and how we have betrayed the assurance that has been given to the nation. I would like to request the hon. Members to come out with their views in this august House. If we have done anything wrong, we are prepared to set it right. I would like a free and frank expression, particularly on the omissions and commissions of this Government in the last ten months.

With these words, I request that the hon. Members may kindly express their views on this Motion of Confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion Moved:

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

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I must comment upon the near total air of unreality in which this debate is taking place. Just before the commencement of the debate, the air was suddenly thick with rumours about the resignation of the hon. Prime Minister, about a last minute change, and about the partners in this arrangement having now settled their dispute. I was very relieved when the hon. Prime Minister finally arrived, even though somewhat belatedly, to at least, for the moment, set that rumour to rest.

The hon. Prime Minister rather coyly referred to certain new developments that have taken place, which require this debate to take place. I do wish, Sir, that the hon. Prime Minister, who with admirable restraint and ambiguity called them 'certain new developments', had specified what these new developments were. The debate has not been occasioned because we have moved a Motion of No-Confidence. The hon. Prime Minister has himself sought confidence of the House because, as he explained, there are certain new developments. What are those new developments?

If you recollect, Sir, I had appealed to my friends in the supporting party, the Congress, who, according to the Prime Minister, gave them support so spontaneously, who also said in the House that they would not withdraw their support, and indeed, Sir, who also said that they would stand by them till the end...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK (Phulbani): Till then, they were standing up for them.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have appealed to them that the debate would be rounded off and that it would be better informed had the Congress explained what these new developments are. Indeed, we would know, the House would know and the country would know and we have a right to know them. But the Congress declined. Why they declined, I am still unable to fathom.

SHRI A.C. JOS (Idukki): You resign and join the Congress!

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The hon. Prime Minister quite rightly pointed out that when he took over office, there was a lurking suspicion about the effectiveness and the survivability of this Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Survivability?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Yes. That is the word the hon. Prime Minister used. He used the word survivability. I am not responsible for the choice of words. I am trying to be analytical.

SHRI A.C. JOS : It would enlighten the House itself!

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: A very good follower.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: As far as the effectiveness is concerned, the hon. Prime Minister catalogued the achievements of his Government for the last ten months and, even though I might not be in agreement with all the claims that the Prime Minister has made, I do sincerely sympathise with the air of bewildered perplexity with which he read out his achievements and I wonder as to what is the occasion for this certain new developments causing this illustrious and once upon a time great political party to suddenly decide to withdraw support.

That is why, I certainly do have to comment that quite an exceptional distinction devolves upon the 11th Lok Sabha in now debating the third confidence vote in just over nine months. I think it has to reflect on this fact and what lies at the core of it all. I submit that this 11th Lok Sabha taking up the confidence vote for the third time reflects in essence the thwarting of the people's mandate when the elections were first held and it is a consequence of this artificial legislative arrangement that was created in May or June of last year. It is entirely up to the Government to agree on this and indeed I do not expect them to agree with me. A huge untruth was then inflicted upon India. I said this earlier also and that untruth is now coming unstuck. The untruth is coming unstuck in this inglorious and ignominious manner, a manner that brings disrepute upon India, which brings disrepute upon this august Assembly which we have the honour of serving; it brings into disrepute without any doubt the entire political class that appears only to be hankering after office and chair. My first charge against this motion is on both these counts and it is a collective charge upon both the defender and the offender.

SHRI SAT MAHAJAN (Kangra): You might say that as a pretender!

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We are not pretenders. We do not pretend because if anything is to be said explicitly, it is only we that have said it. If at all there is a pretender, the true pretenders in this artificial arrangement is the Congress Party and my distinguished friends, the CPM. They were the pretenders because they pretended. There is something about the oldest profession in the world. They pretended to wield power. They pretended to no responsibility. They wielded power but without responsibility. They wanted to run this Government but without any accountability. They were the pretenders. Therefore, I charge both the defenders and the offenders of bringing about a wholly artificial, spurious and avoidable crisis, a crisis born entirely of mendacity, double cross,

double speak, double standards and it is a dishonest crisis.

I do not wish to say much about the kind of rumours that became thick, about all this drama and the charade about talks, talks about talks, informal talks, then, formal talks of Steering Committee and of Core Group and of yet another Core Group or whatever controlling Group. We were told when these talks, double-crosses were going on that those who were entrusted with actually doing the talking were more interested in ensuring that the talks failed so that their leaders who were at the helm, could, in turn, be defeated and the second rank could come forward and take over. The charade, the mendacity of what we have been subjected to today was entirely avoidable. It is a crisis born of treachery within parties and it is also the treachery of arrangements between parties. That is why now when this debate takes place, the air is befouled with a suspicious individual conduct. I will not go into that now. But I earnestly searched in the hon. the Prime Minister's initial intervention as to what is the great issue of principle involved? What was that issue, what substantial matter that has created this new circumstance for the offender to take such an offence? I fail to find anything in the hon. the Prime Minister's intervention. All that we have read and heard is that personal pique, blind, unseemingly self-interest seem to have motivated the bringing about the crisis. It appears in all this that personal interest seems to have taken the first place always and every time. Every kind of consideration of national interest has been relegated to the background.

My second charge is that this is a farce upon Legislature. It is not a farce upon Legislature simply because of the frequency with which we are doing this. It is a farce because of the atmosphere in which it is being conducted. Till the last minute, we have been told that something is being arranged. They said: "We are changing the personality." we read statements in the newspapers about this. They said: "We have objection only to a certain personality. If the personality changes, then, we will work together again." Is the Legislature to be reduced to an arena for settling personal disputes between individuals? As a Legislature, are we to become the victim of a certain party's pique against a single individual, however high the office that he held? ...*(Interruptions)*

After all, we have opposed the hon. the Prime Minister. Our opposition to him is open, is clear, is categorical and is unambiguous. Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, we are your opponents. Your enemies sit behind you and beside you. We are your political opponents. We make no bones about it. It is a farce because it is a sad imposition upon a trusting and unsuspecting nation. I remember with vividness the fluency and the ability with which my good friend the hon. Finance Minister debated

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

the issue when the Confidence Motion was considered, perhaps in June. He said: "There are three reasons why we are here. It is because of the verdict of the people—it is a false assertion now—that we stand for social justice and we are the forces of secularism." What has happened to this verdict of the people? Where is the social justice and where is the secularism? I submit again as I submitted then that all these three were flimsy excuses, a cloak only for keeping the BJP out at any cost. This is an untenable assertion which now visits upon this arrangement at this governance.

My third charge is that you propounded a wholly artificial, untenable and indeed an irresponsible thesis about the support from outside. What we are witnessing today and what we are experiencing today is entirely on account of this arrangement. You do not want to be in Government, yet you want to govern; you do not want the responsibility, the accountability of Government yet you wish to tell the Prime Minister what to do. When you want him to stand up, you want him to stand up and when you want him to sit down, you want him to sit down. No self-respecting arrangement can work like this. We have struggled together for years with some of the constituents of the United Front. I have had the pleasure and privilege of sitting here with some of the constituents of the United Front, indeed with the Leader of the House, Shri Ram Vilasji. I see all these faces and many of them had been our partners in the many struggles that we fought together. Our political differences, our political opposition to the Congress have been categorical, unequivocal and totally unquestionable. You chose to join this company; you chose to work with them and you chose to agree to this wholly, unacceptable arrangement of support from outside. We had even then said that this was untenable and this would not work. This is indeed now being proven as right and the circumstances have brought shame upon India.

As far as the Congress Party is concerned, I am not at all astonished at their conduct because I remember distinctly that we had been witness earlier to the Congress Party suddenly taking umbrage at two wandering Haryana policemen outside a certain house. And because, those two Haryana policemen were casually wandering outside a house, a Prime Minister had to step down ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): I did not wait for the withdrawal of their support. I knew their inclination and I withdrew. We cannot expect a gentlemanly behaviour from them...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: From two Haryana policemen, we are now witness to this transformation of a bolt from the blue suddenly transforming into a button hole of allegiance.

I am astonished that the distinguished leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party, the hon. Member from Baramati speaking from Pune finds the announcement of his Party President about the withdrawal of support, as a 'bolt from the blue.'

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Here, the spirit of Shivaji was guided. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I enquire of the hon. Prime Minister, whether this is the new development about which he was referring? If this is the "certain new development", then, I do sincerely wish, you had also gone and explained how this 'bolt from the blue' became a baton for beating them into allegiance and whipping them into coming into obedience? What had suddenly changed between Pune and Delhi—a flight of only a couple of hours? *(Interruptions)*...I appeal to the hon. the Prime Minister, the Mover of the Motion to also explain to us the conduct of the Party, a very great political party, the Communist Party (Marxist). They have exemplified this question of wanting to wield power without having any responsibility.

I find, Sir, that they were the ones who were most active remaining out of the Government, not wanting the responsibility of it but all the time, they must be ordering everyone including you. I am astonished, how you have suddenly become Mamataji?

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South): Sir, may I know what he wants to say?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Sir, I have said what I wanted to say. More than that I do not wish to say.

I am also struck. I am actually struck by a sense of poignancy. I am struck by the remarkable prescience of my distinguished friend. He is indeed the seniormost Member of this Assembly whom I have the honour of calling my friend, the hon. Home Minister. He, in a different context spoke of "chaos, anarchy and destruction."

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): Are you forgetting that your party was the supporting party to Shri V.P. Singh when he was the Prime Minister? What do you say about that?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The hon. Prof. Kurien, who is a very good friend of mine has asked me to talk about our support to Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. Yes, of course, we supported them.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Without responsibility you wanted to wield power at that time.

SHRI PRADIP BHATTACHARYA (Serumpore): Why are you narrating the story when you had supported them?... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: The hon. the Home Minister is a distinguished parliamentarian. I remember a phrase which was used for him in a function that I attended, by a very great Indian Shri P.N. Haksar. If I recollect right, he said: "The hon. the Home Minister, Shri Indrajit Gupta is a man of untradable integrity." Without doubt, he is. And, if he used the words that describe our state as bordering on chaos, anarchy and destruction then, I am struck by the relevance of these words because that is precisely what the offender has now brought about for totally inexplicable reasons. They have indeed created the situation of bringing about chaos, anarchy and destruction and, I wonder whether the prescience of the hon. Home Minister persuaded him to say what he did earlier.

12.00 hrs.

The conduct of the Congress Party really baffles description. The hon. Prime Minister quite rightly pointed out that up to the President's Address, up to the question of the budgetary debates, up to and inclusive indeed of that very shabby situation that had developed in Uttar Pradesh—on all these and on every fundamental issue—up to the 21st of March, the Congress Party had no difficulty.

The Congress Party indeed struggled and quarrelled with us on every occasion but we found fault with them openly and clearly. Suddenly, on the 30th of March, this 'bolt from the blue' arrives. I do find it necessary to mention that because the hon. Prime Minister has not explained those 'certain circumstances'. I tried to make out what those 'certain circumstances' were from the rather curious phrases of the somewhat repetitious letter.

Here, we are told that the Congress Party which was entirely satisfied with everything on the 21st of March, on the 30th was suddenly concerned over 'deteriorating law and order situation, drift in the economy—they have supported the Budget though we have differences—leading to rising prices'. They condone rising prices up to the 21st and suddenly on the 30th rising prices becomes sufficient ground for them to pull the leg of support. I would be very grateful if the very distinguished and the very able Minister of Finance would specify whether in that nine-day period he saw such a spurt in prices that the Congress Party had no other option but to withdraw support from them.

Next, there was a 'growing communal menace'. They have simultaneously said that the land is at peace and all is well. And suddenly, the Congress Party discovers that there is a 'growing communal menace and a lack of

cohesive functioning of the Government'. To the best of my recollection, between the 21st and the 30th, the most that happened was that everyone went away on a holiday for Holi and there was hardly anyone in Delhi. How is it that, in that long period of Holi holidays, suddenly the Congress Party discovers that there is no 'cohesive functioning'?

Here is a more serious allegation that has been made. The more serious allegation concerns that 'The sensitive defence issues and security requirements of the country have not been properly addressed; there is an overall demoralising effect in the civil services and the various organs of the Government; lack of coordination'—this is a repetition—'direction and will to govern had created a situation of drift...' This is a very serious allegation.

The hon. Minister of Defence is here. I do not remember the Congress Party ever questioning him about the security issues. If there has been any questioning, it was indeed by my Leader, who stood up and said that some decisions were taken for the first time about the Defence issues. This is a very serious charge. The Congress party owes an explanation not simply to the defenders; they owe an explanation to us, they owe an explanation to Parliament, they owe an explanation to the entire country. Such charges cannot be lightly made. If we say that concerns about the state of the nation, about the state of the Defence preparedness of the country, such matters cannot be spoken of lightly. Such matters should certainly not become issues of partisan consideration simply because you are displeased with one person or another. I charge the Congress Party of treating even the security of the country as a tradeable issue, as an issue that could be traded as a charge between Parties.

I am amazed at their irresponsibility. I do not wish to comment on the utter debasement of debate and public discourse that was displayed by hon. the Congress President when he referred to the hon. Prime Minister in certain terms. It shamed all of us. It shamed all of us collectively. You can hold whatever views you wish to hold about Shri Deve Gowda, but you cannot refer to the Prime Minister of the country like that. We have difficulties with the Prime Minister, the premiership of the country. We have open political differences. But never in my party, Sir, has anyone debased our differences to public discourse of that kind to that level. In a public speech the President of once-upon-a-time great party traded charges in a language and in a manner which is utterly shameful. I am also, Sir, most intrigued by the timing of this letter. What has persuaded this timing? Somebody owes an explanation. Either you, Mr. Prime Minister, must explain as to why it was on 30th March that support was withdrawn or someone from the Congress must explain that to the nation.

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Sir, I must now list the catalogue of failures, as I see, of the United Front. The hon. Prime Minister, while I was listening to what he has said about the revival of institutions, spoke of Inter-State Council, National Development Council, the Ninth Five Year Plan, the Budget, the Lokpal Bill etc., etc. I submit and I charge the United Front Government of deliberately, knowingly and repeatedly misusing Article 356 despite what had happened in the National Development Council and despite the opinion of the Chief Ministers. I do not wish to run over the entire sorry debate of Uttar Pradesh and what had happened in Uttar Pradesh and what did not happen, but the misuse of office of Governors as evidenced by incidents and developments in the State of Gujarat and the State of Uttar Pradesh is the direct responsibility of the United Front Government and they are to be held accountable and because the Congress acquiesced in this misuse of the office the Congress is also to be held accountable.

Sir, I do not wish this to be converted into a debate on the international situation or the security situation of the country except to leave a word of caution. Please do not create a world of make-believe. My leader had categorically said that we stand for good relations with our neighbours and we stand for good relations with Bangladesh. But we cannot countenance an unreal relationship based on illusions that which we could not achieve for the last thirty years, is suddenly converted into a water sharing agreement. Why could it not be done for the last thirty years? Has Ganga suddenly started giving more water? We question the Government on the mistake which is now evident in what is happening in the scarcity of water both in West Bengal and Bangladesh.

I do not wish to go into any lengthy analysis of the security situation. But instead of doing that I do wish to leave a thought with my distinguished and able Minister of External Affairs that hugs and false bonhomies are not adequate replacement for a sound foreign policy. I do also wish to share a thought with the hon. Defence Minister. I leave a thought with him that I apprehend a situation, though I have no categorical reasons why I apprehend so, somewhat similar to what had happened in the country before 1962, may recur.

I say this with seriousness and I say this with a sense of responsibility. Let us not be complacent and I do charge the United Front Government of neglecting to make adequate arrangements for Defence, to make adequate Budgetary arrangements for Defence. For the eleventh year in succession, the needs of the Defence were neglected.

My second point about the United Front Government relates to the economy. When the Budget was presented by my distinguished friend, we called the Budget as 'the *chalia* Budget'; that this was *maya jaal*, an illusion of well-being, prosperity and growth. But everyone on that side was happy. We cautioned you there itself. I say that our differences on the Budget lies principally on the

ground that this illusion of prosperity and growth is combined with actual disparity and division of India from Bharat.

I do wish to refer to agriculture; I do wish to refer to the question of foodgrains; and I do wish to refer particularly to the mismanagement by the UF Government on the wheat front. We are informed that some millions of tonnes of wheat are to be imported into the country. For those millions of tonnes of wheat, the UF Government is going to pay Rs. 650 per quintal... (*Interruptions*) I wish we had been told that the Government is going to import 20 million tonnes.... (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is only two million tonnes.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Are you happy that two million tonnes should be imported?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): We are happy with your mistake!

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: You are happy with my mistake? Well, having corrected it, are you happy that instead of 20 million tonnes it should only be two million tonnes which is going to be imported at Rs. 750 per quintal when the domestic producers—the farmers—are going to get only Rs. 550? (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is Rs. 450 only.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Again you have slipped.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: How do you know that I did not actually want you to correct me, to point out the huge disparity between Rs. 450 and Rs. 750?

I appeal to the UF Government to reflect on what they are doing in this regard. I do not wish to sound pessimistic; I do not also wish to draw your attention to what is happening in our neighbourhood—in Pakistan or in Afganistan—on the food front. But I do appeal to you not to treat this casually and I do appeal to you to take a stand that whatever may be the procurement price, it would be the price at which they would supply wheat to all the consumers.

I do not agree with the management of the Government on agricultural front and I certainly cannot condone the UF Government on the neglect of the energy sector. I charge this Government of continuously neglecting the petroleum sector. The situation is perilous; if energy is security as it is, then the nation's energy security has been endangered by this Government.

I will conclude by submitting that the Government of India is not an arrangement! It is not a mere convenience based on personal prejudices and needs. You like a certain person and you dislike another person in which only Office counts and nothing else! I am also not impressed by the undignified manner in which this scramble has taken place about changing, not changing, altering, we will continue to give support if you replace personalities, etc.

Then, where is, Mr. Prime Minister, the one which you have put across as the Common Minimum Programme? You should have put it instead as 'Common Personality Programme!'. Why do you have Common Minimum Programme? If it was to be based on 'Common Personality Programme', then that is what we should have been told earlier. Certainly, the Congress Party owes us much more than an explanation. So this is an insult, not simply to this House which is a distillate of the people of India but it is also an insult to the people of this country. It is besmirching of the fair name of our poor and benighted country. There is only one answer both for the defender and the offender, that is, go depart for heaven's sake and leave this chair. You count these chairs as more and more worthy than the country. There is the only one solution for you now to come to terms with loss of office and to go back to the people.

Therefore, I oppose this Motion.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI (Howrah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, today is the day when our party, the Indian National Congress, is now being tried from this side and that side and it is our duty to convey our message to the entire nation, as to what we stood for, how we stood for till now and for which we stand for. If we make a mistake on emotional grounds, I know and I am aware of the fact that the nation will not spare any individual in the House including the Indian National Congress.

Our responsibility is tremendous. It is not because we are in the Indian National Congress but because we were the sole partner from the very beginning in the process of making the nation as one nation alongwith everyone in this House as the forebearer of the nation...(*interruptions*)... We did realise the meaning of the mandate which was given to the Eleventh Lok Sabha. The mandate was certainly for not this side, to us and to them but the message of the mandate was, if you can, please try to avoid those who try to betray the Constitution and the mandate of the founding fathers to keep the people united and to uphold the dignity of secularism. That message alone provided the direction to the Indian National Congress on 12th May to take a decision and the decision was not taken by an individual. On that day, we did not know who was coming, whether 'X' or 'Y'.

12.18 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

The decision was very clear and categorical. What was the decision? I quote:

"The Congress Party has decided to take positive steps in support of the process of the formation of

the Government by political parties which are totally committed to secular, democratic, communal harmony, welfare, social and economically weaker sections and minorities and rapid growth of our country as well as to values enshrined in our Constitution."

So, we stood by that and we stand by that.

Respected Prime Minister, Shri H.D. Deve Gowda, while moving the Motion, had very rightly referred to a distinguished leader who was the President of our Party and the Leader of the CPP, respected Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao who said that our support was unconditional and we shall not betray. Sir, I again say on behalf of our party that our support to UF and the commitment for the secular order that we stood for, is still unconditional and not withdrawn. So, what is withdrawn? With what pain had we gone to the Rashtrapati Bhawan? With what anguish and agony had we gone to the Rashtrapati Bhawan? Is it against an individual? Shri Jaswant Singh may say anything to exploit the situation but one thing is very clear. We may do or die but we are not going to do anything to make a road for him, come what may. That is the message of Mahatma Gandhi to us.

You may say whatever you like... (*Interruptions*) I did not interrupt. Under what compulsion have we done it? About Shri H.D. Deve Gowda and the United Front colleagues and your Ministers, we have no individual accusations. You have a competent leader on the floor of the House, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, who is the Minister of Railways. He is not in our party. But I congratulate him about the manner in which he is trying to unite the oppressed and the suffering humanity of the nation. I look at him from a distance. I adore him and his contribution. He was not in our party. He is not in our party even today.

There is your competent Minister of Finance, Shri P. Chidambaram. In spite of all the difficulties and differences—where we do not agree and they do not agree he has tried to steer the Budget...(*Interruptions*) I did not disturb you.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : When Shri Jaswant Singh spoke, not a single Member from our side intervened... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please maintain decorum in the House.

SHRI DATTA MEGHE (Ramtek): Is BJP a disciplined party? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: We have very competent Ministers. We do not regard Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav as a Minister of Defence. We consider Shri Yadav's role a crucial one to defend secularism in the country in a

[Shri P.R. Dasmunsi]

crucial hour—in Uttar Pradesh. We know it. We can go against you today. That is a different thing. But history will write continuously that the role played by Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav to save the nation and the destiny of the nation cannot be forgotten. You try to understand our perception. We have withdrawn the support and sent the letter to Rashtrapati. For what? ...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: We will also do the same thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You also please keep quiet.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please do not add to the confusion.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: From the Congress' point of view, we did not raise an issue about personalities as referred to by Shri Jaswant Singh. The Government headed by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda is not merely a Government to head a Government in South Block. But with all regards to Shri Deve Gowda, I urge upon him to look at it. Was it the mandate of the House to elect you only as Prime Minister to do the nitty-gritty of the South Block every day and dispose of the files or to consolidate the secular forces of India to protect India from the danger that they are creating? What was the mandate to you? Was it not the mandate to you? You enquire about it as you like. You can choose any words that you like. What was said in our communique? Is it that we have done it suddenly? Shri Jaswant Singh suddenly found that on 30th—a holiday—we have done the most unholy things. No, it is not a fact. We did not do this hara-kiri on the 4th of November. You may recall, Mr. Prime Minister, that we did communicate to all your constituents our anguish, the decision of our Working Committee, the anguish about the manner in which the things were moving. Should I quote a few words? Should it be out of the context? What anguish have we expressed? We said.

"In a given situation in the country, a Scheduled Caste woman, as a Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, would be further considered to consolidate the secular forces to prevent the communal forces to take over Uttar Pradesh.

Was it a wrong message from the Congress? Was it not a mandate that was given to you? Was it contrary to the desire of all of you? Did we quarrel on the personal issue? But we could not match you. We do not like to go into the debate. The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Indrajit Gupta, is sitting here. I have no hesitation to say it.

I have no hesitation in saying that when I became a Member of the Fifth Lok Sabha, Shri Indrajit Gupta,

the hon. Home Minister who is sitting here, was my inspiration—he is still my inspiration—not only as a Parliamentarian but for his way of thinking on the national issues and on the imperialist designs in the country which are there to destabilise the nation. We might use sarcastic words about his statements but even he felt about it in many ways. Is it not a fact that he felt sad that the things which are in our hands could not be consolidated just because of a few persons? Is it not a fact? Is it not an admission of fact, Mr. Prime Minister?

We did not elect you as the Prime Minister just for delivering a speech on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. We elected you to draw the attention of the nation to the fact that communal forces are not a guarantee to the nation, but the secular foundations are gaining strength everyday. Did you, Mr. Prime Minister, try to step in that direction for a day? Did you try this before and after the elections?

I am not questioning you on Punjab. Distinguished Barnalaji is here. Do you not know how much sacrifice he made after the death of Shri Longowal when the Punjab Accord was signed? We knew that after the Accord, Congress would not win the election; there; we knew that after the Accord in Assam Congress would not win the elections there, AGP would win. But we said, let AGP win; let democracy win; let the power of bullets go. For that reason, you have lost Longowalji. Did we not lose Indiraji? A number of Sikh people were murdered in Delhi. We, the Congressmen of the second and third generation, appeal to you with folded hands to forget those days. We are rebuilding a new structure. We have no hesitation to say in future that the killings of Bhindrawalen and all those misguided youths who were equally our brothers are as painful as the assassination of Indiraji, who is a martyr. We do feel sad. You please try to understand the agony through which we passed. Is it not a fact that we fought against terrorism in Punjab? Is it not a fact that we simply stood stunned when we could not get the body of late Rajiv Gandhi and were left thinking as to how to place it on the funeral pyre? Are not all these cases of contribution and sacrifice? Is it all for power? Are all these not for a cause?

Mr. Prime Minister, at that time you were only given the mandate to act as the Prime Minister to unite the secular forces. Did you not behave in a partisan manner then? Did you not conduct yourself for individual interest to see as to who got what seat. What has happened today? When you became the Prime Minister, we all had a hope. We placed you as the leader at the top and rallied behind you without sharing power. We thought we would go ahead with this till the last. If we have done any omission or commission, punish us. We would rebuild a new Congress, come what may. The nation then would be protected from the threat of the forces of destabilisation and communal elements. Did we argue anything?

What was done in Punjab and Kashmir? Thank God, Dr. Farooq Abdullah is there in Kashmir now. In Kashmir the battle was not merely as to how to win elections. The battle was for article 370, apart, of course, from the battle against the terrorists and extremists. It was a battle against the abolition of article 370. Mr. Prime Minister, was there any meeting in this regard with the representatives of the Parties that are sitting here? About Kashmir we are all together and we are against this malicious campaign against article 370. Did you respond to the political urges and to the demands of this nation?...  
(Interruptions)

Please allow me to conclude. I am not talking about election campaigns. I am talking about the unity and consolidation of the secular forces in this country. We do have differences in the States. In our State, we have differences. I am not bringing those things here. The day the Mosque was demolished, Shri Somnath Chatterjee who is here would recall, the moment it was done, the hon. Chief Minister gave us a phone call. We all—myself, Kumari Mamata Banerjee and others—sat together. What did we do then? We decided that there should not be any clash. Everything should be protected and no such thing should be repeated in Bengal. Did we not do that? This is not all for power. This is not all manipulations and machinations.

How did our anguish come? Mr. Prime Minister, really speaking, candidly speaking, honestly speaking and confessing, we consider that you have marginalised the basic importance and significance of the consolidation of the secular forces in this country. That day we felt that the United Front is okay but possibly the driver with the steering is not driving the vehicle in the proper direction. That was our anguish, Mr. Prime Minister, not against you as an individual, as Mr. Deve Gowda a gentleman, but against the Prime Minister, Mr. Deve Gowda.

It is not our charge. What was the agony? BJP has charged Congress saying, it owes an explanation as to what it means by the security concept. Yes, we will have to alert you, Mr. Prime Minister. I do not know who is advising in the PMO. You prepared a stage for security talks with Pakistan at the Secretary level delegation. It was a welcome step. Gujral Ji read out a statement in the House on the Senior Citizen Concessional Visa from Pakistan. Did we not applaud, did we not stand by him and support him? Had we got any intention to pull you down on the floor to suit our purpose, we could have joined the BJP in their Motion under Rule 184. Did we do that? On the contrary, the Speaker's ruling itself, Mr. Prime Minister, was directly or indirectly a stricture on the collective responsibility and functioning in the Cabinet. Did we make it an issue of debate? Did we embarrass you for a single day? We did not. We could understand what is happening.

I congratulate Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee for raising it in the House twice and alerting the Government to take cognizance of the game plan of VHP on Kashi and Mathura. At that time Mr. Prime Minister, the Government was not formed in UP. We have contacts in UP. Our Party may not be in power in UP today. Our volunteers are spread all over the country. We have hundred years old roots throughout the country. My own friends and colleagues have been in Mathura. I have been the Youth Congress President for five years. Our colleagues spread over the country carry messages as to what is the threat and what is the preparation. What message you have taken out of it? How did you respond? You thought it was only a casual remark made by a Member in the House. Is that enough? Did you call all the Parties to discuss such a serious situation even if it comes under the Government of Ms. Mayawati today? If she is helpless and is under their pressure, we should think collectively as to how we should plan and help that lady. In what manner we should carry over the campaign? You may say whatever you may like but I may tell you, that campaign is alive. The preparation for the campaign is very strong. Did you respond to that Mr. Prime Minister? You did not. You took it casually.

Twenty four hours before, when the talks were supposed to be held with Pakistan, the Pakistan President from Islamabad publicly issued a statement saying something like the 'extremists in Kashmir are my friends'. I do not wish to read out the statement of the President of Pakistan. But there was not a single condemnation, nor a strong note from the Prime Minister went to Islamabad before the talks were to be held. Does it enhance the dignity and prestige of a nation called India in this sub-continent and in the whole world?

Mr. Prime Minister, we are all for solution with Pakistan. One of your interviews, possibly you may not have given that interview, was quoted or misquoted. Your PR Department is very poor. I am glad that you have admitted that the officers and the Secretaries are not obeying you. It is enough for you, Mr. Prime Minister, to think that you are to quit. You have given one interview in the *Khaleej Times*. May I read out that interview? You have said, "Minor adjustment in Kashmir within the ambit of Simla Agreement could be conceived of". That message is a message of compromise on security. We perceive it as a message of compromise on security.

It is not the culture of the Congress Party, which has hundred years of experience behind it, to sit in the Working Committee over a cup of coffee and pass Resolutions. We do think. We do visualise. Are we happy to tell you all these things? We are not. That is why, Mr. Prime Minister we sent you a communication on the

[Shri. P.R. Dasmunji]

4th November itself to think over, talk, sort out, revise your policy and change your direction. This was done not on 4th November but on 16th February. But your whole approach was very casual. Today is the age of electronic media and we saw the nation carrying the message that to Mr. Deve Gowda, this is nothing. You have said, "So, what? I will go tomorrow".

His going back to Bangalore tomorrow, or his sitting here is not important. What is important is the mandate given to him and the responsibility entrusted to him. That is what is important. If he does not respond to that urge, is it not a problem for the nation? That is what has been done. We have not compromised on any principle or policy on that issue.

I would not like to say anything about economic issues. May be there are minor reservations on the Budget here and there. We could have taken care of them later on. I do agree with many of my friends in the constituent parties. But did the Prime Minister give enough thrust to the anti-poverty programmes?

We may have political differences with the Chief Minister of my State, Shri Jyoti Basu. In an article in his party daily *Ganashakti* on its thirtieth anniversary, he wrote as to how he was pained by the manner in which the Prime Minister had compromised on the basic poverty alleviation programme of IRDP and how he marginalised the whole programme. Is it not a fact that on the 16th of March, the senior members of the Left constituents of the United Front, Shri Bardhan, Shri Surjeet, Shri Chitta Basu gave the Prime Minister a signed memorandum asking him as to why the Bill for the agricultural labourers, the poorest of the poor, was not coming? Did they not express their anguish on many other economic issues? They did not withdraw their support, I am not saying that, but the widely accepted report is there that the Left expresses apprehensions on the sincerity in the implementation of the CMP. Through a signed memorandum, the Left warned the Prime Minister that things were going in a wrong direction. Those are economic issues and I am not bringing those things in now.

Politically, Mr. Prime Minister, you are not merely a Prime Minister of the 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s or even the 90s. You are a Prime Minister of an era in which the collective wisdom of you people, about anti-Congressism has brought the other side of the House to this size. If you go on harping on the score of anti-Congressism again, we may be vanquished but they will cover the whole of that side. That is your desire, Mr. Prime Minister. To read between the lines, you go on doing it.

The Left gave you the alarm in terms of the memorandum. Shri Jyoti Basu gave you the alarm in

terms of the article. Shri Biju Patnaik gave you the alarm in terms of his interview to the Home TV. We gave you the alarm on the fourth; we gave you the alarm on the sixteenth; and finally, when we found that things were going beyond to the extent that you were not addressing the real problems, and the dangers that were coming, we felt that it was time to ask our friends in the United Front, "Would you please try to change the leader?" You may argue, "If that was your desire, why did you stake a claim?" It is a technical matter. Even today we say that, Mr. Prime Minister, you search the heart of every Congressman in the country. We may have differences with all the regional parties in the States, that is altogether different. But none of us will say, that for our differences with the regional parties, or for our differences with the CPI(M), or for our differences with the CPI, we desire that the others be allowed to make a takeover and change the whole structure of the Constitution, the dream of Mahatma Gandhi, and the concept of the freedom movement in the country, as you desire. That is not our desire. That is not our dream. Our party sacrifices not a minimum.

Who said all these things? The people are saying, "In the midstream of the Budget you have done it." What is the midstream of Budget? I think, the Budget can wait but the threat to the secular foundations cannot be allowed to go on, shall be thwarted first and then everything can be done.

Once upon a time, Mahatma Gandhiji said, "Education can wait but Swaraj cannot." Today we feel that the Budget can wait but the threat of communal forces to hit the secular foundations cannot be allowed to go on under the circumstances. That cannot be done...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

Not people of your party but only we can say that You can see and review the developments that had taken place since the death of Mahatma Gandhi and keep on mourning for that. Please do not ask us anything. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

I know BJP's position. *(Interruptions)* BJP thought that Congress would split. No. We will not split...*(Interruptions)* You punish us. If you feel so you punish us. You throw us to heavens. *(Interruptions)* I appeal to you, and through you to the Prime Minister, that so far as I understand I was not in that movement. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, Jaya Prakashji led a movement with all of you and put them in the street to share the glory. Jaya Prakashji used to say—I heard one of his greatest speeches at the Boat Club, 'naitikta'. Morality and conscience is most important than anything else. *(Interruptions)* And Mr. Prime Minister, my appeal is not to you. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No running commentary, please. Please listen.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: I feel, Mr. Prime Minister, the moment we had withdrawn you should not have taken it as a personal thing, you should have resigned and immediately asked, "Is it against my Government, my constituents and my constant belief in the CMP and the secular approach, or is it something in-between?" That I could understand. But you thought 'I will go to the floor to explain my stand'. You explain your stand. We have nothing against you personally. But you have failed. You have marginalised the importance of the nation in the international arena.

We are in total isolation in the international arena today. India is in total isolation in the globe today. Mr. Prime Minister, I shed my tears when the British Prime Minister came to Calcutta and you were the Indian Prime Minister. It was for the Indian Prime Minister to decide at what time the British Prime Minister should meet him. But you had to get the time from him to meet the British Prime Minister who was on his way to Bangalore. He was in your land, in Indian land. Has it ever happened in India?

The initiative of G-15 was taken by Malaysia, not by India. India was the giant. Did you ever try to discuss this matter with your Cabinet colleagues? Mr. Prime Minister, I appeal to you. You may say that our past achievements are bad and that your ten months' achievements are good. We are not questioning any of your achievements. We are not comparing your ten months and our five years. We can table many figures, that is not the debating point now. We know that your time is limited. How could you do wonders in ten months? We do not say that. But the casual manner in which you have handled, the approach you have taken, you only acted simply as a Prime Minister as any other bureaucrat feels, that they are the officers; you thought that you were the head of the constituents to run the South Block. But our aspiration was that you are the head of a secular democratic consolidation that will give a direction, the ultimate order, to the nation. Here, Mr. Prime Minister, you failed.

12.43 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

First you tried to marginalise the significance of the nation in the eyes of the world. Then, you tried to marginalise the consolidation of the secular forces. And then finally you tried to marginalise the Congress, the party you may like or dislike—that is not important—and tried to encourage the bogey of anti-congressism. I again

repeat. The anti-congressism may pay a dividend, but anti-congressism will not pay, the ultimate order, in the country. Who will fight these people in Rajasthan, Mr. Prime Minister? It is the Indian National Congress. You may like it or may not like it. Who will fight them in Gujarat, Mr. Prime Minister, as per your secular order? It is the Indian National Congress, Mr. Prime Minister, and none else. Who will fight them in Maharashtra, Mr. Prime Minister? It is the Indian National Congress and a few friends from that side. Who will fight them in Uttar Pradesh, Mr. Prime Minister? It is Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav. He will be the leader and we will share him. Who will fight them, Mr. Prime Minister, in Bihar? It is your party. I agree. We will support your stand. Who will fight these people, Mr. Prime Minister, in Madhya Pradesh? It is our party. Who will fight these people in Delhi, in Himachal Pradesh, in Haryana and in Punjab? Have you ever conceived this total national perspective that your super anti-congressism would be at the cost of the destiny of the nation? Did you ever realise? That is why, you failed, Mr. Prime Minister. The time has come. The Left might have sent a communique to warn you on the economic issues.

Individually, he might have expressed his concern. But, Mr. Prime Minister, we would like to tell you that we have documented our view. We thought that this will help further reconsolidation of the secular forces. It is up to you, Mr. Prime Minister, to act. Do not think that we have charges against you. We have not brought all those things. We are not bringing any individual issue. It is not an issue to debate in that order. We had high hopes. Many times we failed. We have discussed it among ourselves. The BJP may be accusing us as if we are the one who have withdrawn the support and did a massacre of the nation. We do all bad things for democracy, and for the value of the institution. I do not like to repeat all those values. We looked forward to you as a focus point of the secular consolidation of Indian democracy at this critical juncture. I am sorry to say, Mr. Prime Minister, that you have failed to discharge the responsibility and to steer the nation in a proper order. I know today that we will not get any support from any quarter. Today we will be justified in saying what Tagore had said:

"Jadi tor dak shune keu ne ashe  
tabe ekla chalore  
Jadi sabai thake mukh phiraye  
sabai kare bhoy  
tabe paran khule mukh phute  
tor moner katha ekla balore"

He said: "If any one comes to your call and keeps quiet, if everyone is scared and stands aloof, then speak out your mind fearlessly and go ahead. If there is no light, even the storm in the sky will show you the light and go ahead".

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion seeking confidence of this House in the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister. I rise to support the Motion not only because I am a Member of the Council of Ministers but also because I believe what this Government did.

In a way I want it all open by reminding the House that we are, this year, celebrating the 50th year of Indian Independence, and I was hoping that in this 50th year of the Indian Republic, the debate that we would have would be of an order befitting the dignity of this House. I was hoping the speeches that were delivered here would not only enlighten us to decide the Government's policies wherever we need it but would also come under assessment in a correct perspective. Unfortunately, as yet, I find even now this point is missing.

My young friend, Shri Dasmunsi, is an old colleague of mine I would say.

I was saying that I heard with great and rapt attention the speech of my young friend Shri P.R. Dasmunsi. I call him a young friend because I was one of those who saw him coming in the Youth Congress with his fervor on all these days. But generally, he did not travel upwards. This, unfortunately, continues to be his accomplishment even now.

I was, all the time, trying to find out what he was trying to tell us, what he was trying to convey to us so that we from our side can also tell something in defence of that. The only point that I could pick up, and I will attend to it a slightly later, is that I think, he must be the single person in the whole of India who believes that India has been isolated in the world.

I do not know, if he was present this week in Delhi when the Non-Aligned Movement Conference was held. I hope, he knows that 113 countries were present in the Non-Aligned Conference; that 113 countries represent two-thirds of humanity and they had come here not only because they wanted to honour India, but they also came here to pay homage to Jawaharlal Nehru.

I was hoping that if not for my sake and if not for Shri Deve Gowda's sake, he would, at least, pay some compliments for Jawaharlal's sake, who was the author, mother and father of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The Non-Aligned Movement Conference reiterated three things. It reiterated the unity of a developing world. It reiterated the unity of those countries which at one time or the other were victims of colonialisation. It reiterated the unified determination of those countries that would resist the pressures of those who were trying to hegemonise the country and create a new order which is not acceptable to the vast majority of the people. I was

expecting a word of praise from him and I was hoping that while he may not, as I said, praise the Government or the Prime Minister, immediately he would, at least, try to recall Jawaharlal's legacy which we adopted in this Fiftieth Year of India's Independence. I believe that by isolation, if he means isolation from those who live in Washington, then, yes we are isolated.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Sir, it is not audible.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North): What Shri Somnath Chatterjee is discussing with others is coming through his mike.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He is always wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought, that would be advantageous to you as you come to know of his secrets.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Sir, I am not going to give more of my time to what my worthy friend has said. I think, this debate is very important for us to keep in focus the issue that are involved and go on talking about the issues. If I may say so, when I talk about the issues, we must understand the policies which for the last ten months this Government has been trying to follow.

I say with satisfaction that the policies, in the sphere of Foreign Policy particularly, that I have been trying to focus on have been applauded the country over. It is a fact that the competence and achievements in these ten months had three basic dimensions. We were keen from the very beginning and we continue to believe that the Indian Foreign Policy must enjoy the consensus of the nation and it has enjoyed.

I pay compliments to my friends Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on one side, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao on the other and on our side to many parties that are composed in that every major decision that we took was backed by the consensus.

What were the major decisions we took? The first major decision which was taken by us pertained to CTBT. The idea of CTBT was born in this House itself. I remember that when the Vote of Confidence about the BJP Government or perhaps the Deve Gowda Government was going on, my dear old friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had drawn my attention and we had made a commitment on the floor of this House that we would uphold the dignity of the country. We have.

We have unified the nation behind the CTBT. We did not yield to any pressure from any side.

Many pressures came. Some punishments also came. And one punishment which came was in the form of defeating us in the Security Council. We took it in our stride because we knew it all the time that when you take a dignified stand and then the nation stand up like

this unitedly, then, of course, we can stand up and look after ourselves. Therefore, I say that the second dimension of Indian foreign policy has been continued. There is a continuity from Jawaharlal Nehru's days till today and this continuity includes the regime in which Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was the Foreign Minister. I am not referring to 13 days of his Prime Ministership. That was also important. And, therefore, when Shri Jaswant Singh, just a while ago, was talking about the criticism of what is being done in our neighbourhood, I would like to read something. Sir, for your interest and also for the interest of the House. I quote:

"Attempts to drag India's relations with other countries in election controversies by Shrimati Gandhi and her companions have been a serious set back to the process of evolving a consensus based foreign policy. Their allegations that the Janata Government—of which he was a Foreign Minister—sacrificed the national interest, became extra accommodative towards our neighbours with a view to earning cheap popularity is entirely baseless. The interests of different countries in this part of the world are independent and they can progress mainly on the basis of mutual cooperation. Being a large country, it is India's duty to set for the world an example of good neighbourly relationship with the adjoining smaller countries..."

This is the Resolution of the BJP and not my Resolution. Is it not a continuity of the policy that we have been following? Is it not something which Shri Jaswant Singh now sees flaws in?

When we signed the Bangladesh Treaty, I said it in the House with courage and assertion that very political party of India had backed us and, that is why, we succeeded in it. I take pride in this, not because of a personal pride, it is a pride of India, it is a pride of a nation that it knows when to stand together and when to differ. We differ in this House on several things but increasingly and every time we have felt that while correcting the foreign policy and diplomacy, the legacy, the continuity and the consensus have to be preserved. We have preserved it. We have honoured it. Therefore, from the CTBT down to the Bangladesh Treaty or any other thing, I can claim—I hope that no hon. friend will differ—that on any issue where we have not consulted the Opposition on the one side and our collaborating partners including the Congress on the other. Therefore, the Congress friends to say that they were not consulted is neither fair nor true. They were consulted on every foreign policy issue in detail and also were shared the documents with. We also shared the documents with Shri Atalji, also with the parties that sit behind us. That is how, we have been building our foreign policy.

Let us, therefore, now keep in mind the fact that basically the foreign policy of India was neither born in

1980 nor is born now. It was born during the freedom struggle itself. I do not know whether my young friends had participated in the freedom struggle or not, I belong to that generation. I look at Shri Chandra Shekhar, who is sitting here. He belongs to that generation. We had the privilege of participating in the freedom struggle. During the freedom struggle we spelt out our foreign policy. What was the foreign policy that the freedom struggle spelt out? It was spelt out as independence of action, autonomy of choice. And, therefore, while the word 'nonalignment' may have been used later, this was spelt out in the freedom struggle itself. And, therefore, I say with a great deal of courage and assertion that that is the choice we have preserved. That is the choice we have preserved while rejecting the CTBT. You will kindly recall that there were those, outside the world, who look at the world as a whole hegemony. They thought that India will ultimately yield at 11 hours and 59 minutes. Eleven hours and fifty-nine minutes came and went by. India did not yield.

I think, this Government has a reason to feel proud of it that no pressure of any type, no cajoling of any type, no punishment of any type could make us bend. And for that, I would say this. It is not a personal credit to me. It is a credit to the nation. And also let us be fair and let us be honest that the credit goes to the Prime Minister who leads the country at this moment.

13.00 hrs.

It is because he stood for the foreign policy with me. My Cabinet colleagues also stood with me on this foreign policy. Therefore, I would also say that from day one, it was important for us and I think that we should keep in mind the fact that from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to Shri H.D. Deve Gowda, I repeat, a national consensus has been preserved and it should be preserved. Anybody from any party might come and sit here, it should happen and it can happen in a democratic polity that parties can change. But I know that no worthwhile person would change the foreign policy of India.

The former Prime Minister, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao is sitting here. What did Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao do in five years? He also followed the policy in the same way. As a leader, many times, he asked Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to go the United Nations. Many times, he asked me to go to the United Nations. Many times, he asked us to go to Geneva. Why did he do it? Let us understand this. He was also upholding that legacy and that legacy was that when you come to foreign policy, do not look at it in the sense of one party versus another party.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Gujral, would you continue after the lunch? Or would you like to conclude your speech in 10 minutes' time?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Sir, I will come back after lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet at two o'clock.

13.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

14.05 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Five Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

[English]

### MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri I.K. Gujral is to continue his speech.

[Translation]

No Minister is here to speak.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): He himself is the Minister, Sir.

[Translation]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I thought that it was Mr. Speaker who wanted to say something. Gujralji, you can speak now.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): Sir, before the lunch break, I was drawing the attention of this House and you, Sir, as to how the Indian legacy beckoned us to craft the Indian foreign policy. This beckoning is not coming to us today, it came to us during the freedom struggle itself. I was saying that the Indian freedom struggle, I think, had one unique feature and that unique feature was not only non-violence and *satyagraha* but also that we decided all our policy frameworks—thanks to the leaders of that time who were able to visualise as to what type of policy would the Indian foreign policy be. One of the important factors in that policy, they had believed, would be that the Indian foreign policy must be independent; it must not be influenced by anybody; all its decisions should be in the interest of the nation and what the Government of the time perceives and the nation of the time perceives should be in national interest.

I had submitted, and I repeat, that the fortunate part of our legacy also has been that ever since the days of Jawaharlal Nehru, all those who occupied the seat in the foreign office and also Prime Minister's office, upheld this legacy. This legacy basically was that we in India had suffered a great deal during the colonial era and, therefore, we had a great deal of affinity and friendship and cooperation with those who were also under the colonial yoke. That is why you will recall—and this is the 50th year of that—that fifty years ago, Asia Conference was held here. In the Asia Conference, Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhiji had visualised that Indian freedom would never be complete till all the colonies were decolonised. Not only that, they had also at that time associated themselves in the freedom struggle and in the independence of India, with the apartheid of South Africa where colour discrimination was taking place. Therefore, in these 50 years whoever came to office—and I pay compliment to all my colleagues on this side and opposite all of us primarily attached importance to this dimension of Indian foreign policy. The word 'non-alignment' was coined much later. But in the beginning also it was said that we shall not be influenced by anybody. We will decide on issues as they suit us. And we have done it. This is the legacy that we are trying to preserve. Therefore, I have said often in this House, and I repeat, that Indian foreign policy has to preserve that legacy and uphold it, and also, at the same time, stay in a strong element of continuity and also, more important, consensus.

I think whatever our differences may be, as I said a while ago, and I repeat, this is an interesting dimension of Indian democracy and strength that whatever differences we have been having on various issues, broadly speaking, on foreign policy this nation has been backed by the national consensus under all Governments. A while ago I had read here, and I do not want to read again, the statement even by the Jan Sangh at that time, in 1981, and, therefore, I see that as the central component of the Indian foreign policy, and it continues.

Having said that, I would also like to keep in mind the fact that those foreign policy legacies are something which have to be kept up.

Panditji had spelt out a great deal for us. I think this nation will always remain grateful to him for his vision, his commitment and his courage to stand up and fight back those who were trying to hegemonise him was always kept in mind. Some people felt that, perhaps, in the Cold War era we were on this side or that side. No. We were always on the side of India and not on this side or that side.

You will kindly recall, Sir, that Stalin had called Jawaharlal Nehru the running dog of imperialism. Dulles had also bestowed similar categorisation on Jawaharlal

Nehru. But Jawaharlal Nehru was never influenced by nor discouraged by these comments.

Now a point has also arisen that we have also tried to spell out—if it is a consensus then consensus also has to be spelt out. How do we implement a consensus? Just a while ago I paid a compliment to my colleague Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao. When he was the Prime Minister he also activated it. Often Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was sent to the United Nations and to the Human Rights Commission in Geneva. I also had the same privilege. I think we did it not because we agreed with their politics. We did it because it was in the broad national interest. That is the line that this Government has continued to follow as well. This also gave an important message to the world as a whole and the world as a whole felt that when the Indian Government speaks India speaks and that is what I said, give us courage to resist all the pressures on the C.T.B.T. And that is how we will continue to doing it.

That was the first challenge that we have met. We come across a new situation now. The new situation is that unfortunately this neighbourhood of South Asia has been often damned as the area where always perpetual struggles, wars and difficulties would continue. How to change it? I have spelt again and I think Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee will support me on this that this was his policy also. This was his policy when he went to Pakistan. This was his policy when the Resolution was passed. This was his policy when he was the Foreign Minister and I had the privilege of being his Ambassador to Moscow at that time. I know what he was thinking, for instance about Russia. But people might talk about Russia today. But this is the background. I hope that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has not changed his mind about his own role in the past.

The main point basically remains and that is that this neighbourhood is extremely important for us. Therefore, unless we are able to befriend our neighbours we will not be able to release our foot or hand from these neighbourhood politics. Shri Chandra Shekhar, in his own time, tried to do something. Each one of us who has come to occupy the office tried to do it and were sometimes successful, or sometimes partially successful. It has fallen to my lot this time and very fortunately we have covered some ground in this. Our relationship with Bangladesh today is very positive, friendly and we place a great deal of hope on that. Our relations with Nepal have transformed in a big way. Our relations with all our neighbours including Sri Lanka and Bhutan have improved. Now our dimension and the concept of our neighbourhood are extending. We are a large country. We are a big country. We are an important country. Therefore, as I mentioned just now, our neighbours also are not confined only to South Asia. We look at the neighbours in the

ASEAN. In the ASEAN now we have made innumerable relationship, that is, we are full dialogue partners. We are also members of the A.R.I. and that is now a new dimension opening for us. We have also looked over the north. Central Asian countries are our neighbours. So, in the coming days, Central Asia is becoming very important primarily because 40 per cent of the gas reserves of the world are in these countries. Therefore, the future of energy is here apart from other cultural relations, apart from our historical relations and apart from what we have built over the years, even before the Soviet era.

We have seen now and it is very interesting that in this Government, three months ago, we signed a tripartite agreement with Iran and Turkmenistan. What did that agreement mean? That agreement means that now we can reach Central Asia and our goods can reach Central Asia by Railway through Iran and reach Turkmenistan and all Central Asia. I was recently in that region. I was told that the distance is cut by three weeks and that our goods do not have to go now *via* Odissa. It goes by that route. This agreement is a new dimension of our neighbourhood policy.

With Iran we had been having difficulties in the past. Fortunately that era is passed. We also have problems with Afghanistan. For India the Afghanistan policy is both positive and helpful. We do not want Afghanistan people to suffer.

They have, unfortunately, suffered for the last more than two decades, first the Soviet attack and later on, the other things that are happening. We strongly support the idea that in Afghanistan, the people of Afghanistan may decide for themselves and nobody from outside should interfere. The fact is that outside interference is there. I do hope that things will change, but our line continues to be the same.

When I am talking of neighbourhood, I would like to draw your attention to the Indian Ocean Rim Conference that has been recently held. India's initiative once again catalysed this and 14 countries of the Indian Ocean Rim are now in one association. Therefore, India expands that side also. You look at expansion of India's interest now, on the one side, SAARC as a hub and ASEAN on the other, our relations with Korea on the one side and our relations with Japan on the other. Then, we go towards Central Asia and from Iran in Central Asia, we travel towards the Indian Ocean Rim. Therefore, let the Indian economy and Indian influence act as a hub. This hub ultimately builds your foreign policy. My friend has said that we are isolated. If this is isolation, then I do not understand what is 'active'. I take credit for this Government on one point and it is that this has been a pro-active policy, it has never been only a reactive policy.

[Shri I.K. Gujral]

On every issue of the world, India has taken an active interest and has been appreciated in that context.

I would also like to say, how we have done it. It is not because we were a strong Government, it is not because we were on our own, it is because India has now acquired enough self-confidence, our economy has acquired self-confidence. India now behaves like a big power, head shooter not to bully or hegemonise others, but at the same time, in the context of post-Nehruvian era, we use our influence to befriend people and to help them. My friend, Shri Jaswant Singh had expressed, and I regret how he said it, 'why did we give water to Bangladesh?' I would say that India must act as a big country, with a big heart and a big economy. India today occupies 76 per cent of the land mass of the sub-continent. Its economy is 85 per cent of the total economy. Unless you conduct your policies in that visualisation, you can never befriend your neighbours. We have already suffered in the past and I do not want to criticise the past. But I think that it is time we looked at it in a different chasm. India, therefore, can afford to be liberal, large-hearted and to act in a big way to be in with the tradition that we have. Indian tradition and ethos have been like this. All our ethos, cultural and civilisational, have always been to go out and help. That is how India has made a mark in the past. This concept, therefore, I would say has extended itself in various dimensions.

I should also mention about our relations with China. My friend, Shri Jaswant Singh again had talked about security. Yes, no Indian Government can ever be oblivious to security interests, but security interests do not always mean buying more tanks. It does not mean raising more armies. Diplomacy has only one dimension and object in life: how to turn enemies into friends and how to turn friends into close associates. That is what we have been trying to do. That is what we are succeeding in. When President Jiang comes here and tells that he looks at India differently than he was looking 20 years ago, it does not mean that everything has been sorted out. It has not been sorted out. But, we have now the courage, capacity and also the policy to defend ourselves. We are not offending people, but we also understand that any country's future depends on its security equilibrium. We have a very outstanding example of the Soviet Union from which we should learn a lot. The Soviet Union had the largest Army and the largest equipment in the world, but it collapsed. You cannot have security on the basis that you go on acquiring more hardware.

Then, I do not want to talk about our neighbours, but you know that the economy of one of our neighbours has been in shambles because they have been buying planes by starving their own people. Does it help? Ultimately, you come to a stage where you realise that

the total concept of security is different from what has been projected.

I have mentioned in the beginning that it is not that the Indian foreign policy is confining itself to neighbours. We have extremely good relations with America today.

But for this debate I would have gone to America next week. My appointments with the President and the Secretary of State had been fixed. But I had to cancel it because of this debate. Why were these appointments fixed? It is because, they are having a more positive view about Indian foreign policy. For the first time they are realising and appreciating that India has the courage to go out and give a helping hand to its neighbours and that, by itself, has won us laurels and also scope. They have also seen that they cannot bully us and C.T.B.T. was one outstanding example. They could not bully us. Therefore, a new type of equation is taking place now; whether I talk of America or I talk in terms of Europe, we are now having a relationship as equal, dignified friends. We can be. But at the same time, we have the courage and we have also the capacity to keep our heads high.

Sir, I do not want to further take your time. I would like to make one point and that is, we must keep in mind the fact, as I said, of our vision of future apart, the legacy of the past particularly in this 50th year of our Independence and that is important. When I say this thing, my mind goes back to those famous words of Jawaharlal Nehru and I would like to quote him. He said:

"The freedom that has come to India by virtue of many things, history, tradition, resources, of our geographical position, our great potential and all that inevitably leads India to play an important part in world affairs. It is not a question of choosing this or that; it is an inevitable consequence of what India is and what a free India must be. And because we have to play that inevitable part in world affairs, we have another and greater responsibility."

Therefore, it is with that sense of greater responsibility that we are now thinking. After these 50 years of our Independence and when the next century is coming, we have to spell it out for ourselves what our vision for the future is and again I quote Jawaharlal Nehru. He said:

"Destiny has cast a certain role on this country; whether anyone of us present here can be called men or women of destiny or not, I do not know. That is a big word which does not apply to average human beings, but whether we are men or women of destiny or not, India is a country of destiny and so far as we represent this great country with a great destiny stretching out in front of her, we also

have to act as men and women of destiny viewing all our problems in that long perspective of destiny and of the world and of Asia."

That is what Jawaharlal Nehru had bequeathed to us. This is our responsibility. This is our responsibility as a nation, not as a party, not as a Government, but all of us together. And therefore I would only say this thing that again I go back to the ethos of India. Those ethos have been summed up in one Urdu couplet. It says:

'Koi bajm ho koi anjuman, ye shaur apna kadim hai,  
Jahan Roshni ki kami mili vahan ek chirag jaladiya'.

This is India's policy, this is India's future and that is what we have upheld. I promise that we would uphold it and this nation must uphold it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Motion, as I feel it is the patriotic duty of every Member of this House to do so and I have no doubt that most of the hon. Members of the Congress Party also feel in the same way.

Sir, Shri Jaswant Singh is not here. He spoke on behalf of the major Opposition Party, as the opening batsman. But I had always thought that knowing the tenuous position it occupies in the country, knowing that it only represents 20 per cent of the people in this House, they have no reason in their favour and therefore they have chosen invectives as their refuge.

Sir, strong words have been used—I am quoting Shri Jaswant Singh like 'huge untruth was inflicted, disrepute on Lok Sabha and the country, double speak, artificial crisis, born on treachery, farce upon Legislature, cloak to keep BJP out, and 'utter debasement of the debate'—as if we had any obligation to keep them in. Strong words are used when people grope in darkness to speak of substance. I cannot think of a political party other than BJP which has misused the Constitution of this country and who has debased every minute of this House for 13 days when they occupied without any pretence of Constitutional mandate or people's mandate. I consider, with all respect to Rashtrapatiji, that those were 13 days of political *tamasha* that was being performed in this country. It was a Legislative *tamasha* as well. When the hon. Rashtrapatiji called Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to form the Government, he knew that he had no majority in the House, still he took upon that responsibility and for 13 days they tried. I had said it last time when their Confidence Motion was being discussed and I repeat it again that every minute of that discussion they knew that

they had no majority in the House but they clung to power. What more debasement of Indian politics we could see? I must repeat what I had said earlier that that was the Constitutional aberration performed and perpetrated on this House. Usurpers of those days are now giving us sermons. I tell the hon. friends on the Congress side, 'look at their jubilation and look at their glee'. Who is responsible for it?

Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi talked about the commitment to secularism. You have discharged your commitment to secularism by allowing them to dream again of coming back to power.

SHRI A.C. JOS (Idukki): They would only dream.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If you think so, that is all right. I will be happy if it is only a dream. But what is the position in the country today? Those people who had committed the greatest sacrilege on the secularism of this country by the events of 6th December, 1992, are today telling us that we have debased the Constitution of India and this House. Some people have no sense of shame. But we cannot forget that those are the days of national shame. But they have not ever expressed a word of regret. We know that today there is a deliberate attempt to pollute the political atmosphere in the country.

SHRI PRAKASH VISHWANATH PARANJPE (Thane):  
By Whom?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If you have not understood, I am sorry.

Sir, a letter was written on the 30th of March by the Congress President. That letter has resulted in this debate today. That letter did not mention as a condition that the leadership would have to be changed. That condition came up later. I am appealing to my friends in the Congress and all the saner sections of the House to think whether this country can afford to go to polls within one year. Are you honouring the people of this country? The last election was held not even one year back. If this House is dissolved, as it looks like, it has to be if the Congress sticks to its decision and if this Motion is defeated than this will be the most brief tenure of the Lok Sabha in the annals of this country.

Sir, we know that B.J.P. is thinking that it will be the inevitable beneficiary of this. They also know that on their own they cannot expect and, therefore, they are entering into all sorts of permutations and combinations.

Look at what has happened in U.P. They had a Government with the B.S.P. Why did that Government go? What did the B.J.P. leaders say about the B.S.P. as

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

a Party? Kanshi Ramji is here; I am sure, he recalls it. What did the B.S.P. say about the B.J.P.? You are talking about political morality, but just for the sake of lures of office, you have again joined together. I am not going into whether you have made a mistake or the Congress made a mistake in trying to form a Government with the B.S.P. That is not relevant here. I am trying to refer to your postures. We were told all sorts of things here. Now, you have joined Shri Barnala in Punjab to be in power. You have joined the Haryana Vikas Party in Haryana. In Maharashtra, you joined Shiv Sena, who was your natural ally, and then in Bihar, you have joined the fractured Samata Party. This is the political spectrum, so far as the B.J.P. is concerned. And we are told that we are not believing in principled politics!

Sir, the mandate of the people is clear, whether one likes it or not. No single party got the majority. Why did you not get the majority? You tried your best; every party tried its best. You have got only 20 per cent of the popular vote. You may be today the largest single party. But what is your *raison d'être* for forming the Government? What is the political morality, which you are talking of, behind forming the Government?

Therefore, the people's mandate is that there has to be a combination of parties which can form the Government. Otherwise, you cannot have elections after every six months or one year. Is it the intention of the people of this country that we should spend Rs. 500 crore or Rs. 600 crore or Rs. 700 crore, that every election means that there is no development for two or three months, all developmental works are halted, and no decision can be taken by any Government. I want to know from my Congress friends whether that was their intention when their leader wrote that letter of 30th March, that they want a new election within nine or ten months. Ours is still a poor country and we cannot afford to spend Rs. 500 crore or Rs. 600 crore of the tax-payers' money. What was said on behalf of the Congress Party when we had Shri Vajpayee's Motion of Confidence, if I may use that expression? I am quoting from Shri Sharad Pawar's speech delivered on the 27th of May.

"I think, there is some difference between the policies of several parties and our Congress Party. But there is a need for stability in the country. Sometimes, there is a political compulsion that, at least, some parties having faith in unity and secularism of the country are trying to unite. Therefore, Congress has decided to support the United Front from outside."

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SHARMA (Alwar): What is wrong in it?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Are you a speaker? Why do you not wait for your turn? .....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No running commentaries please.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Why did the Congress take up that attitude? Why did the United Front come into existence? Its importance has to be emphasised again and again. There are certain basic values in this country. Secularism is not a jargon. It is a matter of constitutional commitment. To many of us, it is an article of faith and we must do everything to see that this great concept is not sacrificed at the altar of power-hungry politician's whims and caprices.

It was believed and it is sincerely believed that as BJP poses the greatest danger to secularism in this country, the UF has been formed and that is why, Congress lent its support to it. (Interruptions) The UF was born to save secularism and to protect the country from communal divide and the consequential feelings of hatred and insecurity. That is why, we all had to support that party. At that time, we said that at least Congress has shown maturity and that it has a sense of realisation of this country's destiny. Therefore, in order to have a Government which will try to uphold the traditions of secularism and which will also preserve the unity and integrity of this country, they took a conscious decision to support the UF. I very sincerely ask all my friends "Has this situation really changed? Has it radically been altered that today you have brought the country into the vortex of uncertainty which is of a magnitude that may result in a new election to be held within one year and which will mean fracturing of the polity, weakening of the secular forces of this country and raising the head of a communal party, with fundamentalist forces dominating? Is that situation ripe today?"

I am just a student of history. There are many eminent political leaders here. There is a general perception in this country today that hardly any political party will get such a majority as it will be able to form a one party Government. Therefore, whether we like it or not, the coalition Government has almost come to stay. No single party rule is possible in future. Then what will happen? How do we, Members of Parliament, behave? Shri P.R. Dasmunsi was saying that Shri H.D. Deve Gowda is a good man, a nice man, he is a good Prime Minister, but not a good secularist. Is this the way today that the Congress party will decide? We have been asking, "If you really have something to tell us, why do you not tell any one of us when many of us, leaders, are here?" I would have liked the Congress party to say "We shall give issue to issue support." You said that. It is clear enough. As a political party, you are entitled to take a decision. Did you point out any issue, particularly before you sent that letter of 30th March? Please answer this question, at least for the people to know. Some ridicule has been made by Shri Jaswant Singh with his

inimitable command over language and I find his language becomes more flowery when it does not have any substance!

I am not unhappy about the performance of the UF Government. I am in a sense happy with its performance within these ten months. They are a conglomerate of 14 political parties, with different ideologies, different perceptions, with different emphasis by different parties and some of them are regional parties.

Even then, we cannot but congratulate Shri Gujral and our Prime Minister on the achievements made in the foreign affairs front. The CTBT is a good example. The Treaty with Bangladesh is a good example. The NAM Conference is there. The visit to Russia is there. One cannot but be proud of the achievements of the Government of India so far as foreign affairs is concerned.

About PDS, we have admired him. We asked for it and the Government has conceded that the Public Distribution System should cater particularly, favourably towards the economically weaker sections of the people. They have agreed to that. They have done it. Now, it is for the State Governments to implement it. Although a lot of subsidy is involved, even then the Government has risen to the occasion to look after the poor people of this country. There is the Poverty Alleviation Programme.

The relations between the Centre and the States have improved. Yes, it is important. The Inter-State Council, which was in total hibernation for years together, has been revived. The Chief Ministers have come, discussed and decided upon the priorities. The Chief Ministers of all the States in this country representing different political parties have come and done this. Is this a good gesture or not? Was it for the benefit of the country or not that the Inter-State Council was convened? They took decisions. A Committee was formed under the Chairmanship of our esteemed Home Minister.

The Chief Ministers' Conference is regularly held. Priority sectors were identified. The NDC was more regularly convened. I particularly appreciate the Government's decision to pay proper attention to the States in the North-Eastern India. Do not forget that, please. Nobody has ever done it in the past. Special provisions were made to the most neglected areas of our country which had been ignored for years together by whichever combination was there, whichever political party was there in this country. The North-Eastern India has got back some of its prestige, has got its commitment today to be in the national mainstream.

I cannot but appreciate the Government's role in giving a status to the dalits and the poor people of this country. Shall we not do something to give them self-respect at least? I do not think any other Government

has done it. The BJP withdraw the support to the Vishwanath Pratap Singh Government because of the implementation of the Mandal Commission Report. What was the message? The message is that a section of the deprived community in this country was given recognition. Their long-standing demands were taken note of. Some acknowledgement was given. Some provision was being made for them to come into the mainstream and to get what is due to them. That is why, they withdrew the support. The BJP did not want that the downtrodden people should get any special benefit. This was their role. But the Government had continued with that.

There is a commitment by the Prime Minister about the passage of the Lokpal Bill where the Prime Minister is to be included. He has agreed to that. In spite of all the controversy that is there in respect of the Women's Reservation Bill, there is a commitment given. But the Congress Party today is creating a situation when even the Women's Reservation Bill cannot be taken up for consideration. Dr. Girija Vyas, what is this? It is your decision...(*Interruptions*). You do not want that the subsidy for fertiliser to continue.

At least, we have felt that there is transparency in the functioning of this Government. One of the big achievements of this Government is that there has been transparency. But everything seems to have been forgotten when Shri Sitaram Vajpayee comes in...(*Interruptions*). I thought you have become fused into one. Really, Shri Sitaram Kesri seems to have become Sitaram Vajpayee. I am sorry. Really, I meant Shri Sitaram Kesri.

The Congress Party decided upon an unconditional support. It became issue to issue support. Then it became 'no support'. Why? Shri Jaswant Singh has rightly pointed out the first reaction of the great Maratha saying that it was a bolt from the blue. I have also noted that. I find something else in one journal. This Congress President says:

'Sab bum bum hai.'

It is some expression. I do not know this. They will explain it. They were very happy. Why? They must have thought that Shri Sitaram Kesri is going to be the Prime Minister next day. Shri Deve Gowda will realise that he has no majority and he will quietly go away. Then the President will call, everybody will go, and he will become the Prime Minister tomorrow.

It was made very clear. Certainly we have said that, my Party has also said that. We cannot ignore the presence of the Congress Party in the set up that we have in this country. Shri Jaswant Singh has ridiculed this attempt to win power, remaining outside without accountability. Can there be any party like that? Can you

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

cite an example of a party which has refused its own leader to become the Prime Minister of India? Is there any party in the country like that? You are talking that we want to enjoy the loaves of power! That is your combination of having six monthly Chief Ministership of Uttar Pradesh. What is this? I can think of nothing more atrocious legislative combination, sharing of loaves of power in the manner you have decided upon. Who is power hungry? There is no doubt that the people of this country will decide about it.

I have a particular query to make. I hope my distinguished friends in the Congress side will explain it. Of course, somehow the fiftieth year of our Independence has lost its significance to the Congress. You want a disturbed situation in this country. You want an election in this country. You want parties fighting with each other, people being divided. Nobody is thinking or observing the fiftieth year of Independence.

What was the time chosen? This House was going to sit on the 21st of April. The Finance Bill was to be passed on 5th or 6th of May. The House was going to sit till the 9th of May. You could have brought a No Confidence Motion on the 7th of May. Then all this uncertainty would not have been there. Indo-Pak talks were going on. Was it the appropriate moment, opportune moment? NAM Meeting was to be held. Is the country's prestige not involved? You chose a time of 30th March when so many leaders of different countries had come to India or were due to come to India. Was that the time to be selected?

The Budget is yet to be passed. We have now to think of novel methods of passing the Budget. The Speaker is worried. The hon. Rashtrapatiji, I believe, is worried, subject to correction. I am sure, he is worried. All of us are worried. What will happen after 31st of May when the period for passing the Vote on Account will expire? How do you have a new Government before 31st of May, if there is a dissolution? How do you pass the new Vote on Account? Nobody gives any thought to this.

Suggestions or offers were given by many of the leaders of the United Front. Certainly, the views of the Congress Party with 142 or 144 Members should not be lost sight of. Let there be a coordination committee. You preside over the coordination committee. Let there be a full discussion on every issue. Give a chance and put a condition, if you so want. But before anything was done, the support was all withdrawn. Hon. Rashtrapatiji was informed about it through a letter which Shri Jaswant Singh said probably rightly—he was right only once—that it was rather repetitive and it was not a very good draft.

For the withdrawal of support on the ground of Defence issues, Security requirements, law and order

situation, drift in economy, growing communal menace and everything, the Cabinet was responsible—according to them—because the principle of collective responsibility was being ignored. Now, it has boiled down to change of one leader. Therefore, the letter is virtually withdrawn by their party. All these allegations are gone. I do not know, Shri Deve Gowda was so powerful. I wish he was that he could decide every ministerial operation of the Government in this country.

They do not mind about other Ministers. Shri Srikant Jena, of course, is nice. They are the great admirer of him. So is the Home Minister and the Railway Minister. The Railway Minister, of course, is their darling. He promises railways to everybody!... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, What could I do? Being the leader of the CPI(M) in the House and an outside supporting Party, I do not want this Government to go. Even though Bengal was deprived, yet I supported them. Therefore, this is the adjustment one has to make. You are right. But we have to make adjustments and we cannot have it on our own way. Naturally, India would, at the moment, start from Karnataka, then go to Bihar and come to West Bengal and to any other State. Yes, I have always said it...(*Interruptions*)... Where is Shri Madhavrao Scindia? I think, he is not present now. He had a Rajdhani Express from his State when he was the Railway Minister, otherwise that Rajdhani Express was not to be there. When we had Shri Kamalapati Tripathi in the Railway Ministry then Kashi-Vishwanath Express was started. Of course, Gwalior became the hub of the Railways in the Northern India.

SHRI A.B.A. GHANI KHAN CHOUDHURY (Malda):  
What about Malda?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Yes, of Course, for Malda, I salute you, Shri Ghani Khan Choudhury. Although you could do half of it, but at least, there is a good garden though not good railways...(*Interruptions*)... I have saluted him. What more could I do? ... (*Interruptions*)

Therefore, all the Ministers are good. Their performance is good. All these vulnerable gentlemen here are very good friends of ours. There is no complaint against them in spite of the withdrawal of the gas connection facility and the telephone connection facility. There is no complaint... (*Interruptions*)... Today all the Members have come and assembled here in a Special Session, which the hon. Rashtrapatiji had to direct, because Shri Deve Gowda's face is not liked. I wish he had believed in plastic surgery and got it changed.

Sir, can a country like India be run this way? Can the fate of this country be decided by personal ego?

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Shri Harkishan Surjeet would not advice you.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I believe, you are the Chairman of a Committee. I do not know what will happen to your room.

Sir, India cannot be run by personal ego. It is a country of immense complexities. We are still very much a developing nation. So many poor people are there who are below the poverty line. They are illiterate. In respect of child death, mortality rate, we are still on the higher side. It is a national shame for us. There is an unemployment problem of great magnitude. And, we do not feel ashamed.

Today, Shri P.R. Dasmunsi spoke. I admire him that he tried his best. What more could he do?

But the result was very miserable. Therefore, on behalf of the UF, it was made very very clear that we were prepared to discuss all possible issues, sitting across the table. Can you not sit, as mature people sit across the table? Before you have chopped off my head, can you not, as mature people, discuss the issues? Heavens would not have fallen if you had waited for three weeks more. Or, even seven days' notice could have been given to sit with us and discuss what the consequences were. What is the danger to this country? This would be the shortest Lok Sabha. As I said, huge expenses, which the country cannot afford, are involved. It is an injustice to the people. It is not fair to the people of this country.

I appreciate what Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao had said in one of those debates and I quote:

"But this has been the most difficult mandate the people of India ever gave. Every party, therefore, had to pause and think. There was no question of all of us going back to the people and asking for another mandate. That would have been ridiculous. That would have been an insult to the intelligence of all the Members of this House. So, we have to find a way. The Congress Party did not hesitate to authoritatively state even before talking to other Parties and even before the confabulations were going on, what we wanted to do.

I am quoting Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao; he may not be very popular with you. I do not know about it.

"Number one, Sir, we were very clear as to what we were not going to do; and that was, to support the Bharatiya Janata Party."

That was your commitment on the floor of the House. Now, look at them, whom you have strengthened.

One point that nobody remembers is that there could still be a hung Parliament. How many elections can we continue to have? The communal forces will rear their heads. As I said, all development activity will come to an

end. And, who benefits? Does it result in the consolidation of secular forces? With great humility, I ask Shri Rajesh Pilot and his friends in his Party, 'Will a new election necessarily consolidate the secular forces in this country or the country will be torn asunder?'

14.57 hrs.

[SHRI P.C. CHACKO in the Chair]

Therefore, I am again appealing to my friends, those who are supporting from within and outside, 'Please sit together, across the table and decide, as mature people, what should be done'. For the sake of the people of this country, let us show some statesmanship. Let us try to again think about the future: both immediate and distant. Time has not been finally lost.

One wonders why people ask us—of course, they must be asking the friends in the Congress Party more—'What was the calculation of the Congress President?' What was the intention on the 30th of March, unless it was to come to power, which is a number game. To be able to form a Government is a question of numbers. Where would be the number? From the 30th March, up to the 11th of April, i.e., today, they have been unable to show a majority in the House. They did not succeed in creating divisions in the United Front. What I can see is that our good friend and Congress Leader, Shri Sitaram Kesri will not ascend the throne as Ramachandra, but he is assuming the role of 'Atal Bhakta Hanuman' and all my friends in the Congress Party, with no disparagement, will be acting like *vanara sena*.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, of late, he is referring to the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* frequently. That is because of the influence of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee on him.

15.00 hrs.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: On the 6th of December, *Kar Sewaks* were utilised for demolishing the Babri Masjid, what they call a '*dhanca*'. They were very happy and proud. ...(*Interruptions*) The former Chief Minister has now come here. BJP Chief Minister sent *Kar Sewaks*. And they were taking credit about how many *Kar Sewaks* were sent from Maharashtra also. Now, all our friends in the Congress Party will be utilised as *Kar Sewaks* to destroy the secular fabric of this country. This is the position....(*Interruptions*)

It is not a monopoly. I accept it. But please ponder over what is good for the future of this country. We do not mind it and if another election has to come, it will come, we will face it. Who are in the greatest trouble? We know it. All your confabulations, permutations and combinations—this group, that group, 'Pawar' group, 'Pilot'

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

group—are going on. I do not know whether Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev can make a group. All these groups continue.

I know, Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev seems to be a very contented person today. I do not know, he may become Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev 'Poorakayastha' (Interruptions) In his constituency, some 'Poorkayastha' has to be a BJP leader. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmuni may become 'Priya Ranjan Sikodar, the BJP leader.... (Interruptions) This is what is happening. You are helping them. You are strengthening them.

I think, the time is not finally lost. When I am espousing the continuance of the United Front's Government here, I have full knowledge that the UF alone cannot form a Government in this country and that the secular parties will have to come together. Let us not have the impression that Congress has ceased to be a secular party. We do not consider them still to be so.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: For getting support, the Congress is secular. But when you get the support, you forget the Congress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Somnath Chatterjee is saying something good about your party. Please take your seat.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: We will tell you later on. Will he adjust us in West Bengal with secular forces? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He has been contradicted immediately by her ... (Interruptions)

Therefore, it is not a question-answer session. Question-answer session is not here. We can always discuss it. Precisely, I am saying, "Wait". If you can offer a good lunch or dinner, we can go to your place also. Let it be done in a responsible manner, when I am speaking of the continuance of this Government, at least the poor people were kind to realise its existence that this country is having an administration which is trying to help the people. This Common Minimum Programme is a charter which has been supported by them. It has been supported by the Congress Party. With your permission, may I read what Shri A.R. Antulay said on the 11th June in this House? I quote:

"Therefore, Sir, with the humblest of my contribution, I would expect this Parliament to allow without any fetters, without any let or hindrance this Government to function for the full term of five years. I hope there is no difficulty at all. I, on behalf of the Congress Party, can say that we shall not be allowing the Government to be pulled down on any flimsy ground because as our leader has said, the programme that has been chalked out is concurred in by us. Since the programme is the programme of

all of us and secularism is the very basis; indeed basic of all basics! I believe that they have no fear; we have no fear and they, the BJP, may keep on saying anything. And yet the Prime Minister shall remain for full five years."

You never repudiated him then.

Sir, again he also said and I quote:

"Unless democracy is secular, it is no democracy. If we go on arithmetic as has been made out here by BJP, then what is the place under the sun for the minorities".

Mr. Antulay, I have no doubt that you have to answer this.

Sir, again I would like to quote what P.V. Narasimha Rao said. He said on the floor of this House on 11 June, 1997 and I quote:

Sir, he was on the point whether the Congress Party supports and is in agreement with the Common Minimum Programme announced by the ruling Party. I tell him that this has already been accepted. There may be small variations, in some cases we may want them to go a little faster. All these are matters which can be discussed and sorted out. In principle and also in the content of the Programme we have not found anything which we could oppose or we would like to oppose".

This was the statement solemnly made on the floor of the House by the then President of the Congress Party. Therefore, they have no objection to the CMP. If they have objection about the pace of implementation of the programme, certainly that is a matter of discussion. Priorities could be decided upon.

Sir, the stake is very heavy. This is a country of 950 or 960 million people. We cannot just play about with it. This Parliament has a historic duty to perform now on the 11th of April, 1997. Today, we have come back to a position where only one individual is the bone of contention. I am sure if proper discussions could be held as to what are the views against him, then certainly those could be sorted out. But give a chance. You withdraw it first and then you put conditions. You withdraw the support first and then you create uncertainty in this. The condition came much later, not in the correspondence of the 30th March. Therefore, if it could be a subsequent decision, a subsequently arrived at decision, you could certainly discuss this matter.

Sir, we are happy. Otherwise I would not have stood here and spoke in favour of this Government. But the stake is very heavy. As I said, it is the question of the future of this country. It is not merely the life of one

Government. I cannot think of—not because of uncertainties of elections—that this country is again thrown into the vortex of an electoral battle. I do not know whether the Budget will be passed or not. I do not know whether the Finance Bill would be passed or not. We have to decide. We had some discussions today. In spite of cooperation from all, I do not know as to what will happen. Can the country afford to be faced with a situation like this?

Therefore, I feel, as I started by saying, that it is the patriotic duty of the Members of this House to support this Motion. Nothing is lost. My opportunity has gone by for ever. There could always be proper discussions and proper decisions could be arrived at. Let all of us here not tinker with the future of the people of this country. The crying need is for development; the crying need is for progress; for the economic upliftment of the people of this country.

Sir, a developing nation cannot afford to go through uncertain periods like this in its history every year. Therefore, I support this Motion and I still hope that good sense would prevail as there is nothing final here.

I saw the other day, our young friend, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmuni saying that there is no last word in politics, no last event in politics and something more, he said in a very flowery language. I do not know as to why he has made himself scarce now. It is not that we are on bended knees. I am not asking for mercy. The people of this country will decide, if you let them down. They will give a proper verdict on you as also on BJP.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, about the debate, what is going on today I would like to say that it is the most unfortunate and shameful day in the parliamentary history of India. I have many differences on political level with Shri Jaswant Singh but even then I do not agree with Shri Somnath. In place of thinking about the prestige of the country Shri Jaswant Singh has tried to raise this issue at this level. I would like to say to hon. Vajpayeeji that the matter of 'Vanar Sena' is not related to the Members on this side but at times he is also becoming a part of it, consciously or unconsciously. I am saying this after due consideration. As Somnathji has also mentioned that the decision of Congress Party regarding withdrawal of the support from U.F. Government in present situation creates suspicion in the minds of people. Why 30th March had been fixed for it. Why in Congress Party the issue regarding withdrawal of support was discussed with such an importance and in haste, that also at such a juncture when we were trying to improve our relations with the neighbouring countries of Pakistan and Bangladesh and hon. Prime Minister was in Moscow to sign an agreement on a controversial issue which was given high importance in

the world polity. I and all the Members know that some persons did not like to see him in the Chair of Prime Minister when he returned from Moscow after signing the agreement. Our Minister of External Affairs, Minister of Home Affairs, Shri Somnath and Vajpayeeji are aware of the history behind it. Our relations with Pakistan are worsening. Some forces are trying to do that for last 50 years. Jaswantji had criticized the functioning of this Government but I would like to say that no one can serve better than Shri I.K. Gujral so far as India's relations with Pakistan are concerned and if the relations with Pakistan have improved, it is due to his efforts. Today the whole world is displeased and trying to pull down India from emerging as a super power. This had been one country in the past which has been divided in several parts today, it can be called a misfortune or error of the history. Earlier Pakistan, Bangladesh, Srilanka and Burma were the parts of one nation and India can become a great nation if people of SAARC countries start thinking in one and constructive direction. It can become a challenge for those countries, which are directing the world polity today and think that poor and weak countries have no right to maintain their dignity and respect. At such a time, it was not correct to create instability in the country. I do not want to repeat the issues taken up by Shri Somnath just now. As a student of politics the decision of withdrawal of support from U.F. Government by Congress Party at a time of political upheaval in world politics creates suspicion in my mind.

With this apprehension in my mind, I would like to say that it cannot be called a prudent decision but it is a political crime and history will decide and punish the concerned political parties sometime. The policies of the Government which are being criticized and Deve Gowdaji is being blamed, I would like to know as to how these points are justified. Is the opinion of the present Government and the former Government differs at any point? I am not supporter of their economic policy. I never dreamt about the success of Chidambaram's economic policy. I never felt that the budget presented by him is going to provide any relief to poor class. My friend Shri Murli Manohar Joshi criticized the budget that it will ruin the country. I always criticized these policies. This is an open fact. But the dream of hon. Prime Minister and hon. Finance Minister regarding developing the country by external investment cannot come true. I always expressed my dissent on it in this House and outside also.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, do we not care for dignity, greatness and future of our country. This country with a population of 100 crore which has thousand years old civilization and culture and the whole world hopes for some good from this country. I do not want to repeat what has been said by our Minister of External Affairs.

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

Shri P.R. Dasmunsiji is not present here now. He spoke with a great enthusiasm. It is good also and one has to show more enthusiasm when he has to support a wrong thing. But his speech was not factual. The whole world and newspapers of this country are praising Shri Gujral for his achievements in the field of foreign policy. Gujralji is my friend and he may become Prime Minister of this country. I am not praising him much because someone may get a wrong impression. I would like to say that whether there is Atal Bihariji or Gujralji or any other person who is playing an important role for progress and development of the country and it is really heartening that at such an important time one is pulled down. Is it a new tradition of Congress party. What it actually indicate?

I do not know as to whether it is correct or not but so far the issue of secularism is concerned, it has been published in various newspapers that credibility of Deve Gowda was suspected because he had secret alliance with BJP. Though Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev keep on alerting the Party but is not himself attentive. Why you were not alert at the time of demolition of Babri Masjid. Were only Shri Vajpayee, Murli Manohar Joshi or Prime Minister was responsible for that. You were also Minister at that time and seen the demolition of Babri Masjid and now you are preaching secularism to Deve Gowdaji. I know him very well and it will be better if you leave the work of issuing certificate to others. Uptil when you will keep on criticizing BJP in the name of secularism? Have you ever made an introspection?

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did not want to participate in this debate but speaking here on your instructions. I am very sorry to say that no political party or person can be treated as untouchable in parliamentary democracy. I know that my words may be misinterpreted. I have said this on several occasions that I do not agree with policies of BJP. But the BJP is also a part of this Parliament. Somnathji you should keep in mind that you cannot run the Parliamentary democracy by alienating them, it can be dictatorship only. One of my friend in BJP who may be present here has warned me so many time that I should not speak in favour of both the sides. I would like to say that I speak whatever I feel correct whether one may feel good or bad due to it. I do not have any personal interest in it and not from today but since 1962 I am speaking what I felt correct. Gujralji can be witness to my point. How many times he came to me with offer of ministership. Now they are preaching us the tradition and history of Congress party. Which history? The history that was created on 30th March? Or that history in which Subhash Chandra Bose used to oppose the principles of Mahatma Gandhi and people of Congress party used to support him? I pity on certain leaders of Congress party especially my friend Shri Sharad Mehta who had been

my colleague during socialist movement and he is a man of principles and committed to high ideals. But I would like to know as to on basis of which ideals this letter was written. I do not give much importance to it. The person, who has written this letter is familiar to the greatness and dignity of this country. Does he know about its impact on future and history of the country. Is he aware of the fact that it can create instability and disturbance in the country, though I do not want to repeat those facts of history.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was also in the Congress Party at the time when present Congressmen were not there but many stalwarts were there. I was in the Working Committee in which I used to oppose the great leaders like Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Today Shri Rajesh Pilotji is sitting here. I had great hopes from him. He takes inspiration from Shivaji at Pune but here I do not know from whom he takes inspirations... (*Interruptions*) Not from me.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I also would like to say one more thing here. Many people are discussing about it and even Shri Atalji was also asking me as to what is the opinion of Shri Sharad Pawar. I would like to state that after 30th March, I have seen Shri Pawar today only and I have no telephonic conversation with him. In a difficulty people come to me but they do not come to me at the time of creating difficulty... (*Interruptions*)

I am saying this thing because it is a serious crisis and we should not take it lightly. We should take it seriously. You may be annoyed with an individual, individual will come and go but no one is the last man of the history.

[*English*]

No one is a full stop in the history. Even departmental people are semicolons.

[*Translation*]

The Leaders and the Prime Ministers will come and go but Mr. Sontosh Mohan Devji the values for which the Congress party stood should not be crushed under the feet. You may or may not support the Government because it is your party decision.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: You are also responsible for the present condition of the Congress party. Many times we have requested you to join the party but every time you refused to join. Had you been joined the Congress, the condition of this party would have not been so.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful for his invitation but he should remember that I left the Congress when Shrimati Indira Gandhi was its leader. Shri Gujralji knows very well under what circumstances I left the party. During emergency in 1975

the Opposition parties had to take the decision as to what they should do. They had only alternative that they should go to jails but I had two options either to join the Union Government or go to jail and I accepted to go to jail. Shri Gujralji knows that I did not accept the proposal to join the government. You also came to me at that time. Therefore, I do not say such things.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, at that time I left the Congress and now I feel pity on the proposal that I should join the Congress... (*Interruptions*) The Congress should become an organisation which believes in programmes, principles and ideology. I was the only person who said that the Congress party has its own history, it is a big party and a mass based party. This Congress party can be revived but Shri Sontosh Mohan Devji for that purpose you have to show the courage. Shri Rajesh Pilotji, you show the courage but you should have a strong will to go on it alone. Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, it is easy to quote Ravindranath Thakore but you must remember that the desire to go alongwith the group is a sign of weakness. If only few people in the Congress learn to go alone, then this party can become a strong organisation even today. When Shri Sontosh Mohan Devji, will form a Congress party and will invite me, I will certainly thinkover his proposal but he should remember one thing that I would not like to even touch the present Congress party from far away.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that in such a grave crisis, it is not good to point towards any individual. Politics is not for personal allegations, be it in the name of principles or ideology. We should remain far away from such personal allegations.

I would like to say one more thing hesitantly but considering it as my national duty. The time has come today when we all, whether sitting on treasury benches or the opposition benches, should think as to what are the challenges before us and what are the problems before us. If we can evolve consensus on the national issues, chalk out programmes to solve those problems and try to run the Parliamentary democracy accordingly then I think we would be able to overcome the present crisis. It is a real crisis. This undignified crisis may suit you but I would like to say that it would be a good thing if you get rid of this crisis hovering over the country as soon as possible.

I also would like to request the Opposition leader that henceforth this Government would run on his own discretion. Is it necessary for them to support the letter which was written by the Congress Party. Today if you will vote against the Government that would amount to

support the letter and you would not be able to express your anguish by voting against the Government. The sky will not fall within seven days. If this Government survives on 13th that would blemish the face of those people who have behaved in most irresponsible and undignified manner. They have committed a crime against the nation in which they have ignored the moral values and their national duties. You should not join them today because I do not expect anything good from them but I definitely expect that you would act wisely. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR (Mumbai North-West): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say few words on the Confidence Motion moved by Shri Deve Gowdaji. I oppose this motion. Entire country know that the Budget Session was going on and Budget was presented in the House. The House was adjourned for one month to allow the Standing Committees to discuss about the Budget. In this break Session, we heard this news that the Congress has withdrawn its support. On that day I was about to come to Delhi and I got that news that the Congress Party which was hitherto supporting Deve Gowda Government has withdrawn its support and to this effect they have given in writing to the President of India. I was surprised to know about it. When I read the news paper, then I came to know that it was alleged that Shri Deve Gowda talked to communal parties, he was trying to break the secular structure of our country, he was not giving due regard and respect to the Congressmen. I do not know as to when the Congress party came to know about it because I was present in the House on 21st and at that time Congress party was supporting the Government and I do not know all of a sudden what happened and they withdrew the support.

Today when this Motion was moved in the House I was listening keenly as to who is supporting the Motion and who is opposing it. I have listened to with rapt attention the speech of Shri P.R. Dasmunsi. He gave reasons as to why they have withdrawn the support. But what he said that all in the United Front are not bad. He said that Shri Mulayam Singh, Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan are good but Shri Deve Gowda is not a good man because he is the Prime Minister. What I understood is that the Congress party has its eye on the post of Prime Minister. If Shri Deve Gowda is removed from this post, the Congress Party would come to power and it would have its own Prime Minister and all the constituents of the United Front would support them. It gave me this impression that with such an objective they have taken the decision to withdraw the support.

[Shri Madhukar Sarpotdar]

Rumours have been spreading in Delhi for the last four days. It is being said that some settlement is going on. The Congress Party has only one point programme that Shri Deve Gowdaji should be removed. They are saying to the United Front that they are ready to support their Government provided Shri Deve Gowdaji is replaced. If it is so then why the Congress Party supported Shri Deve Gowda Government for ten months.

Were you not aware that Hawala cases are going on against so many Congress leaders? Were they are not aware that some legal action would be taken on these cases? They knew about it.

SHRI DATTA MEGHE (Ramtek): Hawala cases are being withdrawn.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR: If it is so, then why support is being withdrawn. Then some other news was given that Shri Mehto has mentioned the name of Shri Sita Ram Kesri in payoff case. It has shaken the party. Shri Sita Ram Kesri thought that he is the Party President and if he is arrested in this case what would happen to the party. Perhaps with such apprehensions and due to some other reasons, which also appeared in the news papers but I do not want to mention about that in the House because Shri Kesriji is not the Member of this House, he took such a decision. Had he been a Member I would have certainly mention that in the House. This decision was taken out of fear.

I met so many Congress members but they are also not aware as to what all this is happening. I heard the reaction of Shri Sharad Pawar at Pune as has been mentioned by Shri Jaswant Singhji in the morning. I know that Shri Sharad Pawarji will say whatever he wants to say at Pune and Mumbai but he will change his stand when he will meet with Shri Sita Ram Kesri in Delhi. He is doing that type of politics till today. But what I would like to ask is that the members who are sitting here have not been taken into confidence. It is not a good thing. I have with me the proceedings of the House dated 11th May, 20th May and 11th June. I have gone through the speeches made by the hon. Members at that time. I was also present in the House at that time and listened to those speeches. I liked it very much when Shri Somnathji said that this is the mandate given by the people. They are all communal and we all secular forces would come together and lead the nation. Had Muslim league been joined them it would have also become secular but if Shiv Sena would not joined you, that would not be treated as secular. You are repeatedly referring to secularism but what that secularism is? Every one claims

here that he is secular. When action was taken under TADA against bomb explosion case in Mumbai, all the Muslim members came into the well of the House and demanded repeal of TADA. If we are really secular then why only Muslim members came into the well of the House and why the other members did not come into the well to demand that the persons arrested under TADA should be released because they are innocent. If it was a rule of secular forces then why only muslim members came into the well of the House. I was thinking over this thing at that time and also intended to raise that matter but I was not allowed. I would like to ask that when secular forces were in power then what had happened that the Congress party decided to withdraw the support.

At that time whatever Shri Antulayji had said, I would like to quote:

"Now what is mandate? In a system like ours the mandate is an order to rule".

He further said:

"We are supporting the government from outside but if after some time if our leader and our working committee decide to join the government, we can join the government".

After that whatever he said, I also would like to quote that:

"I am saying so because I have firm faith on the mandate."

Whatever had been said by the Congress leader, I am repeating that only. He further said:

"Whenever I see Shri H.D. Deve Gowda sitting here, I do not mind to the fact which party he belongs to. I take pride in being a citizen of India, as I have said in the beginning that it is a testimony to our democracy that a poor farmer from a village is holding the office of Prime Minister of India, the Chief Minister of Karnataka has been invited to form the Government here without any aggressiveness or competitiveness."

I would like to quote here what Shri Antulay had said further:

"I do hope that this Government will last in this House for a full term of five years without my impediment, without any hitch. I hope there will be no difficulty in this. On behalf of the Congress party I would like to

affirm that we would not allow to pull down the Government on any flimsy ground, because as our leader has said this Government will function in accordance with already approved programme."

This is what barrister Antulay told in this House. If the Congressmen had such feelings at that time, what new circumstances have emerged to brand Shri Deve Gowda as undesirable now. All of you had the same opinion of him. All recommended in favour of him to the Congress. After making some criticism he has welcomed the economic resolution. Heavens have not fallen, especially when they are going to pass the economic resolution in any case. Only one thing comes to my mind. Looking at the situation of the country as a whole, only one scenario emerges. Whether it is in Karnataka, Tamilnadu, Andhra Pradesh or Punjab, the vote banks of the Congress have been unsuccessful. They must be thinking now that it must be their last opportunity to which they can take advantage. They are trying to serve their purpose with whatever strength they have at present. Their latest decision stems from this effort, this is what I feel. These people did not think of the country's poor people. Our country is afflicted by too many problems even today. Crores of rupees have been spent in our country over the last few years but nothing has percolated down to the people. We disbursed large amounts of money to N.G.Os.

Looking from this angle, if we assess the manner in which the country has been governed for the last thirty years, we will find that the Congress has indulged in the plunder of the country, in the name of the poor. Perhaps Deve Gowdaji was trying to stem it, therefore, he was not liked by the Congress. What's wrong Shri Deve Gowda had committed? If all his team of Ministers is good, is it Shri Deve Gowda who is the odd man out as the lone bad person. The pretext on which the Congress wants to oust Shri Deve Gowda, is not tenable. Recall what Sharad Pawarji spoke here on 20th May.

"The BJP has in a way tainted democracy by trying to form their government even without enjoying majority. They don't have majority here. They have polled less votes than the Congress. In addition to this, many more arguments can be put forward."

This is what respectable Sharad Pawarji from the Congress side said in his speech on 28 May when respectable Vajpayeeji moved his Motion of Confidence here. Later on 11th June Shri Sharad Pawar did not

deliver his speech. But in his speech delivered on 28 May, he had said:

"The Congress will support the United Front from outside. So long as the policies of this Government are oriented towards upliftment of the poor people, the Congress will keep supporting wholeheartedly the Government in the making."

I would, therefore, like to ask the Congressmen whether the problems of the poor are over? Whether the country has no problems now? Why do they say today that Deve Gowda must go? Whether Deve Gowdaji worked so hard during these ten months that he removed poverty from the entire country in just ten months. Is that why the Congress wants to bid him farewell and asks him to yield place to somebody for whom Congress may have liking. Nobody disliked by the Congress can become Prime Minister. This is the situation in which the Congress has landed this country into. Congressmen have vast knowledge. They are in politics for the last several years. They are familiar with corruption also, not that they are unfamiliar with it. They know the means of indulging in corruption. They have a very good channel for doing that. They are making such speeches from here. When it is high time to check corruption. That is why I feel that the policy now adopted is most harmful to the country ...*(interruptions)* When the Bill regarding women was not getting approval, the Congressmen used to threaten Shri Deve Gowda that they will withdraw their support from him if the Bill does not get approval. The women Members here were ignored by the Congress. Such an opportunity was denied to them by the Congress. Apart from this, even the female Members on the Congress side did not ask their party to withdraw support from Shri Deve Gowda if he does not introduce the Bill in the House. In my view it was a fit opportunity to get the Bill approved which has not found approval till date. Then look to the situation in Uttar Pradesh. Respected Shri Romesh Bhandariji was working there in close understanding with Union Defence Minister Shri Mulayam Singh. Both were working together. The Congress could have complained against them. About the situation in Uttar Pradesh the Congress was of the opinion that it was akin to chaos. Our Home Minister opined thus. Later such type of pressure was put on him that the very meaning of his utterances underwent change. What to speak and what not to speak was ultimately left to Home Minister Shri Indrajit Gupta. Although I will not speak on this subject, yet the way and the situation in which Shri Indrajit Gupta said in this House,

*[English]*

"It is a matter of anarchy, disorder and destruction..."

[Shri Madhukar Sarpotdar]

[Translation]

These were the words he used. It was a good opportunity to the Congress to have told the government to remove Shri Romesh Bhandari from U.P., otherwise the Congress support will be withdrawn. But the Congress missed even that opportunity for withdrawal of support.

Now have a look at the wheat situation. Prices of wheat have been increased. Every Member here expressed his concern for the farmer and assured the latter of his support. The farmers were then getting Rs. 4.15 per Kg. as price of wheat. The Government purchased wheat from abroad at the rate of Rs. 6.50 per Kg and sold it at Rs. 7.50 per Kg. in other words that way it earned just double. At that time I wrote many letters demanding some facilities for them. A number of farmers in our area are amazed to see what is being done. The people are not getting the quantity of wheat which they are entitled to get under the Public Distribution system. If this policy is not changed then there will be problem. At long last, this line of argument was understood and the government deemed it proper to raise the price of wheat by rupee one and now it is being heard that it propose to raise the price of wheat from Rs. 4.15 to Rs. 5.15. Now the situation is that there is no Government with adequate powers to take any decisions. Under the circumstances, the poor farmer and the poor worker in the country will feel cheated and deprived.

Whenever I think of politics in this House, I come to feel

[English]

'Politics thy name is uncertainty'.

[Translation]

Political situation in this House is quite unpredictable. Nothing can be said with authority. When we get elected to this House, our only concern is how to gain power? How to take over reins of power and how to perpetuate our rule in the belief that unless reins of power are got hold of, the people cannot be served. This thing has made its way into our mind. Therefore, once we are elected to this House, we think for power, whether it be with a 15 parties combine or by taking all and sundry along, but we must get power. Make someone Prime Minister for four months and then opt for someone else to make him Prime Minister for another 15 months and then bring him down from the position of power. That means politics has become a game to be played with...  
(Interruptions)

It was under these circumstances that the Hon'ble President invited us to form the Government as the single largest party. Our strength was 193 with one ideology. On the other hand, there are fifteen parties, and above all there are the CPM and the Congress. The other day, hon. Mr. Azad, he is not in the House, has said that they are sitting in the centre. I said to him why they are

there. Now that they have preferred to be in the centre foregoing both the other options, what can we do! We have no solution for this problem. It happens in politics, this game is played in politics. It looked as if the BJP people have developed cold feet and in their heart they feel that if they do not hold the reins of power then BJP will sweep the elections thereafter with no chance whatsoever for them to come to power again. This fear is uppermost in their minds. This is the reason that such things are said in the House and such a thing has happened in the country's politics.

There is nothing to worry as to who can be secular and who can be non-secular. Whoever is born in this country is a citizen of this country. If they have such feelings that only someone belonging to them can be secular, otherwise he is a Hindu, a Muslim, or a Christian, then it is nothing but misplaced attempts to perpetuate their rule by creating dissensions here and there. Who is then going to think of the people? 50 years have gone by.

[English]

This year we are going to celebrate the golden jubilee year of our Independence.

[Translation]

What method are you going to adopt? Will it be by pulling down the present Government? What is all this happening? Our country is united, what games, in what manner and with whom are we playing. This game is not being played by them. Who is going to loose his life? None other than the people of course regarding whom there is no decision here.

Sir, the economic resolution has been moved. It should have been debated here. Necessary amendments should have been made therein, if required. If there were some suggestions to be made, these should have been made. I have to submit that even after seeking the economic resolution through, this House was still to continue till 9-10 May, if the Congress, through a Notice, would have conveyed three or four specific reasons for withdrawing the support to the present Government, then we could have appreciated this move. It should not been like as if suddenly it occurred to somebody in the party at some point of time and then all the partymen gathered and started crying that they all stand united. When they meet us outside the House they admit that they have been landed into such type of situation. Nobody has told them, they are not in a position to face the elections as yet. If I am prompted, I will disclose the names of persons who told me like this.

A question has been raised here by me regarding gas connections and telephones. When I raised this question here, no fellow Member here stood up to support me and later on, 400 Members went to the Speaker and requested that they want to get their LPG and telephone quota. Why they fight shy of speaking here? What is this House meant for; Members are elected to this House

by the people. If you have no fear and want to speak honestly whatever you want to, then speak out your mind here irrespective of the party, anyone of you may belong to. I wonder what has happened to Shri Somnathji that he and his party have preferred to support the Government from outside and pull it down when it does not act according to their advice. They cry hoarse over remote control while themselves holding one. ...*(interruptions)* We too have remote control, therefore accustomed to it. We do admit that we have adopted this policy. We do not indulge in talking one thing while the reality is different. If you go through the country's politics as has been practised now a days, you will find that rule through remote control has been there in the past too. Was it not the remote control of Nehruji or of Indiraji for that matter? Whether Mr. Rao did not exercise his remote control. If it was really not there, then please be frank enough to say that here. I am putting the question to you, please answer that... *(interruptions)*

Sir, the ultimate stage in any party is that of the remote control. Today's stage is one of remote control irrespective of whether it is Sita Ram Kesri today reigning supreme in the Congress party. I would like to speak it out today that the reins of power are being held these days not in Lok Sabha, but in the Rajya Sabha. He had said that he would go to the people but it was not to be, and he got elected to the Rajya Sabha. Similarly, Shri Gujral is also a member of the Rajya Sabha. Does this mean that there is some conspiracy. This is against the spirit of democracy. This government believes in remote control. The members of that side feel that they may be deprived of the chance to get a ticket next time if they violate the whip now. But we do not apprehend any such thing from our party. We are true to our party... *(Interruptions)* I was repeatedly asked whether our party would oppose Deve Gowdaji. I told them that when the Congress with a strength of 142 members and the BJP with 160 members are opposing him what is our say. We are helpless. Today the BJP did not say anything even then Shri Somnathji says that the Congress and the BJP have joined hands and would form the Government. On the other hand he says that they would work unitedly. I would like to tell him they should first learn to trust each other. We trust each other. If we had anything in our mind we would said so earlier. About UP I have said that if you walk out from here we may not help you there. I believe that we should categorically putforth our point. It is not good to conspire and manipulate things and blackmail the people. This is not the way to rule the country. Lot has been said in this regard there. Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri Sharad Pawar spoke a lot on this issue. They have spoken at length on 28th May and 11th June also. Ram Vilas ji had also said lot many things then but as soon as he became the Railway Minister he started appeasing the members of various political parties. He says that he is concerned

about Maharashtra but in fact he is not really concerned about the State. This is a fact. But we are still happy. But if you weep we would be sad. Don't think that we would help you today when the time has come to weep because this is politics. If you want to remain in politics, you will have to take steps for the welfare of the poor and provide benefits to those living below the poverty line. This Government should not think that it is only the party which is safeguarding the interest of minorities and SC/ST. We should not try to create conflicts between the communities. We should spread love among them. I am happy when this party fights for the rights of Muslims in the country but when innocent people are killed in the bomb blast engineered by ISI, it should be condemned by every quarter including Shri Banatwalla. This is what pains us sometimes.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up. Your time is over.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR: Yes Sir, I am just concluding.

*[Translation]*

I thank you for giving me some more time. If they run the country in this manner it would be good. They are not our enemies. India is a country of many religions and communities. We have Muslims, Christians and all other castes. We have elected to this House then why do you say that we are communal and you are secular. If we are communal then you are also communal. Today every party promotes a particularly community. On the face of it they say only our party is communal. What type of communalism is this? If you want to say something about this, come out openly against it. We do not talk of any particular community or region. We believe that whosoever works against the interest of the country, he is our biggest enemy and we will never forgive him. We will never forgive those who have been guilty of bomb blast or belongs to the ISI or says anything against this country. All those people are our enemies who do anything which is detrimental to this country. The United Front has learnt a lesson today... *(Interruptions)* I had said this on 11th June and I would like to quote ... *(Interruptions)* If you keenly go through the newspaper only then you will come across it. I had warned the UF Government that "they should rule the country happily but they should save themselves from this party". Did not I speak the truth at that time? Shri Chandra Shekhar and Shri Charan Singh ji

16.00 hrs.

both had experienced how the Congress ditched them. Even Kanshi Ram has got the similar experience. He fought the election in UP with the Congress alliance. He had asked the Congress to withdraw the support from

[Shri Madhukar Sarpotdar]

United Front in case the latter does not help them but the Congress did not listen to him and they will never listen ...*(Interruptions)*

We have said lot of things about the reservation for women. If there is anybody who had opposed the appointment of Mayawati as the Chief Minister of UP, it was the United Front. The opposition was made because Shri Mulayam Singh did not want this to happen. Now the interest of the party are not supreme. It goes more by the whims and fancies of a particular individual like Mulayam Singh. The interests of the country are supreme. It does not matter what Mulayam Singh and Sarpotdar and Vajpayee ji likes or dislikes. Ultimately the BJP and Shiv Sena had to act in UP. The ruling party says that we have trapped Kanshi Ram but you have trapped 15 parties. The basic thing is credibility but the ruling party has not given this prerogative to any party. This injustice can not be done. I know that the Congress fears the elections. I hope that some internal arrangement would be done

[English]

We are not going to declare the elections. We are not going to the Hon. President and tell 'dissolve this House and let us face the elections'.

16.01 hrs.

[COL. RAO RAM SINGH *in the Chair*]

[Translation]

If this happens we would welcome it but we know that this will never happen. Some understanding would be reached. They may sit against each other but ultimately there would be some consensus. We do not know whether Gujralji or Paswanji would become the Prime Minister. If Paswanji becomes the Prime Minister we would definite help him but he should not merely laugh but do some work also. I do not know what will happen at 7 p.m. today. Every member will express his opinion. I was just now telling Shri Atalji that we are lucky that we have been elected for the Lok Sabha for the first time and we have got the opportunity to vote three times on the confidence motion. There are eminent people in this House like Shri Indrajit, Shri Somnath, Shri Chandra Shekhar and Shri Atalji who have been here for the last 30-40 years and we had the opportunity to know how they work.

It is unfortunate that whenever some issue is raised here Somnathji diverts the attention by saying that the

Babri Masjid demolished on 6th December 1992. It seems that something has fallen on him. This is not the way. The Muslims have forgotten Babri Masjid and there are many Muslims who do not know anything about Babri Masjid but on the other hand Shri Somnathji does not want to forget this. He is deeply pained over this incident. Acharia ji please console him and try to make him understand. Only you can make him understand. That time is over. What will happen in future it is to be seen.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA (Bankura): How can we forget that day?

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR: We will see what will happen in future. If wise people like you come to the House we will definitely arrive at some decision. You should come with an open mind. This tall claim of being secular does not carry any weight. Nobody is secular. Every person belongs to some caste and he never likes to leave it. We never believe in this and we will work for the country, that is our slogan. When the slogan of Mandal Commission was raised Shri Bal Thackray had said that instead of implementing Mandal Commission, attention should be paid to the plight of the poor and those living below the poverty line, to whichever castes or creed they may belong. In spite of this there is nobody who can make them understand. We are labelled as communal whereas we are being exploited in its name. The people of this country have awakened and they have seen you in your true colour. Whatever you have done during the last 10 months it is because of that two confidence motions have taken place in this House and this is for the third time that a confidence motion has been brought here. Today the country has not only heard you but also watched you. When the members will visit their constituencies they will be taken to task by the electorate but we can explain to them that we have done no wrong today. The Deve Gowda Government will fall today and tomorrow but we have not been a catalyst in this move. We have always been praising him for his good work. People say that the biggest mistake that Deve Gowda committed was that he met Shri Bal Thackray and as the latter is communal the Prime Minister had to go. I would like to ask did the heavens fall after this meeting. Did late Indira Gandhi not meet Bal Thackray. Recently, in the Municipal Elections in Nagpur Congress is reported to have supported the Shiv Sena. You can ask the people of Nagpur whether there is any fact in this. There is no congressman who has not met Shiv Sena leader.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Congress and the ruling party talks a lot about Gandhiji but unfortunately his statue is

standing near Parliament gate in the scorching sun. I would like to ask whether Gandhiji would have approved of the corruption at high places and position of authority. The slogan today is that you may indulge in corruption to any extent but keep on repeating the name of Gandhiji time and again. Today the Members of the ruling party are at each others neck and slitting each other throat. The Minister of today do not have any values. They do not believe in what Lohia believe. Today the ruling party is full of Ministers like Mulayam Singh and Beni Prasad Verma.

Shri Ram Vilas Paswan is also a staunch supporter of Lohia but he should bear in mind that the progress of country depends on carrying everybody along and not only the Dalits with him. During the last 50 years of Congress Rule in the country the people have become Dalits. He should become the leader of these Dalits ...*(Interruptions)* So far as BJP is concerned, their number has swelled from 2 to 86 and today they are 162. In future, they will be 260 but we have never adopted the wrong path. They have been going steady and straight and have never tried to trap anybody whereas the ruling party believes in politics of trapping. You would be on the right track if you leave the politics of entrapping.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I hold Mr. Indrajit Gupta in high esteem whosoever went to him for help he heard him patiently and helped him. We want people who fulfill their commitments. We want a Minister of Home Affairs like you. You go everywhere with the same spirit. You remain the Minister of Home Affairs and govern the country...*(Interruptions)* I have said in the very beginning that I oppose this motion. I said so in the very beginning so that I may not forget to say so. But Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi did not say anything whether he opposes this motion or favours this motion. He left everything to his friends. He has talked very big. He has tried to misled the House that Congress has done so many good things. We want to give him thanks.

I would like to request you that don't give such an opportunity to anybody in future. If you want to work, do it without deceiving anybody, and support with full determination. If you want to deceive any body don't deceive him in the very beginning. There is no time for passing the Women Reservation Bill. It can be considered in the next session. Jenaji has succeeded in this regard. Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav was speaking on the one side, Shri Deve Gowda was speaking on the other side and Smt. Geeta Mukherjee was speaking on the third side. Seeing running her in this old age I thought she would do something concrete to save the honour and rights of women but no body listens to her whatever was

to be done, is done. What did you get Mr. Deve Gowda even after doing so much good work? You worked with everybody with a smile and you tried to please everybody. But still you were deceived because you did not perhaps understood them well. In future I hope before taking any decision you would weigh all such things as to who are your real friends and would stand by you.

With these words I thank you and the entire House and I again oppose this motion.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN): Mr Chairman, Sir, after ten months this Government headed by Shri Deve Gowda is again seeking vote of confidence in its favour. I firmly believe that this House will vote in favour of the motion of confidence.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, people like us born in poor families had never thought that we can become village chief even but this is a Democracy where Ram Vilas Paswan, born of poor parents, has become the Minister of Railways and a man like Deve Gowda who was born of poor peasants family has become the Prime Minister of the country. It is all because of the democracy. I do not know whether the foundation of democracy is being weakened or strengthened by the work which we are doing. We are here since 1977. When I won in 1977 we had to face another election after a period of two and half years. Again when we won in 1989 we had to face another election after 15 months and today also the way the politics is going on, we may have to perhaps face another election. I have heard my friends saying that the past debt has not yet been paid how we will face the next election? Therefore, I would like to ask whether we are weakening or strengthening the very foundation of democracy. Even after serving for ten months as Minister of Railways if somebody calls me a Minister of Railways it appears to me as if they are calling Mr. Jaffer Sharief or Mr. Kalmadi and not me. I have never considered myself as Minister of Railways or member of the Government, which is called the Government of India. We are trying to discharge those responsibilities to which we have promised and are committed. We have repeatedly said that we are not bothered whether the Government may survive or not. We had been in Gaya some days ago. All of our colleagues are here. In our political life whatever is the duty of the Government towards undertaking developmental work we have fulfilled that irrespective of party affiliations. Neither our Government nor Shri Deve Gowdaji has ever considered such things. If any body or any leader or worker from any political party can prove that we have worked with biased attitude towards any political party we are ready to bow and surrender before them and I am proud of doing that. Today all the members of the House belonging

[Shri Ram Vilas Paswan]

to various political parties are sitting mum with tears in their eyes. They do not want to dismiss this Government but they are compelled to do so. Why this situation has arisen? What is the reason behind it? The proceedings of this House are being telecast not only in India but throughout the world. The entire country and the whole world want to know as to how this situation has arisen? Sontosh Mohanji have we ever said that we are sitting here to govern this country permanently or forever? While we were in Gaya and Ranchi the Reporters of Newspapers asked us as to for how many days this Government will survive? I told them that I don't know because we don't have majority. A match of cricket is going on. It is of two types, viz. one day matches and five days matches. We don't know we are playing a one day match or a five days match. My duty is to make runs and to save the wickets but we will go on serving the masses. Our government survives or not, we are not bothered. We would be bothered only when we would stick to the chair forgetting our duties. We are not worried for survival of the Government. We are most worried because of the fact that this is the third vote of confidence. One of our colleagues Shri Ajit Singh is not here. He has come contesting two elections and may have to contest for the third time. Three elections in one year means elections after every four years. Have we ever ponder over as to wherefrom the poor men will bring money for contesting elections and if he doesn't have money he will go and seek money from outside and if he arranges money from outside will he be able to serve the poor well?

Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have come to join politics. What for politics is there. I fully understand that politics means power. I am also aware that power is inherent in politics and power is like a twine edged sword capable of causing fatal damages to oneself and to one's opponents as well. The important thing is for whom you make use of this power. So power in itself is not a bad thing. But the important thing is for whom you wish to make use of this power. We repeatedly say that national interest is paramount to us, then comes the interest of party and an individual man. But a country can never progress if personal and parochial interests take precedence over the national interest. Today I don't hesitate to say that here personality cult is paramount. Personality cult is mostly prevalent in Asian Countries. You go to America. We have seen so many Presidents of America and Prime Ministers of Britain but personality cult is found most in Asian Countries, which shows that somewhere aristocratic mind is supreme and we are biased and prejudiced. Mr. Jaswant Singh has rightly said that when you take a decision ignoring the national interest it is improper. There is a saying about it—'If you make jackal the leader of lion he would win the battle but if a sheep is made the leader of lion he would lose

the battle.' Therefore, I would like to say that it is a sad day for the country. The post of a Prime Minister is something very big. It is above party politics. It should not be changed frequently. Deve Gowdaji is our Prime Minister, he is leader of the United Front. Rajesh Pilot is present here. Shri Narasimha Rao is also present here. Can anybody raise an accusing finger towards Deve Gowdaji? But still they insist that Deve Gowda be changed, leader should be changed. But why? We had earlier implemented the recommendations of the Mandal Commission. Shri Jaswant Singh had said that differences are there.

Only ideological differences are there. We have some differences with the B.J.P. Of course they have some differences with us also. But neither they nor we hide anything. We don't have individual differences. When we implemented the recommendations of the Mandal Commission, we did not hide anything from them and they too did not hide anything and ultimately our Government had to go. When Babri Masjid was demolished there was a demand that Shri Narasimha Rao should go. But he was not changed. When our Government was there and Parliament was in Session you could have asked the President to dismiss our Government by withdrawing your support because the Parliament was again to recommence with effect from 21 April. We never said that we are in majority. So you could have withdrawn your support then.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, through you I would like to submit that they wanted to withdraw their support on one pretext or the other. We have not to say anything against that. If you want to impose elections, if you want to bring economic crisis in the country, it is upto you. We don't want to utter anything. About 90% M.Ps. of Congress Party don't want to fight election. Same is the percentage on that side and same is the position of MP's on our side. But still if you want to have elections, we don't mind. If we are forced to fight elections we have to fight. There is no option. But still I want to say one thing that people had sent us for five years. Therefore neither you nor we wish to fight election of our own volition.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit through you that a person holding the office of the Prime Minister is also the leader of the country. Whenever he visits Russia or any foreign country he represents the whole country. He takes care of the country's interest and whenever he talks outside he keeps the interests of the whole country in view. So you make anybody Prime Minister, he is the symbol of the country's pride and dignity. So you can't expect a Prime Minister to work on party lines and you cannot ask him—that he should commit to do certain things which are against our national interests. Therefore, a Prime Minister does not belong to any particular party but he represents the whole country whenever he goes abroad.

Since our childhood we have been studying, listening and seeing that whenever our Prime Ministers whether it was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, V.P. Singh or now Shri Deve Gowda visited abroad we always wished that our Prime Minister should not lack anything confidence-wise and personality-wise. But if Indian Prime Minister is daily asked that we are withdrawing our support, can he function as Prime Minister with the same degree of confidence? I want to ask from you Mr. Rajesh Pilot. You are my good friend. Swamiji is my good friend. Every time during day and night we are in each other's contact. Nobody, even the top leader, knew that letter was being drafted to withdraw the support. Every one was in his constituency. Sharad Pawar was busy in his constituency. He says he knew nothing about the letter. Madhya Pradesh people say that they also did not know anything about the withdrawal of the support. Who knew it? Such a big decision was taken but you are defending it. Even, today, if you say that it was a mistake and since it was order of the high command, we had to comply with that then we can understand your helplessness but instead of saying it, you are defending the same again and again. You are trying to raise old issues. The newsmen used to ask us as to what is happening inside? We merely would say that we are discharging only our duties and we also do not know as to what is happening inside. I had clearly expressed my ignorance as to what had happened yesterday. I had merely said that the party, which is supporting us, is a part of our body and we would work for checking the wrong deeds in future. We never did anything with prejudiced feelings. They failed to allege us with any charges of corruption. We would have understood their point, had they alleged charges of corruption against Shri Deve Gowda or Shri Ram Vilas Paswan or any other Minister. But without any significant reasons they have withdraw this support. We all have been fighting against the corruption and we have launched a campaign against it. During the last 10 months, no body could raise his finger at any of our ministers. No minister has been changed with any kind of corruption. All institutions are performing their duties. CBI are performing their job. Let me know as to who has been spared by CBI? Whose house has not been raided by CBI? Whether CBI are not searching the house of Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav who is in our party? Whether CBI did not raid the house of one of CPM leaders? Kalpnath Raiji is sitting over here.

The public interest litigation has been allowed and now anybody can file suit against anyone in the court and the court will monitor the case. Do you expect us to go to court and start interfering? Do you want us to interfere in the CBIs functioning? These are the individual institutions and each of them is discharging its duties very well. Where did you start from? You started with the question of ideology. First, you said that you would

form the Government but then your MPs started saying as to how do you propose to muster the required support? You are having 138 members, we have 192 and those people have got 204. 204 is a different goal and 138 and 192 are also different goals. You have got only 18 members then how did you say that you would be forming the Government? What was there in your mind? Did you think that United Front is a weak conglomeration which can be broken so easily?

On the very first day, when the constituents of UF met together, we said that

[English]

"We are like a rock under the leadership of Shri H.D. Deve Gowda."

[Translation]

Right from the very first day we have been saying that we are like a rock under the leadership of Shri H.D. Deve Gowda. You say that you have got the know-how to break that rock. I do not know as to how do you propose to break it.

I would say that we can have differences with each other but that does not mean that we should abuse each other. During our school days whenever we learnt that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was coming to our town, we would bunk our classes and went to listen his speeches. But, in case, we are having differences today with each other, does it mean that we should start abusing Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee? Politics, at least, must be dignified to some extent. We have been the anti-Congress people right from the very beginning. And the fact is that even during the emergency period, we were with BJP and we spent time together in jail. During the tenure of V.P. Singh also when BJP extended their support to the then Government, we were having no objection thereto but the incident which took place on December 6, 1992 hurt us very badly and we have failed to forget that incident. In the backdrop of that incident, whenever the issue of secularism is raised, you and we, both, come together and join hands with one another to defend the secularism at any cost. But on the one hand you say that in case elections are held, the number of BJP seats will go up and on the other, you are pushing the country towards elections. What is this? You are saying to change the leadership. Is it ever possible? Today, as the leader of the party, I do say that under the leadership of Shri Deve Gowda, the country has made economic progress and we have given a clean administration during the last ten months. No communal riots or caste riots took place during his tenure. India's reputation in foreign countries and our neighbouring countries has improved significantly under the leadership of Shri Deve Gowdaji. Deve Gowdaji is a deserving Prime Minister. There seems to be no

[Shri Ram Vilas Paswan]

reason to disown Shri Deve Gowdaji. We will live and die under his leadership. I want to make it very clear today that whatever we have to do, we will do that only under the leadership of Deve Gowdaji. Do not have any doubt in this respect. ... (Interruptions) Had there been any ideological difference, I would have certainly asked you to take whatever steps you may like but since there is no such difference, why are you talking like that?

Just now Shri Chandra Shekharji made references about India and Pakistan. We present Railway Budget every year. Every year we are paying Rs. 68 thousand crores as interest to foreign countries. The budget of the entire country is of Rs. 1 lakh and 80 thousand crores and for one-third amount we are paying as interest. Whether Deve Gowda is responsible for it? What kind of war India and Pakistan are waging today. Today there is no danger to us either from Russia or China or from any other country. But India fears danger from Pakistan and Pakistan fears danger from India—this is a permanent danger for both countries. These two are spending a lot of money on procuring weapons and where do they get it from—from only one country. There is only one country which supplies weapons to these two countries. Can either of these two countries take a decision to destroy each other with atom bomb—is it ever possible? Neither we can destroy Pakistan with atom bomb nor Pakistan can destroy India with atom bomb. Even seven cycles of birth will not be sufficient for this purpose. With the amount of money which is required for purchase of a tank, we can open a number of schools and hospitals. Our villages do not have drinking water. We do not have adequate money to provide irrigation water to our farmers and impart education to our people. We have not got adequate medical facilities. But in spite of it every year we are spending thousands and crores of rupees in the name of Indo-Pak war.

Shri Chandra Shekharji has rightly said that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are the children of same parents. But today in case something happens to Pakistan, they would start abusing India and if something happens to us we would start abusing Pakistan. Why is this? Can not there be a friendly relationship between these two countries? If Arab-Israeli, East Germany-West Germany and European countries can be united, why not India and Pakistan? Why should there be no initiative in this regard? We took the initiative by organizing four day's meet between the Foreign Ministers of these two countries in India. But you withdrew your support exactly at a time when their meeting was going on. In spite of this, you claim yourselves to be secular. Oman's Sultan is on his visit to India and you are withdrawing your support. The conference of the Foreign ministers of 70-80 NAM countries was held on 7th and 8th and now they are coming to India, so, could not have you waited for a few

days more? I was not aware as to what was going on inside your party?

The Parliament was to resume their work by the 21st of April but you did not wait till that time. Had you waited till that time and then moved the No Confidence Motion, the heaven would not have fallen down. Now several things are coming into our mind like as to why the date 30th March was chosen to ... (Interruptions)

SHRI YELLAIAH NANDI (Siddipet): The time was auspicious to topple the Government.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: What kind of auspicious time and what for?

Sir, I, through you, would like to say as to what wrong our government have done? Probably, the wrong which our government did was that it conducted elections in Kashmir and no body could say that these elections were not free and fair or we have shown any bit of partiality in favour of any party. Elections were held in Punjab and Uttar Pradesh also but no political party accused us with charges of any manipulation in the elections. We allowed the democratic process to function and allowed the parties, having majority, to form their own government.

Similarly for the first time I am feeling today that wherever I go for example, day before yesterday I went to see ailing Biju Patnaik in Escorts Hospital where I was surrounded by doctors who expressed their unhappiness over your this move—No body, whether he is an intellectual, mediaman, middleman, Dalit, SC/ST or belonging to minority or any section of the society—is happy over your decision of withdrawing the support. Every one is saying that this is a wrong move. I am happy to think that in case Ram Vilas Paswan or United Front has to go to polls, we will be going with our heads high with pride that during the last 10 months neither we deceived anyone nor we have done any wrong things. We have done justice to all sections of the society. Today we are not in a defending position, rather they are.

There are three things which are required in politics for doing anything. And these are—a leader, an image and an issue. Do you have got any issue to raise before the people? With what issue will you go to people? Will you go with the issues which you have framed yourself? With what image and with which leader you are going to the people to contest the elections? Will you say to people that due to your personal matters, you have forced the Government to hold the elections? Therefore, I request you people repeatedly that all of you are very senior leaders of this House, so, before going to elections think over it time and again. This is my humble submission to you. To consume poison in a fit of anger is very easy

but that is never a solution to any problem. To jump down from a five-storeyed palace and say that you are heralding a revolution by doing so does not mean that you are really heralding any revolution, instead you are committing suicide. He is hopeful of his own benefit and BJP is hopeful of its own benefit. It does not matter if you call them communal ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): What happens if one jumps down from a tractor?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Well you may call them communal but if a bed-bug bites you then will you kill that bed-bug or a lion? When a bed-bug bites, kill that bed-bug and do not go in search of a lion to kill him. *(Interruptions)*

Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi has just now said one thing. We used to see and talk with him off and on ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: We understood about the weak people but who is stronger?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: We would like to tell Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi about one thing that he should leave aside old points such as who was communal or who was secular, whom we should have supported and whom we should not have supported. Sarpotdar Sahib has referred to Dr. Lohia. We are as staunch followers of Dr. Lohia as the others. We have been remained together. We too have learnt the lesson of socialism. But we would like to say only one thing. If you see the current struggle, you would find that national interest was involved some where. That was to be looked after. On the one hand you declared Shri Mulayam Singh a secular in one breathe and on the other hand raised objection as to why such and such person tried to form the Government. We did not want to go into it. But when something has been finalised and the BJP and the BSP have already formed a coalition Government, what is wrong there. It has been said that I played politics in the name of 'Dalits', as Shri Sarpotdar has also said. But I would like to say that I did not indulge in politics in the name of Dalits. I talked with reference to the politics of the country. According to Shri Lohiaji, the importance of ideology was greater than the blood-relationship. The Ultra who was a revolutionist sometimes became orthodox. Therefore, we were waging an ideological war. The significance of an ideology is greater than the blood-relationship. In this country, every person, irrespective of his caste and religion talked about Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar. But whom Baba Saheb adopted as his mentor? He considered Budha as his mentor Budha did not belong to Dalit or backward communities. But he believed in

socialism. That is why he uttered:

"Budham Sharanam Gachchami  
Sangham Sharanam Gachchami  
Dhaman Sharanam Gachchami.

In the same way, who was Vivekanand? He was Kayastha. He had asked the capitalists and the people belonging to forward castes to shift your rights to the people belonging to backward classes. Otherwise, when these people would rise, they will throw them out of power. Similarly, think about Shri Dayanand Saraswati. He was Brahmin. When he started fighting against hypocrisy and generated awareness among the people against superstitions he was given poison to consume. Shri Dayanand Saraswati was a Brahmin who made him consume poison. In the same manner, who was Gandhiji. He was Vaishya. He was not shot by any Muslim or Dalit. He was assassinated by Nathu Ram Godse. Therefore, our's is an ideologies war of we do ask whether you are Brahmin, prove as Budha, if you are Kayastha, show as Vivekananda and if you are Vaishya, do as Gandhiji did and lead the nation ahead to a new path. This is our ideology.

I did not want to speak on this motion. The next election will be held. We will again contest the election and the combination will remain the same. In the process if their size goes down, our number will increase and if our size reduces, their number will increase. In the whole, the result will remain the same. The country has to move and face the same music. Therefore, I am not rising to make allegations or counter-allegations. The sentiments of the House will be honoured. Everybody knows about our efforts which we have been making during the period of ten months. Uma Bharatiji and I do not belong to the same party. But she has the same respect for Ram Vilasji as she is having respect for the BJP.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much time will the hon. Minister take?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I am concluding. The hon. Prime Minister has explained about the achievements of the Government. He may also tell us something more in this matter. I am explaining my point. Shri Sharad Pawarji is sitting here. I know if you had been bold, this crisis would have resolved. Your own MPs do not agree with you. I don't know whether they express their resentment to you or not. But your own MPs feel aggrieved with you. You were not here. All people have said the same thing. Shri Chandra Shekhar has particularly said that when you reside in Maharashtra, you prefer to remain in the style of Chatrapati Shivaji. But when you come in Delhi, it is not known which style you adopt. That is why you have still the opportunity. You can pull the chain even now. Therefore, I would

[Shri Ram Vilas Paswan]

appeal, once again, to every member in this House that keeping in view the present prevailing condition in the country, do not forget that for tomorrow we may have to face yet another economic crisis. Political crisis is a different thing. Forget the past. But in case some economic crisis arises in future, you will be held responsible for the same. We become member of this House after having been elected by ten lakh people. After winning the election we become representative of the ten lakh people of our constituency. Thus, we, the MPs, are representing the whole country, therefore, whatever decision you take, you should take in the interest of the whole country. Take into account the picture of the country while deciding any matter. Your every decision should be taken in the interest of the country but the decision, you have taken on the date 30th, is not in the interest of country at all. Also no party is going to benefit from this decision. If elections are held, you are most likely to be the loser. It will expose your position. This decision is neither in the interest of the country nor any party. And if it has been taken to serve someone's personal interest then I would say that nobody's interest is above the interest of the country. Therefore, rethink your decision and save the country from this prospective national crisis even during the eleventh hour. With these words I beg to lay on the Table of the House the Motion of Vote of Confidence.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN (Mumbai-North East): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion of Vote of Confidence in the Council of Ministers laid by Shri Deve Gowdaji. At the beginning of my speech deliberately I am telling you that I am going to oppose it because so far many members have delivered their speeches but as of now it is not clear as to how many of them are going to oppose it and how many support it. Hence I want to let you know that I am on my legs to oppose this motion.

Just now Shri Ram Vilas Paswanji has finished his speech. I do not want to ask as to why has he gone outside. One has to go outside after chain pulling. (Interruptions) He is expecting Shri Sharad Yadav to pull the chain. (Interruptions)

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: Six months' imprisonment is awarded. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: You have said just what I was going to say. Shri Sharadji, after remaining in power for ten months in such a critical situation, I doubt that the Prime Minister is mentally prepared to continue for another six months. That is why your request will not prove to be beneficial. A number of motion of confidence have come up in this House till now. No-confidence motions have also been moved here. Heated debates have been witnessed here. But such a situation has never been witnessed during motion of Confidence-No confidence because the person who is seeking confidence

of the House doesn't have any faith in himself. He doesn't have faith in his own members. When he does not have faith in his own Members and he intends to get the vote of confidence with the help of others and this has created delusive situation in this House. That is why the Prime Minister has moved a motion of confidence. Certainly we had expected this as Hon'ble Jaswant Singh had also stated in his speech that the Prime Minister should have explained it in detail that as to whether such a situation arose when he has come up with the motion of confidence? As to whether H.E. President asked him to move a motion of confidence? But the Prime Minister in his speech which lasted for half an hour, has nowhere said as to whether he is seeking confidence of this House? He even forgot to formally request this House to express faith in him... (Interruptions). I would not blame him for this because he knows everything... (Interruptions)

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: He said this in English.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Because the Prime Minister knows that the matter of confidence is not being decided in this House and the same is being decided outside this House and he has started his speech without having knowledge of what is actually going on or it is also possible that he might have kept all those things in reserve to utilise the same at the time of answering the debate. Probably his counter blast would be hundred times more furious than our during his reply to this Debate on Confidence Motion and then he would let us know as to why he has brought this motion. But apart from his speech, I have heard other's speech also but no body has referred to this problem in his/her speech. No body could muster the courage to touch this point clearly. Gujralji delivered a good speech on our foreign policy. Whether we do agree with his foreign policy or not but one thing is clear and that is when I was listening his speech, I felt as if he was speaking on demand of grant of Ministry of External Affairs rather than confidence motion. He dwelt on issues pertaining Pakistan, NAM and touched other important international issues but he did not speak anything on the current political crisis due to which we have assembled here together.

The Prime Minister dwelt on his achievements. He said that after six years we have cleared the issue of Interstate Council. But there is no relation between the current political crisis and the Interstate Council. If, at all, you wanted to speak about any council, you should have let us know as to what happened in the Steering Committee, Negotiating Committee etc. Today's crisis is the result of your Steering Committee and Negotiating Committee—formal and informal—respectively. Why are you wasting our time today by referring to Interstate Council and National Development Council? You should have let us know as to what has happened in the Steering Committee but you did not say anything in that respect. Neither he has named Congress nor he has said anything

about the letter of withdrawal. The way he spoke, it looked as if nothing has happened. He read out one line confidence motion and said few things about the council of ministers and then sat down. If the Prime Minister asks for passing of Confidence Motion in this way and Shri Chandra Shekhar expects that his Guruji will accept that, I do not think that is going to be done. Moreover, he himself has not asked about this, though Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi has tried to ask indirectly as to why we are opposing the Confidence Motion but till the situation is made clear it is not necessary to say something just in the dark. I was listening to his speech and I felt

[English]

It was a bunch of contradictions.

[Translation]

You have appreciated Shri Mulayam Singhji and have said that

[English]

He is the builder of secularism in UP.

[Translation]

He feels that Shri Mulayam Singh is a great man and is the biggest secularist in India. He further said to Shri Deve Gowdaji as to why he did not allow Ms. Mayawati to become Chief Minister. What poor Deve Gowdaji will do? He does not have even seven members in UP. After holding 70 rallies in Uttar Pradesh, his Party's Members of Parliament has come down from 28 to 7. What can he decide. That is why Mayawati could not become the Chief Minister ... (Interruptions) Therefore one is surprised to see the fighting. Mayawati should have become the Chief Minister with your support because Congress and BSP both have fought election jointly.

16.55 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

We too had toured the State. We have listened to Shri Kesri's speech that if they do not support them they will withdraw the support from the Central Government. Now who has prevented them to do so. The entire world knows that it is Shri Mulayam Singh who had cooked spokes in the ways of Mayawati becoming Chief Minister. Congress could not gather courage to stop Mulayam Singh from during this. After all

[English]

He is the builder of secular UP.

[Translation]

If the poor Deve Gowdaji is losing from both sides. How can we help? We also have suffered a lot. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi was saying that we have suffered a lot for years here, now you should also suffer. Now you have stated that we made Mayawati, the Chief Minister, what was the reason. You are also talking about replacing her after 10 months. The quarrel is over 4 months only. You are also talking about replacing her in 10 months only. Which promise of Narasimha Raoji is being kept. You have not even kept the promise that the next Prime Minister will rule for 5 years. You are also replacing him after 10 months. At least we have openly stated in the Press Conference that they will rule for six months and thereafter we will rule for six months'. Whatever the fact was, we said it openly, we brought it into the notice of the people. You didn't state in your speech that you will think about the result after 10 months or nine months and accordingly you will take the decision. Whatever we said, we said it deliberately therefore only we made Mayawati the Chief Minister of the State. Only we people have tried to find out a way to solve the problem of Uttar Pradesh. You could do nothing.

Sir, I have heard that Farooqji has been praised and at that time he was also sitting here. It was stated that Farooqji must win the election in Kashmir. Then I asked my friends from Kashmir whether Congress is not contesting the election in Kashmir, whether they have given him support from outside only and said to fight the election yourself and get elected. It is for the first time in the history of Jammu and Kashmir that they secured very less number of votes and seats. When you contest against Farooqji then how Deve Gowda will save Farooqji? You please tell me the main reason for it. Now I will tell you what President of Pakistan, Shri Leghari has said. He said that we cannot say anything about our party President. It means you cannot say what the Party President has said. It means, when you cannot take the responsibility of the statement issued by Party President, then how Deve Gowda can take the responsibility of Leghari. I am unable to understand it. We are unhappy with what Leghari has said in 'Khaleej Times'. Whatever he has said it is condemnable. The way it appeared in 'Khaleej Times' may it have been denied later. If it is so, it is wrong. But it did not relate to any individual. At that time you were saying that the member of United Front Farooq Abdullah of National Conference has said in Chindwara Public Meeting that one-third of Kashmir should be handed over to Pakistan ... (Interruptions) Now you are sitting in the Farooqji's house and taking decision about it and that's why today it was published in some newspaper that why the negotiations have failed. It was said that they have selected the wrong place. First time, you have meeting in Farooq Abdullah's residence and

[Shri Pramod Mahajan]

there no one can cross the line of actual control. Since there was the line of actual control they could not cross it. You had a second meeting at Sharadji's residence, there it was the case like fence-sitting, if positive is taken how can they expect that decision would be taken... *(Interruptions)* I felt that if that agreement was to be succeeded then you should atleast ask Vajpayeeji, BSP and Kanshiramji about this ...*(Interruptions)* you might get a way out from there. I want to say that he stated in his speech that one-third of Kashmir should be handed over to Pakistan but a resolution was passed by the Parliament of India unanimously to take back the one-third of Pak-occupied Kashmir. The Chief Minister of Kashmir himself is saying that one-third of Pak-occupied Kashmir should be handed over to them and you are praising such a statement. You are trying to tell us that what is in the interest of the country. Shri Priya Ranjan Das has asked Shri Deve Gowdaji to read out an article published in 'Ganashakti' untranslated. Shri Somnath da also read it, but he did not agree. Now even Shri Somnath da is not listening to Jyoti da.

17.00 hrs.

He has stated in his speech that those who have become communal, who will fight against them—Indian National Congress? He has named 10-5 states. I was looking at the Map of India. I felt it is right. He had named Maharashtra, Rajasthan—It is all right. But than I realised who is contesting against whom in Kerala, in Andhra Pradesh, in Karnataka, in Tamil Nadu, in Orissa, in Bengal, in Assam, and in Tripura? Indian National Congress is contesting against whom. Is it contesting against us?... *(Interruptions)* You will be nowhere in the next elections. So please do not bother about your future... *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not interested in their internal politics. As the matter has been raised in this House, we are suppose to say a word about it, otherwise one is the ruling party and the other is a supported party. The Government has been formed with their support. Now they have withdrawn the support. It is their internal dispute. Since they have brought the matter to the House, we are here to give our comments, otherwise we have no interest in your internal dispute. You want to give support or not, only you will have to decide it. But it is difficult to understand the politics which you are playing. If all the Ministers are good than what does your letter shows. In the letter, you have not spared even a single Minister of United Front. You have not given any credit to United Front, not only this, I was surprised to see the letter written by you. In your letter to the President you have written that due to their non-cooperative attitude, you have lost election in Punjab. What can the President do? You lost election in UP and also in Punjab, but what

it has to do with your withdrawal of support from the Government. If you would have join together, even than Akali Dal and Bharatiya Janata Party were so strong that you would have lost election. But you are asking the President about what is happening in UP.

*[English]*

They are not helping us politically. We are losing all bye-elections. They are not helping.

*[Translation]*

What has the President to do with this. You are losing the elections. You look at the draft. Sharad Pawar is looking, he must do so. I am stating what is written in letter.

*[English]*

Sir, I would save the time. They say that in Punjab, Haryana in the series of bye-elections, the United Front failed to work together with the Congress to contain the forces of political communalism. What has Rashtrapatiiji to do with this?

*[Translation]*

It is a compromise for elections, who compromises with whom? It has nothing to do with the Motion. Priya Ranjan Dasji is feeling drowsy... *(Interruptions)* No body feels sleepy in this House, everyone thinks/contemplates. Mr. Speaker, Sir, he felt sorry that he is losing from both the sides. Jaswantji has deceived him so now it is not good on my part to deceive him. I can realise his condition. United Front Government is in power with the support of Congress Party. They have supported United Front, otherwise, it could have stand no where. They had given them support but what these people had said. One of the leader said, "If you withdraw the support, you will be beaten up. I know it is not a parliamentary expression. But if a leader says such words then what can we do? One member had stated in Karnataka Legislative Assembly, "If you have courage than try to withdraw the support" and one of leader had said,

*[English]*

You have a choice—United Front or Tihar Jail. The choice is yours.

*[Translation]*

Is it the way to ask for support? I can understand your disappointment. We had also given support to V.P. Singhji so we can very well understand your problem. Now you are making appeals and praying, then why did you say so earlier.

In fact it was not a communal rivalry. If BJP had been communal 10 months back, then still it must be a communal party. We have not changed our stance so far but, you two have join hands on the sole issue of communalism. Now you are about to split, what lead you to this juncture, which you consider more vital than your so called communalism. But it should be conceived in mind by the United Front that they should treat them properly as they are extending you their support. A new name has been added to the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha case which had not figured in this case. If a charge sheet is made against a senior leader, naturally that will create trouble. Someone has subscribed money to the party, not in a suitcase but through cheque. He should not have subscribed money by way of cheque. That company was on the brink of liquidation. therefore that should not have paid such a huge amount as subscription. It was illegal, that's why the subscribers houses were raided. It is really a matter of sorry. A contribution of Rs. 3 crore was made to the party from outside the country through a draft.

[English]

No suitcase, no hanky-panky business and nothing under the table.

[Translation]

A draft was sent from Singapur which did not bear the name of the sender as per the practice in the banking system. Mr. Chidambaram asks about the name of subscriber. It is a party which has given them support and he has a right to ask them as to whom it should be given. Certain parties were asked to furnish their accounts but some parties did not maintain accounts and the Congress failed to submit accounts in line. It so happens, as it is a supporting party. You could have preponed or postponed it by 2-4 days. They have been supporting you for the last ten months but even then you assess a tax of Rs. 24 crore on them. There is no income for the last ten months and the tax has been assessed at Rs. 24 crores. There goes an adage in the Indian polity, that is 'Don't ask for accounts, whatever we say trust that as the truth'...(Interruptions). You have served a notice on them on the charge of having disproportionate income. No body asked them to furnish accounts for the last 25 years and now you are asking them to submit accounts. Now who is to be blamed if they feel annoyed? Congressmen are not speaking at all, therefore I have come to their rescue. Their people were entrapped on the charges like murder, dacoity or corruption. Everybody cannot move the Supreme Court like Mr. Advani. Only a few leaders have that much guts. They don't have. One should be courageous like him. When allegations were made against Shri Advani, he offered his resignation and told that he would not attend the

Lok Sabha till he is cleared from the Court. Well, the annals of history would reckon that he maintained the sanctity of his membership and was later acquitted by the court. He will again join the Lok Sabha. You expect them to behave like BJP. If you cannot do so, at least treat them in the same manner as they treat you. Now it is said that

[English]

Law will take its own course.

[Translation]

How things will continue like this. You are occupying Race Course and sending him on course. How can it go on like this?

SHRI SUNDER LAL PATWA (Chhindwara): It is for the first time that you have made Mr. Rao smile?

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, please do not take it lightly, this is the bone of contention which started right on the very day this Government came in power. You are making it a communal issue such as the incident of 6th December. They are keen to give us a certificate that

[English]

(on) the 6th of December, 1992, the BJP was hundred per cent secular.

[Translation]

At least give us this certificate. Someone should rise to say that we were non-secular on 6th December. Oh, but you are born secular, whereas we are non-secular, as per you. When it comes to Janta Party or when one wants to create strife between the people of a country,

[English]

we are the whipping boy of Indian politics.

[Translation]

You stake the violence and level allegation on us. After all what we have to do with you? They say, according to you we were communal on the 6th December, but not before that. Mr. V.P. Singh is an eminent leader, firm on his principles. During his struggle in 1989 in a public gathering in Mathura he had asked to remove the BJP flag as the purpose was to defeat the Congress. But he sat on his chair after making the speech as he wanted to avoid confrontation. When they needed our support, they came during a meeting of the National Executive of BJP in Parliament Annexe and asked us to give up secularism and to support them. Anybody's support works in this country. Just now you heard the speech of Shri Somnath Chatterjee wherein he said that they could not support Congress, but of course they could seek support from Congress. If the man himself

[Shri Pramod Mahajan]

is bad, then what what has to do with him, everything should be clear cut in a bargain. Good to take, bad to give; how it will go on like this. When we people had extended support to you in 1989 only then you could run that Government for 18 months. At that time you did not recall this fact. At that time somebody said something about Mandal Commission. I remember that very well as at that time I was in Rajya Sabha. On 7th August, 90, the PM had given an assurance in the Rajya Sabha which was debated in that House but not in Lok Sabha. Have you forgotten as to why Mandal Report was made. On 9th August Mr. Devi Lal had thrown a challenge in a rally and just to divert this alternative Mandal Commission was put forth. By that the issue of social justice was not in the fore. That day by the good fortune of BJP, I was the first BJP speaker to extend support to Mandal Report on behalf of BJP, we still welcome it. We offer maximum number of seats of Chief Minister, MLA and MP to the SC-ST and backward people... *(Interruptions)*... You people talk of Mandal Commission (MC). We withdraw our support in face of the onset of the struggle for Shri Ram Mandir and secondly it was to mark our protest against the arrest of our party's President, we are not the type of people who do not reckon even for a minute or two and just withdraw their support from the PM in crisis or those who do not think much while wreckoning the political career of their Party's President. Ours is not that sort of party. We are just proud of the withdrawal of our support. At least Shri Chandra Shekhar will decide as to which fact sounds reasonable, one pertaining to Ram Mandir or the other pertaining to two constables. At least try to decide it. It was Indiraaji who had brought Shri Charan Singh in politics

[English]

worst outside support.

[Translation]

It, however, continued for 17 months with our support. Rajivji gave support to Chandra Shekharji whose regime lasted for 4 months. We saw three governments which lasted on an average for 7 months. I felicitate Mr. Deve Gowda for running the Government for 9 months with outside support. Nobody could do that and with the result we had to see governments with an average age of 7 months. Why the Congress withdrew its support three times. There was no visible reason for this in respect of Ch. Charan Singh's and Shri Chandra Shekhar's governments and what can be seen is the self interest. Therefore withdrawal by BJP cannot be equated with those by Congress. It was based on principles. We could have done that, had we desired so. Now we have seen the outcomes of the support from outside and have become cautious while deciding whom to give outside support. The Congress has not learnt anything from that outside support, neither they want to learn anything from that. Nor Shri Chandra Shekhar wants to learn anything from that. Mr. Deve Gowda is your friend. Had you told him about your experience, he would not have taken

oath to the Premiership. But unfortunately that happened. It is not a communal rivalry. The Home Affairs documents are with me which show Statewise incidence of communal riots in Hindustan during 1996. In Maharashtra where communal harmony is being praised most by the Shiv Sena-BJP alliance, seven times rioting took place. During the most secular Government in Bihar 24 rioting incidents took place... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna): It is wrong. We challenge the veracity of figures. You prove the authenticity of your data... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: I hope the Home Minister would listen to the people standing beside him and bring improvements in the situation.

Yet another communal government is there in Rajasthan where only once communal rivalry took place. There is a secular government in Madhya Pradesh where 40 incidents of rioting took place. Once rioting took place during the communal government of Delhi. The most secular government is found in Kerala where 34 times rioting broke out. These data are not my fabrication. This has been given by Home Affairs and it indicates that there is nothing such as Communal or non-communal in this issue. We may agree or may not agree but there is no need to spoil one cheeks by shedding tears on the fate of UF Government of the PM.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: When rioters are themselves in power, then how the riots can breakout?

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: If it is so place us in power and remain riots free. It is one of the device for averting possibility of riots. I have heard this thing several times.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the very birth of this Government has been quite piquent. Yesterday I heard on TV and today read in newspapers that 13 parties are going to issue whips to their Members. However, I do not know whether the whip has been issued or not so far, as it is a partisan affair and it depends on the sweet will of the party concerned. I was thinking as to who would issue the whip. To whom and how? Then I was reminded of Mr. Khalap. He is still secular. About a year back one agreement was signed between Maharashtra Gomantak Party, BJP and Shiv Sena. We contested in the election and tried to make him the Chief Minister but in vain because he himself has lost in the fray. Now he has turned secular and as far we—staunch communal! Well, it goes on like this. There is nothing new in our case. I wondered as to who will issue the whip of Mr. Khalap to 13 party's members and how? I thought his right hand would write down the whip and then handover to his left hand. This is how this Government has been formed. I thought Sis Ramji would issue a whip to Satpalji and Satpalji would reciprocate that with yet another whip of

his own. Because those who use to issue the whip has joined the Congress and he had to sit this side. Now Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari is not on this side. To whom he will give his whip. I want to give a small example. Mr. Khalap is sitting here. Recently one Indian delegation had visited China under the leadership of Shri Khalap. I too had joined that due to your kindness. Now a days the outside world wants to know about the upsurge of democracy in China. The time has changed. Earlier the delegation of the Communist Party of China used to come here on the invitation of the CPI but now they find there comrades of no avail and no more interested to continue relations. They too were keen to develop closeness to the party rising on the political horizon of India. That China bound Indian Parliamentary delegation comprised of Shri Ramakantji, Shri Sriballav Panigrahi and many other Members, including Members of Rajya Sabha as well. There some of them asked us as to how our democracy was functioning. Infact, they have a parliament and the mode of election, entirely different from that of ours. Ramakantji was our leader. He was my old acquaintance, so he asked me to explain the working of our government. One of their M.Ps. asked me as to how is your democracy?

[Translation]

I told them that I would give him only the introductory details in this regard.

[English]

I am Pramod Mahajan. I am a Member of Lok Sabha. I belong to the single largest party and I am in the opposition.

[Translation]

The Chinese were left looking aghast.

[English]

Is your party, the single largest party? I said, 'yes, we are the single largest party in the House and we are in the opposition.

[Translation]

Then I pointed out to Shri Sriballav Panigrahi and told them

[English]

He belongs to the second largest party. Though he is outside the Government yet he is supporting the Government.

[Translation]

Then I pointed towards Shri M.A. Baby and told them that

[English]

He is the third largest Party. He is inside the Front but outside the Government

[Translation]

and then I said,

[English]

He is Mr. Ramakant Khalap. He is the only Member of his party and he is in the Government. Mr. Chairman, Sir, now when we have a Government with such piquent birth, then you or Sharad Pawar or anybody can pull the chain of the running train may be that you charge Mr. Deve Gowda because he is a leader of 42 parties. Search the leader of even more smaller party and make him the Premier. Then one day the country will see a Prime Minister having no party of his own. In that new trend the man with smaller number of supporters will have better chances for Premiership than the one having larger number of supporters. Well, a neutral man will not indulge in irregularities. Even after this experience the Congress wants to test another party, well, I have no objection to that. But, that will not solve the matter. The truth is that the UF is anxious to continue in power whereas the Congress is scared of justice and these two factors have put them in a coalition. Why we should have any mercy on the UF, formed with 13 parties, like Sarkaria Commission... (Interruptions) whether one or two parties breakout of this 13 party coalition... (Interruptions). This Government has misused article 356 and this very Government slashed our Government in Gujarat despite the fact that our Chief Minister enjoyed the majority and had already proved majority in the legislature. Did he show any mercy at that time... (Interruptions) We were the single largest party in UP.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Not in Majority.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: You had no members, yet you are asking about our majority. Instead of beating about the bushes, go and look for your members. One without a single member is asking of our majority. Four are sufficient for you. That's why there political turmoil has even been confined to opposition of the BJP Party. Like Chandra Shekhar cried out to Shri Jayprakash Narayan for help, you are crying out for help saying 'my mentor come to my rescue'!

Abuse first and then ask for help! Only you are capable of doing that, not we. We can't tolerate abuses and then extend our support as well.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now what will happen to the budget. It is their concern to think of solution of this crisis. After all you are in power and not we. We are not suppose to pass the budget. That's your business. Why you are after us. First think and then come here. Jenaji you say that you don't have to pass that. CPM and Congress

[Shri Pramod Mahajan]

say we don't have to pass that. Then why do you blame BJP. BJP can do anything in the interest of the country but that should not be construed as our madness. It is not that any one asks for anything and we may give him that. We are not seers and medicants. Vishwa Hindu Parishad is with us that does not mean that like ever tolerant sadhus we may extend support to this budget. I am not dwelling on the budget. Should we support the declaration of Mr. Chidambaram and the ads in the media that Cars, AC, Cellular phone etc. are to cost less.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, they are not worried about the Crop Insurance which, otherwise, we could have appreciated. Therefore we do not see any need to extend our support to it. Mr. Somnath is a stalwart in the leftist parties. Right prior to coming here I had told you that I had nothing to say on this hypocrisy. This trend is continuing since even that Congress support is needed. If it continues like this, then I don't think any thing will come out of it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now Shri Somnathji made a mention of Sitaram Vajpayee. He is such an eloquent speaker and has got the award of the Best Parliamentarian which has added to his grace. He did not say so just by mistake. He is not that bad speaker that he may forget suffixing Kesri with Sita Ram and Vajpayee with Atal Bihari. I know he is a very good orator, an eminent lawyer and a Professor of law teaching in a law college. But Sita Ram Kesri says Deve Gowda Vajpayee. In both of these name Vajpayee is common. This way he wants to show that Vajpayeeji is a villain, whereas the people hail him as a great hero, a national hero. Whatever attempts you may make, all will prove futile. Why do you get together Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi and several other Members have delivered their speeches. All of them asked to refrain from the intra-conflict and to share the income mutually. Otherwise, they will come to power. Your real fear is BJP. If BJP will win, it will be with people's mandate. It will not win in the elections by confining to urban areas only and through manipulations. The people of India want to install Shri Vajpayee as their Premier. Well, however strong bonds you may develop among yourselves and whom so ever you make you mount horse, your government cannot continue for long. We are not worried. You have created the present crisis and you know that if you go on functioning in the same manner as you did during these 10 months and indulge in irregularities then the people will know your reality. It is only our party which can give a standing government in alliance with our friendly parties under the Prime Ministership of Shri Atalji. Now, we will make a claim for providing a viable government. Well, even if you succeed in solving the present crisis today, even than you will have to go to people for their mandate and that time we will enjoy such overwhelming majority under the leadership

of Shri Atalji that even if you join hands, you will not be able to stall our government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with these words I oppose this motion.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, may I remind the House that the decision taken in the All Party Meeting was that the debate should be concluded by seven o'clock so that the Prime Minister can start his reply after that and that the voting could take place by eight o'clock? I think, still a very long list of speakers, very important speakers indeed, is there. Therefore, we will have to be very careful about time.

May I request all the speakers to please keep in mind that much time is not available to us?

Mr. Shivraj V. Patil, please.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL (Latur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will abide by what you have said and I will be very very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I am standing here not to criticise any person or any party but to give expression to some of the thoughts I have with respect to the situations which have been arising in our country and which need to be solved.

17.30 hrs.

[SHRI P.M. SAYEED *in the Chair*]

This House is supreme. This House is the apex organisation in our country and the hon. Members who are sitting in this House are very wise, very experienced and have a vision which can really help the country. That is why it has become necessary for us to find out what are the real problems and to find out what are the real solutions to the problems. If we commit a mistake in finding out the real problems and if we commit a mistake in finding out the real solutions, I am afraid that the individuals will suffer, the parties will suffer, the people will suffer, the country will suffer and also the system will suffer. That is why I think that we shall have to find out as to what kind of problems have been thrown up in the course of this debate.

If I have understood the debate correctly, one of the problems which has been thrown up in the course of the debate is whether we should have an election immediately or not. The politician should not be afraid of elections and if it is absolutely necessary we should certainly go to the people and come back with the verdict. But, is it correct for a country like ours which has a population of

95 crore of people to hold the elections every year? That is the most important question which has to be answered by us.

In my opinion, most of the Members, whether they belong to this party or whether they belong to the Opposition parties or whether they belong to the ruling party or whether they belong to the supporting parties, I think—this is my view—that they do not want elections. And if they do not want elections and if the people outside also do not want elections, should we create a situation in the House in which it becomes necessary for us to hold the elections? That is the most important question which has to be answered by us. In my opinion, this question should be answered by us on the floor of the House. It is not enough to say that this is the problem and not to find a solution to that problem. It should be within our power. It should be within our capacity to find a solution to it. Why do we find a solution to this problem difficult? In my opinion, we find the solution difficult because many of the times, we have acted not on the basis of a principle but on the basis of some bias we have in our mind and some sort of a hatred.

We have heard the speeches. And what is coming out of the speeches is anti-Congressism, anti-partyism, some partyism or anti-this-section of anti-that-sectionism. If a hatred of this kind is there, it will be very difficult to find a solution.

On this problem, my simple request, suggestion and appeal is that it would be necessary for the leaders of the parties to sit together and find a solution and to see that there are no immediate elections. If elections are there, whether we like it or not, *willy nilly*, per force we shall have to go back to the people and we shall certainly go back to the people not with a heart which is hesitant and frustrated, but with boldness we will go.

But the time requires and the situation requires that we should avoid the election. It is not for one party or the other, it is for all of us to see that some solution which is acceptable to the majority and, if possible, to all the people in the House, is found and that solution is applied.

What is the second problem which has been thrown up in this debate? That problem is touched upon by one or two Members. I think Shri Somnath Chatterjee and some other Members also referred to it. Shri Pramod Mahajan also, in his witty and good speech, referred to it. If the Government continues, there is no problem of passing the Budget. But if the Government does not continue, then the question is whether the Budget can be passed or not. The knowledge that I have of the procedure tells me that there shall be no difficulty in passing the Budget. If all the Members in the House

want that, the Budget would be passed. There would be no technical difficulty in passing the Budget. If the Government continues, certainly, there is no difficulty. If the Government does not continue, even then, if the Members want that this Budget should be passed, there shall be no difficulty in passing the Budget. There will be no technical difficulty in passing the Budget and we can find a solution to it.

The third problem which has been thrown up and which has been discussed is the stability of the Government. Unfortunately, for us, in the last ten months, it had become necessary for us to have three Confidence Motions. In ten months' time, we had to have three Confidence Motions. It is an irony that that which cannot be done under the rules, we are expected to do. And that which has to be done under the rules is not being done. There is a provision for No Confidence Motion but there is no provision for Confidence Motion and yet we have created a situation in which we have to come before the House asking for the expression of Confidence in the Government. I am not going into the technicalities and legal aspects. But the fact that for three times, we had to come before the House seeking for the confidence of this House in the executive is a fact which has to be borne in mind by all of us and we shall have to find a solution to it.

Four years back, in 1993 I had said that no party would come back to this House with a majority and would be able to form the Government. I was asked, 'why do you say all these things and why are you frustrating us?' And the situation today in 1997 is that there are three groups and these three groups are equally strong. If two groups do not join hands, no Government can be formed and the situation is that because of this, the Government is not stable. Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Shri Jaswant Singh and I think Shri Ram Vilas Paswan also said that if we hold the elections now, we are not going to have the majority for any of these parties. This is a prophecy. This is our assessment that no party, even after the elections, will come back with a majority. Generally, the situation that prevails now will be the situation that will prevail after the general elections. Now if this is the situation, is it not necessary for the hon'ble and wise Members of this House and this Parliament to find out a solution, that, even in a situation like this, there is something which gives reasonable stability to the Government? There is something which will not require us to go back to the people every six months, every one year or every two years asking for their votes.

It is also said by Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Shri Jaswant Singh and some other people who come from the Congress Party also said that it seems we are in an era of coalition. If we are in an

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

era of coalition and if the coalitions have not worked in the past, should we not find a solution? Should we not find a device to see that a coalition Government is formed and works. We had a coalition Government of Shri Morarjibhai as the Prime Minister. We had a coalition Government of Shri V.P. Singh as the Prime Minister. We had a sort of a Government by Shri Chandra Shekhar which was not actually a coalition but supported by the Congress Party. All these three Governments could not last for long. They could not complete their terms and this Government is also not completing the term and we are going back to the people. We are in a situation in which we shall have to find some solution either to go back to the people or to compromise with one another.

If this kind of situation arises, is it not necessary for us to find some solution? Is it necessary for us to depend on a system which has been brought to this country, lock stock and barrel? Till this time when the great leaders were there, when the ethos of freedom struggle was there, when the ideologies were there, the Governments were stable. Panditji's Government was stable. Shrimati Indiraji's Government was stable. Shri Rajiv Gandhi's Government was stable. Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao's Government was also stable. But these coalition governments could not be stable. If the coalition governments are not stable and if the coalition governments to be formed are not going to be stable, should we not find a solution to it? This question has to be answered by all of us. This is the immediate problem. I am sure that the leaders of different political parties will sit together and solve that problem. But can we push this long-term issue under the carpet for too long and if we push it under the carpet for too long—and see what happened in a country like Soviet Union happens here—then what is the result of it? If the coalition Governments do not work and if we have to hold elections every now and then, what happens? That is really the question which has to be answered by us.

Some people ask: 'what is the solution to this problem? What can we do to solve this kind of problem?' One of the solutions which is given here is a Presidential form of Government and whether it is suited to this country or not has to be decided by all of us. If it is suited, let us have it, if it is not suited, let us not have it. In some countries the Presidential form of Government has worked, but in many countries it has not worked. As far as Soviet Union was concerned, it has not worked. So, the question is whether in a country like ours where there are many religions, where many languages are spoken can we have the Presidential form of Government and successfully work with it? In my opinion, we can do something to the parliamentary system also and we can provide a sort of reasonable stability. The question is: what kind of device can we have in the Constitution of

India to provide a reasonable stability to the Government that would be formed?

In my opinion, the system of having a positive Confidence Motion is there where the Chancellor is not removed by passing a No-Confidence Motion. The Chancellor is removed by passing a positive motion in favour of a person who is not a Chancellor. And when a motion of this kind is passed, the previous Chancellor goes. That has provided stability to Germany. There are some countries in which the Prime Minister and the Ministers are elected by the elected Members in the House and once they are elected, they are not removed by simple majority or not even by absolute majority from their positions. Their Constitution provides that there should be a special majority to remove them from their positions. Supposing, a two-third majority is required for electing a person and for removing a person, then that kind of device can give a reasonable stability.

What I am trying to suggest before this august House is that the Government should be absolutely accountable and responsible, which the Government is today. For every small thing, the Government can be held responsible, by passing a one rupee cut motion we can pull down the Government; by not passing a Motion thanking the President for his Address we can pull down the Government; by passing an Adjournment Motion we can pull down the Government; and by passing a No-Confidence Motion by a simple majority we can pull down the Government.

What is this simple majority? In this House of ours having 540 and odd Members, if there are a hundred Members present in the House and fifty-one Members vote in favour of the No-Confidence Motion, the Government has to go. It is altogether a different thing that in a situation like that all the parties will see that the voting is done according to the basis of the strength that they have as parties in this House. That is a different thing. But the question is that it is a simple majority. So, I am suggesting that something of the nature which can give more stability, should be done, it is not enough to see whether the present Government works or goes; it is not enough to see that the present Budget is passed or not. The Government has to work; if it continues, it continues; if it does not continue, we can have another Government. If we have to pass the Budget, the Budget can be passed. But the problem of having a Government which is reasonably stable and more stable is most important.

And if you do not solve this problem when there is the time available to us, the future will blame us. We are the persons who are sitting in this apex body. There is no body which is higher than this body. There is no body which can provide a solution to the national

problems of this nature. And if we are closing our eyes to these long-term issues and the problems and are trying to tackle only the day-to-day problems, laughing at each other, hating each other, trying to spread the malaise against each other and not trying to solve the long problems. I do not think that the country or the posterity in this country will excuse us. I had to make a submission of this kind.

As far as Shri Deve Gowda is concerned, I find it very difficult to blame him. He has found himself in a difficult situation and the situation has to be tackled. In solving that problem, all of us have to support and help each other. Even Shri Deve Gowda has to support and help, the situation has to be helped. The situation is difficult. The electoral mandate which is given is difficult. Somebody is saying that it is in favour of this thing, it is in favour of that thing, against this thing or that thing. These are not the real assessments of the situation. If you say this is correct or that is correct, that is not correct. But it is difficult to blame any person. The situation is difficult and we shall have to find a solution, and I hope that this august body will find a solution which is in consonance with the wishes of the people in this House and which is in consonance with the wishes of the people outside the House also.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise for the second time in ten months to support the Motion seeking a Vote of Confidence in the Council of Ministers headed by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda.

Ten months ago, I spoke with a sense of pride, a sense of vision, a sense of the future and, if I may say, a sense of achievement that this august House with 544 Members had correctly interpreted the mandate of the people. Today when I rise to speak, I have a sense of achievement, I have also a sense of pride, I have also a sense of what the future holds. But I must confess that there is also a terrible sadness in my heart that this Parliament, this House is being led to forget the lessons of an electoral verdict and led to misinterpret and distort what the people decided ten months ago. I will explain.

The governance of this country is not an easy matter. We have all been in Government at one time or another. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was a distinguished Minister for External Affairs for nearly two to two-and-a-half-years. We are all in Government in one State or another. There is, I believe virtually no party of any consequence which has not been in Government or which is not in Government or which does not aspire to be in Government. In fact, electoral politics is based upon the aspirations to govern—govern as representatives of the people of this country.

The governance of India, as I said, has not been an easy affair. Immediately after independence Sardar Patel faced a very complex situation—how does one govern India with over 600 pockets of feudalism, 600 pockets of sovereignty. Yet he managed to integrate India. Yet he managed to make the Indian map a whole map, not a map full of holes.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru enjoyed not only the overwhelming support of this House but also the overwhelming love and affection of the people of India. Yet, he had difficulties in governing India and these difficulties became very acute in the early Sixties and, in fact, in the last days of his Government it became obvious that the Congress Party led by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru faced considerable difficulty in carrying the process of Government.

More than at any time before, the governance of India is a difficult matter. In May, 1996 the verdict of the people of India came. It was a complex verdict. How does one interpret it? Take my friend Shri Pramod Mahajan. Ten months later he continues to interpret it in an exclusive manner, in a manner that excludes large sections of the people. In fact when Shri Jaswant Singh opened the debate I thought he was reading a page from Dale Carnegie's book *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. When Shri Pramod Mahajan spoke I thought he was influenced by the title *Mein Kampf*. Is this the way to interpret the mandate of the people? We cannot be exclusive parties in India. We cannot exclude others in the process of governance. The fault of the B.J.P., if I may say with great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, the failure of the B.J.P. is that despite distinguished individuals who wish to rise above this principle of excluding others, the party as a whole still sends out the message that it will exclude large sections of the people in the governance of India.

How did we interpret it? When I say 'we', how did the Members of the Benches here and the Members of the Benches there interpret it? We interpreted it by sitting together and asking ourselves: 'What is the need?' I mean no disrespect to anyone.

I was blooded into politics in the Congress party. How can I ever forget that what I am today is what the Congress Party made me? But the verdict said that the Congress Party had lost its moral authority to form the Government this time—not for all time to come. In May, 1996 the Congress Party lost its moral authority to stake a claim to form a Government. This is not the first time that this has happened to the Congress Party. It happened to Rajivji in 1989 and he accepted it with great equanimity. It has happened before in 1977. The Congress Party, to its credit, accepted this lesson and then said: 'Is there anyone in India, are there any other parties in India, is

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

there any combination of parties in India which will come forward to carry the agenda laid down by the Congress Party, with, of course, changes brought about by the changing political situations?

Sir, it is in those circumstances that the regional parties came together. Let us not caricature governance in India. Let us not ridicule governance in India. It has not been easy for the gentleman who sits in the seat of the Prime Minister of India to hold together regional parties, to hold together national parties and to hold together a large number of individuals.

In fact, I do not envy his task at all. Today, the real power has travelled down to the people at the grass-roots. Let us go back in history. How and why did the Congress Party lose its dominant position in various States? I come from a State where the Congress Party lost its dominant position. Why? The Congress failed to recognise that power was travelling from the upper classes, from the upper castes, from the richer sections to the people in the villages, to the intermediate castes and to even the castes which were at the bottom of the so-called social ladder, to the very poor people, to people who did not have jobs, to people who did not have property, to people who did not have incomes, to people who did not have a voice until then. As power travelled downward and downward as it should in a democracy, the Congress Party lost its dominance in many States. The regional parties were better able to reflect the aspirations of the people. This explains the rise of DMK and AIDMK in Tamil Nadu, Telugu Desam Party in Andhra Pradesh, AGP in Assam, the Akali Dal in Punjab and now, the Haryana Vikas Party in Haryana and many parties in Kerala. I will not name them.

You go round India and you will find regional aspirations and that the regional leaders, leaders close to the people, leaders of the grass-roots reflect better, interpret better and more accurately the wishes and aspirations of the people. If you wish to look for a recent example the best one is the National Conference in Kashmir. For years, they were hounded by terrorists. For years, their leaders were not allowed to address meetings in Kashmir. Yet, the party which had not participated in parliamentary elections, when it came to participate in Assembly elections, the people voted the National Conference to power. My appeal not to Shri Jaswant Singh who, I think, understands this better but to Shri Pramod Mahajan, who refuses to understand or is unable to understand or is unwilling to understand and willing to play the role of what I call a stand-up comedian, is 'do not ridicule the governance of India, do not ridicule the governance by regional parties'.

Ten months ago, a combination of National parties, CPI(M), CPI, the Janta Dal, which still have a spread

over many States and a number of regional parties came to form the Government. The agenda of this Government was based on a few principles. I think that Shri P.R. Dasmunsi articulated all of them and I am sure that all of us share it. The agenda of this combination was first based on the fact that it is a democracy. We are not going to hand over power to anyone except this House. We want to show that this House works. We are going to demonstrate that 544 members belonging to different parties can still provide a Government. Let us not miss that element while we emphasise some other element. The first principle is democracy. The second principle is secularism. It is not in the order of merit. I am simply listing them. It is not that the first principle overrides the second.

I still remember the speech delivered by Shri Chandra Shekhar when he became the Prime Minister as one of the most eloquent speeches I have heard in the Parliament. This country can be nothing but secular. Can this country be anything but secular? Can you imagine an India with one religion, with people belonging to one religion? Can you imagine an India with people talking one language? Can you imagine an India of people abiding by one model, one code, one rule? It will still be a country, but it will not be India. The India that we know is home to many religions. The India that we know is home to many languages. The India that we know is home to many cultures.

**18.00 hrs.**

That India which we claim to govern can only be a secular India. If you try to impose uniformity, if you run against the principle that has governed India for 40 years namely, 'Unity in Diversity', if you replace that by a uniform code, be it a political code, or a religious code or even a civil code, you will destroy the India that we have made independent and you will destroy the India that we love and cherish.

The third principle which, I think, goes beyond secularism is pluralism. We are a plural country. We must recognise that there will be differences. In fact, we must recognise that it is a matter of great surprise that for 40 years these pluralist aspirations did not come to the fore. In India with 975 million people there will be plural views. What I object in Shri Pramod Mahajan's speech is his refusal and his inability to accept that pluralism of India.

Sir, as I said, there are regional aspirations. India is too big a country to be governed from Delhi alone. India is too complex a country for a Government in Delhi to say 'thou shall do this and thou shall not do this.' India can be better governed and India can be more efficiently governed, as we have demonstrated in the last 10 months, by devolving power upon regions, upon the

States. Finally, and this, I believe and I would appeal to my Congress friends, the most important element that has come to fore in the last 10 months which is being written into the conventions of our Constitution is that India can be governed only by a spirit of cooperative federalism and India cannot be governed by a dominant Central Government.

Sir, what have we done? Whatever you will say, in the Chief Ministers' Meetings, in the National Development Council Meetings, in the Inter-State Council Meetings, Chief Ministers belonging to the BJP, the Chief Minister belonging to the Shiv Sena, Chief Ministers belonging to other parties have come together and have shown a degree of non-partisanship which, I am afraid, I do not find in the Benches of the BJP today. I applaud those Chief Ministers. I salute those Chief Ministers. We have held, if I remember right, three Meetings of the Chief Ministers, we have held two meetings of the Inter-State Council, we have held two meetings of the National Development Council, we have held Meetings of Power Ministers and meetings of other Ministers. Please search your memory. Can you show one discordant voice of any Chief Minister that what the Prime Minister did or what was presented as the consensus of those meetings was not correct? Did one Chief Minister stand up and say that this Government at the Centre is ignoring us or disregarding us or treating us unfairly? Not one Chief Minister in one meeting spoke in that voice.

My humble submission is that the Governance of India, in future, cannot be a governance by just a Council of Ministers in the Centre, it can only be a governance where the Council of Ministers in the Centre carries with it the Chief Ministers of the States. For the first time, we have recognised that the Chief Ministers do not have a right and obligation only to rule their States, they have a responsibility and an accountability to share in the governance of India, to share in the governance of this country.

Sir, how have we translated all this? We believed in the devolution of powers. We said so in the Common Minimum Programme, we have said that Centrally sponsored schemes must be transferred to the States, we have said that more money must be given to the States. I took pride in my Budget Speech when I said that I saved Rs. 2,500 crore in the Central Plan. I did not use it either to cut the fiscal deficit or to spend it on some other plan scheme of the Centre. When I saved Rs. 2,500 crore in the Central Plan, I willingly gave an additional Rs. 2,500 crore to the State Plan. I mentioned humourously that if I had robbed Peter, the Central Government, it was only to pay Paul, the State Governments.

We have taken an enormous step forward by saying that 29 per cent of all the revenues of the Central Government and of all the taxes will be devolved upon the State Governments. It is this governance which is in jeopardy today. I am not in a position to say why it happened. I am in no position to say why it happened and when it happened. Above all, I am in no position to say why it happened on an Easter Sunday. I am in no position to say why it happened when there was a holiday mood prevailing in India, the spirit of Easter was prevailing in India, when salaried persons were expecting their salaries next day, when the Ninth Plan was supposed to commence on the 1st of April, when Indo-Pakistan talks were taking place and when on the 7th of April, the NAM Conference was to be inaugurated by the Prime Minister. I cannot say why it happened. I can only say it leaves me, as it leaves millions of Indians, with a terrible sense of sadness.

All of us have been in our constituencies in the last ten days. What do the people say? Are they happy? Are they happy with what has been happening? Are they proud of us? Do they think that we are serving them? Do they think all the change and churning that we are doing in this House will yield nectar or will it yield poison? There is a terrible sadness in the hearts of millions of people of India.

I am not making any great boasts for this Government. This Government has been in office for ten months. The first two-three months were particularly difficult. I have shared these difficulties with many friends there and friends here. We have spoken to them quite candidly that there are difficulties. We had new Ministers, we had new programmes, we had to understand the demands of different political parties, we had to persuade Chief Ministers to join in governance. Yet since December, 1996, is there not a sense of confidence which was not there for nearly a year and a half? Since December, 1996, is there not a sense of decision-making? Have not crucial decisions been taken? Have not major decisions been taken by the Government in the Ministry of Finance, in the Ministry of Telecommunications, in the Ministry of Power, in the Ministry of Railways and in the Ministry of Labour? Have we not addressed the concerns of labour? Did we not raise the ceiling on gratuity? Did we not raise the contractual savings? A number of decisions have been taken.

It is not my purpose to recite them here. It was my privilege when I presented the Budget to highlight some of the achievements and to present the sense of the future. The Prime Minister has been more than kind to me. The Prime Minister has been more than generous to

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

me. In his opening remarks, in fact, he spent a considerable amount of time highlighting the features of the Budget that I have presented. Let me say that the Budget is not the product of the creative imagination of one person: the Budget is a compact that I make with this House and the Budget is a compact that I make through this House with the people of India. I cannot make this Budget without a Prime Minister. I cannot make this Budget without my colleagues supporting me and I cannot present a Budget with which each one of you will not in some way not be identified. I cannot present a Budget which will evoke a large measure of support among large sections of the people unless you carry the message to those people. I am deeply grateful to the Prime Minister for the generous words that he has uttered.

But governance in this country has been on the move since December, 1996. In January, we took some historic decisions. In February, we reached out to our neighbours. In March, there was a new confidence in the market; there was a new confidence in the industry and a new confidence in the trade, a new confidence among the young people of India, particularly the scientists of India, the educated people and the entrepreneurs of India. That sense of confidence was everywhere.

All one had to do was to travel in India in trains, in planes, and at the airports and at the railway stations, people walked up to say that things are moving now.

On the charge that has been made by my friend, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, and I have tried to understand this charge with great humility, is that we marginalised the consolidation of secular forces and that we marginalised the Congress Party. The consolidation of secular forces is an act of faith. The consolidation of secular forces is not a competitive act or a demonstrative act. It is an act of faith. If we believe in secularism, if the bulk of this House believes in secularism, how can the secular forces be marginalised? We may have lost an election here, and we may have lost an election there. I know that he mentioned about Chhindwara; I know that he mentioned about Punjab. Let me ask him with humility: What was the reason to create a vacancy in Chhindwara? There was a Congress member from Chhindwara.

[Translation]

SHRI SUNDERLAL PATWA (Chhindwara): Chidambaramji, you should have called me.

[English]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I understand what Shri Patwa is saying. If fate had decreed that Shri Patwa will come to this House then Chhindwara had to be created.

SHRI SUNDERLAL PATWA: I am grateful to Kesri ji.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Yes, in Punjab, the dominant Party is the Akali Dal. Let us face the fact that the dominant Party is the Akali Dal. When the Akali Dal Party—Barnala ji and others, please do not misunderstand me, this is just an expression of opinion—according to me became an exclusionary Party, it create problems for itself. But when the Akali Dal Party reached out to other sections of Punjab, it won the confidence of the people of Punjab.

Now, in Punjab, it may be that the political parties on this side, who have a base in Punjab—my Party does not have a base, the DMK does not have a base and the TDP does not have a base—could not reach out to the Congress and, therefore, perhaps, some election results came up in Punjab, Haryana and in other places which are not to our liking. But does one election result lead to the conclusion that we have marginalised the consolidation of secular forces? It is too trivial an argument to even merit an acceptance. If an argument is so trivial, the people of India will reject it.

With regard to the marginalisation of the Congress Party, if we are at fault, I have no hesitation in accepting the fault and apologising for the same. But blame everyone, blame every Minister and blame every party of the United Front. How does the Prime Minister marginalise the Congress Party, while the United Front does not marginalise the Congress party? How is the Congress party warm to the United Front, but cold to the Prime Minister? How is it possible to marginalise the Congress Party because the numbers stare in our face?

Antulayji, please remember, when you spoke here, I have nodded my head so vigorously that I may have been misunderstood by my colleagues, you said that some day or the other the Congress Party would have to find representation in the Government. A speech here, however passionately made, is not going to change the arithmetic of this House. The arithmetic of this House is quite clear. We are about 185 or 190; you are 144.

There is a proverb in Tamil.

"Neiku thonnai adarama  
thonnaiku nei adarama.

I will explain it. 'Nei' is 'ghee', 'Thonnai' is the 'container' made of the palm leaves. One of us is 'ghee', one of us is the 'container'. You cannot hold the *ghee* without a container. There is no *ghee* without a container. The container is of no value without *ghee*.

The arithmetic stares in our face and when 185 Members are pitted against 144, what is the result? One hundred and seventy seven Members make merry as if they have come to power already. Why are we making a spectacle of ourselves? Why are we making a caricature

of ourselves? Are we disuniting only to invite the B.J.P. to form the Government in this country?

Let us not make a spectacle of ourselves. If there are difficulties, we must discuss these difficulties. If there are problems, there is a method of civilised dialogue; there is a method by which people can sit across the table and say let us resolve our differences.

Sir, the marginalisation of the Congress Party is a baseless apprehension. The Congress Party cannot be marginalised... (*Interruptions*). Let me just complete it.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Will you yield for one minute? The point is that time and again the Congress has become the target of criticism. On 16th February, we changed our decision from offering unconditional support to issue-based support. But up to 29th March, none of these people had the time to come and talk to any of our leaders. And, everybody is coming and giving sermon to the Congress. They are using the Congress as a doormat. Again, you are telling us these things. You cannot use the Congress as a doormat... (*Interruptions*) Do not say all these things, please. Be reasonable.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I thought I was more than reasonable. I thought I was more than conciliatory. In the last 15 minutes, I have not uttered a word which blames anyone. All that I am saying is that the arithmetic of this House stares in everybody's face. The only way the arithmetic of this House can be converted into a Government, the only way the arithmetic of this House can be converted into governance, is for the parties of the United Front and the Congress Party to work together. I make this plea most humbly, most sincerely and with a deep sense of feeling for a Party to which I belonged for 20 years. Have I uttered a word which can wound anyone? Have I uttered a word which has hurt anyone? There is a way of resolving differences, a way which Indiraji taught us, a way which Rajivji taught us, a way which all of us have to imbibe.

I have the highest respect for the Congress Party. I have also the highest respect for the many leaders of the Congress Party... (*Interruptions*). But the only way in which we can resolve our differences is for us to work together, to sit down and to talk to each other and to find ways in which secular, democratic governance in this country is not derailed. I have said this most humbly. I do not know why my good friend Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev reacted like that. We have worked together. We speak to each other every day. We are in touch with each other. I am sure, he did not mean any offence... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: You can create an atmosphere in which we can work together again... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: That is what I am saying. I started by saying that if we are at fault in marginalising the Congress Party, I accept the fault and I apologise for the same. I said that. I started this part of my speech by saying that if we have created a feeling of marginalising the Congress Party, I accept the fault and I apologise for the same. But there is no intention because there can be no purpose in marginalising the Congress Party. How can the Congress Party be marginalised?

Let me conclude. I do not wish to make a long speech. All I say is this. This Government has been in office for ten months. This Government has moved the Vote of Confidence. If each one of the three major groups sticks to its decision, we know the verdict. It is not a verdict which makes anyone particularly happy or unhappy. I have a sense of equanimity about it. But this Government cannot be voted out because it has committed any grave misdemeanour or grave crime. This Government will have its place in history. This Government has left its imprint on the political and economic history of India.

Shri Jyoti Basu told us a few minutes ago: "Do not be disheartened." It is not that we should emulate or we can emulate what Shri Jyoti Basu did in West Bengal; it is not that we have the capacity or the qualities to emulate what Shri Jyoti Basu did in West Bengal. The first United Front Government, according to Shri Jyoti Basu, lasted for eight months. The second one lasted for thirteen months and the third Government has lasted for twenty years. Why I say this is let us learn a lesson from that. Is there a way in which we can work together so that secular, democratic governance remains the Government of this country for ever and for ever and for ever irrespective of who is the Prime Minister and who is a Minister? That is the question. That is the question which must echo in our hearts today. This Government cannot be wished away; this Government's accomplishments cannot be wished away.

*'Thakkar Thagavilar embathu avaravur  
yetchathal kanapaduvathu'.*

Those who have held the scales in a balanced manner and those who have not done so, will be decided by the deed they leave behind. I believe this Government of Shri H.D. Deve Gowda has left its imprint on the political and economic history of India. There will be a time when historians will write about this period, however brief it may be, and they will say that this Government was the first genuine coalition in India. They tried, they

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

endeavoured, they did not succeed beyond ten months; yet they have enshrined in the Constitution of India in a way that can never be deleted the principle of cooperative federalism. Historians will also say that they have written into the economic history of India certain principles which will make this country one of the strongest economies in the 21st century and that this Government gave an impetus to growth, gave an impetus to reforms, gave an impetus to social justice programmes which will make us the fourth largest economy in the world by the year 2020. I, therefore, conclude with a sense of achievement, with a sense of pride, with a sense of humility but also, as I said, with a terrible sense of sadness that an experiment, a promising experiment, should come to an end.

Let me say this. There is no full stop. Life is a series of commas; life is a series of semi-colons. There is no full stop in politics. Every beginning has an end but every end marks another beginning. I do not know whether at the stroke of 8 o'clock today, it will be the end of something. But I have no doubt in my mind that it will be the beginning of another event. I have no sense of regret for what we have done over the last ten months. We will end this experiment, if it has to be ended, in a fighting spirit. We will go down fighting. But after we go down fighting, let us join hands again to begin another chapter. We will go down fighting ... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI SUNDERLAL PATWA: Chidambaramji, you could not discriminate your friends and foes.

[*English*]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Let us begin another chapter because as I said, life is not one of full stops. Life is one of commas and political life is no different.

I am deeply grateful to you and to the Members of this House. They have been kind to us, they have been generous to us. We have served the people of this country with utmost devotion, with utmost humility, with utmost sincerity. What the future holds for us is yet to be seen. When we decide, let us not mock at the people, let us not mock at the electorate, let us not mock the electoral verdict given ten months ago. Let us re-interpret it creatively in a manner so that people will be proud of the Parliament of India.

[*Translation*]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was listening to the speech of Shri Chidambaramji very attentively. I could not understand what he wants to say. He is giving valedictory address of his Government but it seems as if he is also making a scope for the next Government. That's why he lost his way in the middle of

his speech. Who is responsible for the situation arisen in the House and in this country today. Opposition is not responsible for it. Only those people are responsible for it who have got united. When 11th Lok Sabha was constituted these people have interpreted the people's mandate in their own way and have gathered at one place. The mandate was very clear.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those hon. Members who want to go out may please go out quietly. Please do not disturb. Can those hon. Members who are standing in the way kindly go out quietly?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the general elections the people of the country had given a clear mandate and it was against the Congress Party and in favour of Bharatiya Janata Party and their supporting parties. In view of the mandate, Hon. President had invited Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji to form the Government and Shri Vajpayee had accepted his offer. But, when he moved the Confidence Motion in this very House, the people made fun of it. You should recall the speeches made by you at that time. I do not want to take the precious time of this Hon. House by quoting the speeches of those members because I am sure that people of this country do not speak from their heart they just speak for the sake of speaking and after delivering the speech they threw out the papers in dustbin. They should recall the words said by them at that time. They have joined together to bring down one Government and to form the new Government. They came together and formed the Government. At present three types of groups are there in the country. You have formed one group—United Front. Mr. Chidambaramji, you were very active in that group and whatever was the number of members of United Front, I do not know the exact number, you were not in a position to choose a leader from your party. That's why you adopted the theory of alimination.

18.28 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

First of all you asked Shri V.P. Singh to take over the leadership but he refused the offer. He was on the roads of Delhi for 4 hours and three Chief Ministers were waiting at his house because they were very well aware about what is going to happen? Shri Jyoti Basu was refrained from his party in becoming the Prime Minister, although he confessed later on that CPM has made a blunder. I have no idea about further developments that took place but Deve Gowda says he was the fourth choice. Deve Gowdaji was happy as Chief Minister of Karnataka and when the results of elections were being declared, I

remember, he had told in his interview on Doordarshan that he does not want to leave Karnataka as Shri Bommai and Shri Hegde are already there to take care of politics in Delhi. But Deve Gowda himself have come here to look after Delhi affairs. He said, it was the will of the God. His luck has brought him here. Deve Gowda is not to be blamed for this. He was the Chief Minister and he was elected as Prime Minister by the United Front, supported by Congress Party. Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the leader of Congress at that time. I do not want to comment on how the leaders are being changed in Congress now a days. But since you have created such circumstances in the country that's why such adverse comments are being given about your party. You could have found thousands of faults with Shri Narasimha Rao. But the manner in which you run the party, and how you have thrown him out of the chair, it is a history in itself. One may agree with Narasimha Raoji or disagree, but the manner in which you threw him out of Chair people have come to know about the culture you want to bring in this country. Shri Narasimha Rao at that time was the ex-Prime Minister, the President of Congress Party and also the CPP leader. The Congress Party is a very strange Party, to whom you are answering from leader seat. No one is competent to stand before him. Had Sh. Narasimha Rao made the same speech during his tenure as Prime Minister which he delivered at the time of last Confidence Motion. he might not have seen this day. But he made that unique speech when he was out of power. He promised the people of the country that he will keep on supporting Deve Gowda Government and also stated that he will not shake hand with BJP. He also said that if you want to shake hand with BJP you can do so. What is going to happen today you have been threatened that you should change the leader. Congress party has stated that only then talks will be held with you. Just now if we all leave the House, than what will happen? Will you be able to bring down the government? We all know that the government can be brought down only when we vote against them. If we look from this angle than who is shaking hand with Bharatiya Janata Party. You had promised the whole country and the world too that you will keep on supporting them. Today if we do not vote than are you in a position to bring down the Government? What are you going to do? You want to remove Sh. Deve Gowdaji but what is the reason for that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the day on which Congress had withdrawn its support from the United Front Government, I was in my district Dhanbad. There was a public meeting of our party on that day. At 2 O' Clock when we all were just taking rest, since I was tired I was in sound sleep. Some workers of our party came there in very enthusiastic manner and wake me up and told me that some journalists are saying that Congress has withdrawn support from the United Front Government. I

said if Congress has withdrawn the support then Deve Gowdaji may be very much disturbed then why are you disturbing me? There also I said that elections should be held. It is better to have mid-term polls, than going for compromises.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, when I reached Patna next day, I talked to one of my close friend there, who is a Minister at present. As far as politics is concerned we are opponents but whole world is aware of it that we are friends. I was very eager to know the truth. That's why I rang up Shri Srikanta Jena in Patna. There is no harm in disclosing it. Transparency must be there. I rang him up and asked how all this had happened, Jenaji replied that it all happened on 30th and earlier also it had happened and when Kesriji have come back from the gates of Rashtrapati Bhawan very disappointed. So I said, oh, this is the situation. I thought someone is joking with me that's why such news was given to us. When I returned Delhi, I inquired more about it and then I came to know that, as per the opinion of an astrologer, 25th was fixed for withdrawal of support and when they were just going to write a letter to the Prime Minister, someone told that Prime Minister is in Moscow today. Do you want to make it Banana Republic. When Prime Minister is in Moscow, it is not justified to talk about withdrawal of support. Then again they tried. This time Nelson Mandela was on his visit to India. Thus Deve Gowdaji's Moscow visit and Nelson Mandela's visit to India gave him 5 days respite. When this issue came up again and this time Indo-Pak talks were being held. Then the conference of Foreign Ministers of non-align countries was to be held. Then it was said that we will not tolerate all this for so long and he went straight to the President. Now what has been written in that letter, we have read it out in the House. By repeating all that, I do not want to waste the time of this Hon. House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is some 'Bihari' connection in it wherever I go, people ask me as to what is all this Bihari connection. I get fed up with all this. That's why I have to rise here. Today a man from Bihar has collided with a man from Bengal. To ensnare the Bihari gentleman, the Bengali gentleman has made such a draft that there will be blockade in the future as well. Bihari does have a common sense but when it comes to writing a letter, Bengali gentleman stole the show. Till Mr. Rao was in power his loyalty was to Mr. Rao but God knows what happened, may be it related to Mr. Rao, and the ultimately, the letter was written on which now they cannot stand. Now Mr. Deve Gowda a discussion is taking place and I hope that you will open the mystries one after the other. We all hope that you will expose them. What is the actual ground of withdrawing support? They are something from outside and something else from inside. You should expose them fully. You have no axe to grind. You belong to a poor humble farmer family. He himself says I am very humble and poor

[Shri Nitish Kumar]

farmer. Today we expect that you will call a spade a spade. You please tell the truth. Do not try to get away with it. What are the facts? What about CBI? Congress people have openly withdrawn the support and you are here to give speech. Some members of your council were speaking in your favour. I was also listening them carefully. Member of your council, Shri Gujralji, Shri Ram Vilas Paswanji and Shri Chidambaramji were speaking in your favour whereas Shri Gujralji and also Shri Ram Vilas Paswanji being named for Prime Ministership and ...  
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: It is not so...  
(Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: What is wrong in it? There is nothing wrong in it ... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Why have you derailed?

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: It is good, you can become the Prime Minister, but who would let you become the Prime Minister? ... (Interruptions) 'Bihar' will definitely become the Prime Minister of this country but that 'Bihari' will be Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji. When Shri Deve Gowdaji stood up to speak in your favour. I was noticing him very carefully. Shri Gujral, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan and Shri Chidambaram—all the Ministers and Motion of Confidence in the Council of Ministers has been moved by you. Members other than Council of Ministers should also be given the opportunity to give the speech. Among them, Shri Somnath Chatterjee was speaking. He has not joined the United Front but is in the United Front. His position is very odd. The position of CPM is like swallowing a camel but to strain at a gnat. His position is also like this. He will not join the United Front but will support it. He will remain in the United Front but will not join it. He has spoken, that is different thing but none of the Member who are the part of United Front, has spoken over this issue. Everything is clear. There is a rumour since morning. When we entered the Central House of Parliament, we got the same news. Just now Shri Chidambaramji was on his legs but an officer of Tamil Manila Congress told us that Shri Deve Gowdaji has been asked to resign. We were in distress. Later on we came to know that Deve Gowda has already resigned. Deve Gowdaji your train was late. No one was aware about it but you came and face the Parliament. You are facing the Parliament at the moment but are you aware of what deliberations have been going on yesterday night? You might be aware of it because till you are Prime Minister, CBI will act as per your wishes. You might be aware of that fact that who contacts whom? Chacha Kesriji might have not consulted to Congress men while writing the letter but had definitely talked to your party members as well as some members of United Front. Each and every person of this country is aware of it and United Front is

[English]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, Shri Nitish Kumar is in grave danger of losing his reputation. He is known as a man with a sense of humour. I am afraid, he is being known as a man with a sense of rumour!

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: You said what will happen next time? We have listen very good speeches by you but today your speech was useless... (Interruptions) Earlier when you use to give speech the people like me listen you attentively but today where are the facts in your speech. After 8 o' clock, you remain with Deve Gowdaji or try to make Mr. Mupnar or Gujralji as Prime Minister, we are not aware of it. If Mr. Manmohan Singh ji's name is also there than it will be better if you yourself becomes the Prime Minister. You are aware of what was in the air in the morning. Entire country knows the people of your party are also trying their level best. Some people feels sadastic pleasure in such things and feels happy that people came and went but we are still here. If Deve Gowda does not fulfill his promises, we will not spare him. Please give ear to things. We want to know the facts while talking about CBI, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan gave reference of his party chief. As far as I think, no inquiry is being conduced against the President of Janata Dal although inquiry is being conducted against the Chief Minister of Bihar. Now you have elected him the leader of Janata Dal, that is different thing. Sharadji is a working chief of the party. You were talking about unity in the world. But Paswanji and Sharad if there would have been a dialogue between you, the situation might have been different. That's why such people becomes the party president. You should remain satisfied with the Portfolio of Railway Minister. We know this very well that you are not at all bothered. You are a carefree person. When this government was not in power and whatever works you have done in the Department of Welfare, we used to tell about that to the people of the country. Tomorrow when you will be out of power we use to tell the people about what you have done in the Ministry of Railways. This is your distinctive quality. You are a carefree person. You will make a very good speech here and leave the House. It is for members to worry. When the promises you have made here, will not be fulfilled, the members will suffer in their respective constituencies. You are not guilty. You will come and say we were not given the opportunity to fulfill them because you have made so many announcements that it is not possible to fulfill them. It is good for you that this Government is going to fall. If the Government would have been remain for 5 years Shri Somnathji might name you other than Darling Railway Minister. That's why Deve Gowdaji we would like to know the facts, the cases in which CBI is conducting inquiry.

When Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao took over the seat he has asked about this a number of time which he very cleverly ignored. He is ingenious. He has command over many languages. The case was under trial. We would like to know whether CBI is working on your directives? Whether you are not in a position to protect anybody? I mean to say, you protects the person till he helps you, thereafter you leave him with CBI. We would also like to know what the CBI really stands for. Is it really an investigating agency or a tool in the Prime Minister's hand to blackmail the people. We were of the view that in some cases CBI is conducting inquiry on the directives of court. You should not intend to protect anybody.

Once a member of Janata Dal asked me....  
(*Interruptions*) Shri Ram Kirpalji, please let me continue  
... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM KIRPAL YADAV (Patna): I would like to know ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You please take your seat.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Many people of Janata Dal themselves asks us about what will happen, whether Deve Gowda will be able to save the Government. I replied not to talk of Deve Gowda even if Shri Ram Kirpal becomes the Prime Minister he would also not be able to save it. We would like to know the truth that what is going on behind the curtain. What is matter of Chacha Kesri? Who have inspired him? We want to know about all these facts. If you tells us about this, it will be in the interest of the nation because God knows who will become the next Prime Minister and for how long. The matter of ex-Prime Minister's should be decided today in the House itself. I do not want to go in details. Many things are happening in this country, if all this also goes on, I have no objection over this. Prime Minister has its own status. But you please tell us the truth that to what extent you have control over any matter because tomorrow you will not have any control over things. This is clear from the present circumstances. But even then there is a way out. The Member of Parliament are very much worried about election. The people like me wants that elections should be held. I had said this the very first day. When I went to thank the people of my constituency I had told them that Lok Sabha may dissolve any time, so I am asking you to vote in my favour in next elections. Therefore there is nothing so unexpected. But we met some Members of Parliament who said Sir in these 10 months we could even see the galleries of Parliament. Some members asked we do not even know what does the Parliament do. In such circumstances there is a problem of holding election before the country. Deve Gowda has been pulled down by the people. You must be alert in the future. I would like to say you only this since so many things have been said openly. Deve

Gowdaji you must be bold to keep aside the people who have deceived you. Only than you can be friendly with these people. Either you do this yourself or let all of you do this otherwise you all the people sitting here.... Now there is one thing only i.e. everybody wants stability. If it is so, you do something, you decide in your own way what to do. Don't continue to act like a bonded labour and take decision in the interest of country. After taking a final decision you form a group, 204 members are already in its favour. Jointly we can form a Stable Government. Some Hon'ble members asked me as to what could be done if that is not to be done, whereupon I told them there was a solution. The Members, who do not want dissolution, should come out of the House irrespective of their party affiliation and they should jointly march forward to the President House. They may request the President to give some room in the Darbar Hall itself to elect their leader. So it is the situation—an unprecedented solution in unprecedented circumstances.

You might be taking it for a joke. We are sharing jokes with each others as we are called big leaders and these big leaders are making fun of the country. What is all this happening? What is happening to the country, at what a juncture they have brought the countrv? Just now Shri Chidambaramji was speaking and now he has gone away. He said as to who asked you to create a vacancy in Chhindwara. On this Patwa Saheb stood up and said that it was vacated for me. It is a fact and this fact was taken in a very casual manner. Now I am telling you this fact that you created a vacancy in Chhindwara and Patwaji filled it. In the same way you are doing nothing but creating a vacancy to bring Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji. For all this all of us are thankful to you because all of us have come out of the same circumstances. There are some reasons due to which we have come out of this situation and now when we have come out of the situation, we know your merits and demerits because these are not only your merits and demerits but this situation applies to all. We realize our own merits and demerits also. That is why we know that you cannot arrive at any agreement and if you at all arrive at an agreement it will not last long, this agreement will be broken. You decide yourself who will be the Prime Minister? One dozen names have emerged. Turn by turn your all Chief Ministers are claimant for Prime Ministership. Nobody will like each other. After that search will start for such a person who has no opponent. Such experiments are being made in this country. The mockery which is being done to this country, with regard to that I want to make a request through you... (*Interruptions*)

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: There are such persons members in that side as well who do not have even a single follower.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Not only one, there are several members. I don't want to name out them. As an

[Shri Nitish Kumar]

individual we have regards for them. Why shall we call their name? Everybody is well informed. Now a days a very strange situation has emerged in the politics of the country. The people who are well informed do not have any public support and those who lack information are blessed with a tremendous public support. It is a paradox in the country. Therefore, how can we say that it is rootless, or worthless. It is not so. They may not be having any root but they have their own value, moreover they are required.

Nothing is going to happen in this country. Our such quarrel-some attitude has created this situation. Through you I would like to say to all the people that you have made your experiment and that has failed. Whatever experiment you shall make after tonight, no result is likely to come out of that because you have lost your credibility among the people. You had already lost your credibility among us. Therefore, for God's sake and for the sake of the people of this country you vacate the throne. Whatever the public decides in the elections, some-way will come out of it, which will be in the public interest.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI (Khajuraho): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, please tell me the time limit because I get scared of the sound of the bell. I shall fully abide by any time limit fixed by you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You may speak.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, what was the principle when this Government was formed 10 months ago. On what principle this United Front Government was formed. What is the principle and argument behind this breaking away from each other which has emerged today due to which the Government of Deve Gowdaji is requesting for vote of confidence. This all is not clear. When I am reminded of the formation of the United Front Government last year when this Government had acquired vote of confidence, at that time all of you said in Unison that it is a fight for secularism and against communalism. All secular forces should be united to protect secularism as well as to check the communal forces. But the situation which has emerged today requires two points to be made clear.

Either the people of United Front who in the name of secularism, had formed Deve Gowdaji Government last year, are no more secular or now we are no more communal. This question comes up as to what was the reason for forming union last year and what is the reason for breaking away today? They were not united previously, they were united in the name of secularism. Whether there is not any threat to the secularism now? Whether the communal label which has been ascribed to us is

not relevant now? Except those from the Bharatiya Janata Party and its supporting parties whosoever delivered his speech here have said one thing only that today if elections are held the Bharatiya Janata Party will be benefited the most from these elections. In other words all the parties have expressed that they are scared of Bharatiya Janata Party. But reality is something different from it. In fact last year they feared that they might be imprisoned. They were afraid of being imprisoned. Due to such fear a corruption protection company was formed. As they were apprehensive of being sent to Tihar Jail, so they put the mantle of principle on the corruption protection company and claimed themselves to be secular people united to fight against communal forces. Hon'ble Nitish Kumarji was asking the Prime Minister time and again but how he would disclose it. Certainly there is some mischief somewhere and the things are being managed in such a way so that somebody can be sent to the Tihar Jail and he has not been able to tolerate it. That is why the issue of secular and communal forces has come forth again. The issue which was raised last year has again come for discussion today also. Just now Shri Madhukar Rao Sarpotdarji was also asking whether the people who call themselves secular and communal know the meaning of the term 'secularism' and 'communalism' in real sense?

I would like to cite two examples. One example is of Jammu and Kashmir and another example is of Charkhi Dadri because a very big leader of Congress party, in his speech, made an allegation against the Prime Minister Deve Gowdaji that he had joined hands with communal forces. One allegation against him was that once he attended Sangh programme. This fact stated here by Hon'ble Atal Bihari Vajpayee, was now refuted by him. If attending the Sangh programme is a crime, then tell me who made the ex-propagator of Sangh who still admits to be a volunteer of the Sangh—Chief Minister of Gujarat? The Chief Minister of Gujarat Shri Shankar Sinh Vaghela was propagator of the Sangh earlier. He still admits himself to be a volunteer of the Sangh and you made him Chief Minister. Thus you keep the regulator of secularism with yourself. I quote two examples with regard to secularism and communalism. The people who make allegation of communalism against Bharatiya Janata Party, should learn something from Charkhi-Dadri accident. In this accident two planes had collided as a result of which a number of passengers were killed. The dead bodies were lying there all around in mutilated condition. The scene was so horrible that the mutilated parts of the bodies were lying scattered here and there. Even the family members of the deceased were feeling helpless in mustering courage to pick up the dead bodies. Here I would like to remind all those who claim to be secular and who are present here, that only the Khaki nikkar and black cap wearing people of Rashtriya Swayam

Sewak Sangh went there and picked up the dead bodies. They did not make any difference between Hindu and Muslim at that time.

Those people asked the next of kin of the deceased to identify their deceased persons and the person who identified the corpse, arrangements were made for the last rites to be performed according to their religion, whether he belonged to Hindu community or Muslim community. If somebody will ask those muslim families, they will say that it is only Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh (RSS) which can do some good to them. They regarded our feelings and joined hands with us in digging the graves for the burial and last rites of our deceased relations. On the one hand the testimony of the identity of the character of Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh is visible from what they did in the Charkhi-Dadri tragedy and on the other hand 3.5 lakh Hindus are lying at Jammu and the secular forces do not utter a single word. They have not been able to speak on their behalf till date. 3.5 lakh Hindus are lying at Jammu. This is their altered secularism which these people call communalism, and the contribution in Charkhi-Dadri tragedy is itself expressive of the fact that our communalism deserves applause and honour.

I would like to ask all of you a question, about communalism which is haunting the people of the entire nation. May I know from all the people sitting here, as to why a special police force is deputed at the time of festivals like Id, Holi, Deepawali, Dusshera or Muharram etc.? Why the processions of Muharram or Dussehra are not taken out peacefully? Festivals are not festivals if celebrated in tension. These should be celebrated in gaiety. Why tension on festivals? Why meetings of special police forces are held in connection with festivals? Some solution has to be found to ease this tension.

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav is present here, he calls himself a great messiah of secularism. Shri Rajesh Pilot and Shri Narasimha Rao are present. I would appeal all the Hindus of India to prepare 'sewains' on Id in their households and likewise I would appeal all the Muslims to light lamps in their homes on Deepawali. This is the only way when the possibility of a communal goodwill will nurture.

19.00 hrs.

"Sewaiyan" be prepared on Id festival in Hindu households and the muslim houses be illuminated on the festival of Deepawali, i.e., both the communities should contribute to communal harmony. But the Government wants to bring communal harmony through some other means. The lips which could express the agony and plight of 3.5 lakh Hindus are sealed, the tongue is totally tied. It is not the way of communal harmony. That is why

your secularism is exposed before the Indian masses. Just now Shri Pramod Mahajan was giving the example of Farooq Abdullah, who gave a statement in the name of secularism, and it is a major crime committed by this Government by remaining silent on his statement. The Resolution of the entire nation was read out in this House that Pakistan should consider to return that part of Kashmir which is in Pakistan's occupation. Farooq Abdullah has committed contempt of the House and contempt of the country. Even then the United Front Government remained silent. Why?

Sir, I have got great respect for Shri Deve Gowdaji. There is a reason—a small incident behind that. Once I rang Deve Gowdaji at his residence. The problem was that a woman Sarpanch from my constituency was not being handed over the charge. I thought of seeking an appointment with Shri Deve Gowdaji and thus I rang him. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was surprised, that when I dialed the number, he was available on the line. I could not believe that I was readily talking to him. I wanted to talk to his P.A. to seek an appointment with Shri Deve Gowda, but surprisingly it was Shri Deve Gowda himself on the line. Whatever transpired between us, I would like to tell you. I said, "Sir, Is it you. Are you on the line. I am surprised." He said, "Yes, I am a common man. I am the Prime Minister, but I don't ignore the fact that I am a common man. So I came to talk to you immediately." His simplicity, naivety and such an attitude has influenced me greatly, but in spite of that, certain developments have taken place which can be called a grave sin committed by the United Front by remaining silent. Whatever sins the Congress people committed is a matter of past, and Shri Deve Gowdaji has been quite instrumental in shrouding those sins, all the same he has not been able to help them at certain junctures, and with the result the present crisis has risen. When Shri P. Chidambaram was delivering his speech, the way he was pointing towards the Congress people, I could guess, that if they frankly announce what they have done during the last five years, he is ready to forgive them for that, perhaps at that very moment the Congress people would say that you run the Government for further four years, and we will not have any difficulty. Such is the situation today. I admit that Shri Deve Gowda must also have made attempts to shroud, but at times certain sins are of the nature which are not shrouded in spite of efforts and somehow these are exposed and it becomes very difficult to shroud them. Even 'Brahmaji' cannot hide these sins, not to speak of the Prime Minister. Such situations take place many a time. These situations take place at such crises. But United Front Government has also committed some sins. Why did the Government keep quiet after Farooq Abdullah's statement? I was shocked to read the speech

[Kumari Uma Bharati]

which Shri P. Chidambaram delivered in London, which I have mentioned in the House as well. Therefore, I would like to tell the House that we should rise above party politics in the matters of nation's prestige. Since my childhood, I have learnt that the interest of party is above one's own interest, and the interest of the country is above the interest of the party, and when the question of the interest of the country arises one should rise above the party interest. While addressing the Englishmen Shri P. Chidambaram said, "when you came to our country for the first time, you remained there for two hundred years. Now, please come again to settle in our country." He says that it was a slip of tongue. I say that it is not a slip of tongue. I believe it is the deeply ingrained idea, the profound character, the innermost psyche which has found an expression. This is the most interior background, the inner mentality, psyche of slavery, from which the people have not severed themselves. On this occasion also the United Front Government observed silence. But why?

Hon. Prime Minister has always said one thing in the House—that I am the son of a poor farmer. I hail from a poor family, and I want social justice. Personally,

say that the United Front Government has committed a breach of trust to the women of India, in the name of social justice. United Front Government had said that we will do the job of giving reservation to women right in the first session itself and bring a Bill for their reservation. But certain complications arose for which a selection committee was to be formed. The Report of that Selection Committee has been presented in the House, and the Prime Minister has been giving assurances that the Bill would be brought today, tomorrow or the next week. Ram Vilasji, I would like to say that it would be very difficult for Shri Ram Vilas Paswan and the Prime Minister. You had promised a reservation for women in the name of social justice. Please come out and face the resentment of women and see that to what an extent you have made a breach of trust with them. Women have been cheated to a great extent.

Sir, it is repeatedly said that the Lok Pal Bill would be introduced. I know, if the Lok Pal Bill is brought, even those people would be sent to Tihar Jail who do not want to go there. Lok Pal Bill was referred to every now and then, but it was not brought. Dinesh Goswami Committee Report was also referred to, but that Report too did not come. Sarkaria Commission was referred to, but the Report did not come. Likewise Uttarakhand issue is there. Prime Minister would go there and say that there is likelihood of an announcement regarding Uttarakhand. There has been a breach of trust with the people of that area. Women have been cheated. Truth have not been told about Prasar Bharati and there have been cheatings also. I will not name anybody in the name

of social justice, because I am aware of the fact that naming any person is not permitted in this House. It is said that the person who cannot present himself in this House for clarification, should not be named. (That person's name should not be divulged who can not present himself in this House for clarification.) But if it is really a matter of social justice a very important person has been consuming poultry feed, buffalo and Cow's feed for the last 7 years. Who takes care (or tames) buffalo, cow and poultry. He begins his speech with the words, "ye, poultry-keepers, piggery keepers and cattle (cow and buffalo) keepers. I would think, why he remembers all these things come to his mind first of all. But later on, I could understand that a person remembers first of all in the speech who is the source of his bread. Finally look at the courage of the person. He said that even if he is punished he will run the Government from the Gaol. It is a matter of shame to speak such words about the democracy of India.

On one hand, we are celebrating the 50th Anniversary of Independence and on the other hand, the honour and the pride of the country are being treated so lightly. Shri P.R. Dasmunsi was expressing grief in the House just now. Probably the Congress party members wish to become messiah of dalits. I would like to tell them that if they regret that they were unable to make Mayawati Chief Minister and that she has been rendered helpless after getting our support, they should answer as to what extent she has become helpless. They won't dare say such things openly. If they feel that Mayawati has been rendered helpless due to our support, I would like to ask Shri Dasmunsi as to who was preventing them from doing so and why they allowed themselves to be pressurised by Shri Mulayam Singh? Why Shri Deve Gowda succumbed to the pressure of Shri Mulayam Singh and prevented Mayawati from becoming the Chief Minister. Today, they say that Congress is losing its honour. Which were those unknown reasons and which was the unknown disease which was not treated properly, under which the decision was taken to withdraw the support. If they had withdrawn their support on this issue that if the United Front does not make Mayawati Chief Minister, the Congress would withdraw its support, thus that would have given you a different image amongst the dalits but you were only desirous of becoming messiahs of dalits. Mulayamji was also exerting his pressure. The Lucknow Guest House incident was an example of this very tendency. Just now Shri P.R. Dasmunsi was saying that Mayawati has been rendered helpless now but, the truth is that Mayawati was rendered helpless the day the anti-social elements protected by Shri Mulayam Singh in Uttar Pradesh made an attempt on her life. At that time the Bharatiya Janata Party members saved her honour by putting their lives on the stake. That was the day when Mayawati was rendered helpless. She is not helpless now

because the dalits of Uttar Pradesh are supporting that woman. The poor women of Uttar Pradesh are supporting her. They are regretful now and it is quite natural to be in such a mood because they have faced a tough time in Rajasthan. This is a fact also. The United Front did not struggle there. Again they faced a tough time in Gujarat and there are also Maharashtra and Punjab but what can poor Deve Gowdaji do about it. He has only recently become the Prime Minister. Earlier he used to enjoy a snooze on the back benches. I have observed him for days together. Ever since he became the Member of Parliament in 1991 upto 1996, I generally found him asleep on the back benches. He is not at fault. The misdeeds of Congress have caused their downfall. Whether Deve Gowdaji caused their downfall in Punjab. Their tendency to indulge in corruption caused their downfall in Punjab. I visited U.S.A. last year. There, the people told me that after Russia, it is Punjab which is the second most corrupt place in the world.

The indifference shown by you with regard to Uttarakhand and other matters in Uttar Pradesh caused your downfall. Corruption caused your downfall in Bihar. Now the policy of giving protection to anti-social elements in Madhya Pradesh by the Government of that state would cause the downfall of Congress in that state also. Your government in Maharashtra was constantly in touch with anti-social elements through telephones and other media which was revealed before the public. Lakhs of poor people of Nagpur went to meet the then Chief Minister of Maharashtra belonging to Congress Party who is present here. Those poor people were fired upon. You open fire on the same people on whose vote you are elected as the Chief Minister.

They came to knock at your door. When the elections are round the corner, you go to their doorstep for votes like beggars and when they came to you, they were fixed upon. Your Government fell in Maharashtra because of such misdeeds. Now what can poor Deve Gowda do about it? If you commit sins, you will have to suffer the consequences thereof. Just now, this complaint was being made again and again as to why Congress did this to us. This is very much correct. Shri Chandra Shekhar should remember that Congress has always followed the tradition of ditching. Shri Deve Gowda and Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, from whom did you expect loyalty. You expected loyalty from such people who do not know the meaning of this term. Loyalty is not a part of the traditions and conventions of Congress Party. It is much like the poisonous creeper found in Bundelkhand. It is the speciality of that creeper that it smothers the tree on which it grows. It sucks the life out of that tree and grows strong. They did the same thing with Shri Charan Singh and Shri Chandra Shekhar and this is what they are going to do to Deve Gowdaji. There is a difference

though that their sinful deeds have reached the extreme position and nothing is going to help them at this stage.

Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri Somnath Chatterjee is not present here. I would like to convey my apprehensions very honestly. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have great respect for these two great leaders. When I see them, I feel that they were very knowledgeable and I feel a little hesitation in speaking in front of these people lest I may make some mistake. If Shri Indrajit Gupta had not become the Minister of Home Affairs, I would not have felt any less respectful towards him but the way they expressed their views on Uttar Pradesh and then took their words back and the way they maintained silence at time the anti-poor budget was presented by Shri P. Chidambaram, is their silence pardonable? Lenin must have turned in his grave in Moscow when they maintained silence at the presentation of anti-poor budget. There is a saying in our area that 'janam bhar padhe Kashi aur ant mein marane gaye apne gaon ki ghati'. They raised the slogans of communism the whole life and in the end, maintained silence in case of such a budget for which the poor won't pardon them. Hon'ble Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I suggest you to not to find out any such way out.

This country is celebrating the 50th year of Independence and the people are witnessing this mockery of democracy and Independence. There is so much of inter-conflicts in the government that even when we were ready to support them in case of Lokpal Bill and the Womens' Reservation Bill and Dinesh Goswami Committee matter, their own members were not ready to support them. So what do we do about this Government involved in internal conflicts.

Once an astrologer went to meet Hitler. Hitler asked him about his age. The astrologer thought that if he told the truth, he would be killed. But Hitler promised to spare his life. The astrologer said that he can not tell the truth. He said that such a person like him should not remain alive even for a single day. Hence I won't be able to state your age truthfully. Likewise, in case such a Government continues to be in power which can not function smoothly; which is involved in internal conflicts; wherein the Ministers do not have a mutual understanding and wherein the Ministers consider themselves to be at par with the Prime Minister, the nation will suffer heavy losses. I believe that elections do not put such a heavy burden on the nation but if such a Government continues for even a single day, the nation would suffer heavy losses. It will cause damage to the nation on economic, political, social and psychological levels. Hence we oppose the confidence motion moved by the Prime Minister and I request you to stop raising the issue of secularism and communalism and state directly that since some Members were afraid of being locked up in Tihar jail and that is

[Kumari Uma Bharati]

why this corruption protection company was formed and one or two members were not properly protected by this corruption protection company. But to what extent Deve Gowda could have protected them? That is why this problem has arisen. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to remind all of you that we are face to face with truth and we should admit the truth. The truth is that Bharatiya Janata Party stands for the honour of the country, pride of the country and future of the country. Hence they won't succeed in their attempt to destroy Bharatiya Janata Party and in turn destroy the honour, the requirement, the traditions and conventions and pride of the country. With these words, I conclude.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have got the names of fourteen members on my list. Under the circumstances, you should decide as to who will speak for how long. Otherwise you will have to sit till late. I have no objection to that.

[English]

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Pune): We can continue tomorrow.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Dausa): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this debate is going on since morning. Shri Chandra Shekhar and Munsiji from Congress (I) took part in it. We, the Member from Congress Party are listening to it with heavy hearts. I would like to say that Congress was compelled to take such a drastic step.

Elections were held in May, 1996 in which my party got 142 seats. United Front got 177 seats and BJP emerged as the largest party. In the party meeting held after the elections we all had this feeling in our minds that people of this country have not given us right to form Government. This had been Congress (I) party's policy since long but today many members have alleged that Congress (I) has withdrawn the support for coming into power.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: It is correct also not wrong at all.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: We need not to go back in history but in the elections of 1989, our party got about 195 seats and it was the single largest party and some of our colleagues won the elections on different election symbols. At that time Shri Rajiv Gandhi refused the offer of formation of Government and the second largest party was given a chance. In 1996 after felling of BJP Government, ours was the second largest party with 142 seats and we could have formed the government. Members of United Front also asked us to form government but our party refused to do so. Working

committee of Congress took that decision and in place of forming government ourselves, we offered support to United Front in view of its secular status. We were fully aware that in 1989 both the political parties were working together and formed Government and used to meet on Friday which was known as Friday club. Now we assumed that position of that party might have improved as they contested elections on different grounds. We had given support to this party and our hopes were shattered. I would like to say that the gardener, who planted a tree, is the one who is more grieved by its felling, the viewers may also feel sad. I would like to tell the two-three points which were in our mind while giving support to this party. Pramod Mahajanji has correctly pointed out that we were not in favour of formation of BJP government and I openly say that the day when BJP government will come to power the integrity and unity of country will shatter. I am not concealing anything. The time will tell... (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we had given support to Deve Gowda Government with high hopes. He is known to me personally for the last 18 years. He may be remembering that at that time I had given a statement that a person belonging to farmer family has become Prime Minister of this country. All the members of Congress party were happy with a hope that we would be successful in stopping the communal forces. But, we have gone wrong somewhere. We had told earlier itself that our party will keep on supporting the Government from outside. But what actually happened? There had been two main points for supporting the government i.e. policies continued to be followed and the development of the country continues. We were also at fault on some matters. I do not say that Congress government had not committed any mistake during the period from 1991 to 1996. But several important matters had been solved and steps taken by the Government during this period. As a result of our policies, the country had been in a better position, when we left in 1996 and heading towards progress.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, what was the position of Punjab and Kashmir earlier? Just now my sister Uma Bharati has mentioned the position of Kashmir, but I would like to say that upto 1996, none of your party had crossed the area of Banihaal... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHAMAN LAL GUPTA (Udhampur): How you can say that?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: You are a resident of Kashmir but I am talking about the political parties. The workers of Congress (I) and National Conference were attacked. The local people of Kashmir faced terrorism bravely and later on got ready to take part in elections. Shri Paswan has mentioned correctly that their party held elections in Punjab but whose policies were implemented there for

the last five years and who faced bullet I would like to tell that these were workers of Congress Party and now you blame Congress party that it had not done anything?

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA (Patiala): How many times the Prime Minister had gone there.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Chandumajra, you will get a chance. Your party will get a chance. You can explain it. Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we have good relations with Akali Dal. But only difference is that our party associated with those people who suffered during bloodshed in Punjab.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Pilotji, please come to the main point. No one here wants to listen to Kashmir problem. We want to know as to what was written in your letter... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, several members of Akali Dal are on their legs and I do not intend to mention that but now I have to say that workers and leaders of Congress party used to go to the houses of those people whose family members were killed and Akali Dal offered Saropa to those people who were responsible to kill those innocent persons... (Interruptions)

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA: It is not correct. These people are responsible for killing of Akali leaders. We can provide its proof here. Our leader Shri Longowal sacrificed his life. May I know the name of a leader who sacrificed his life. He is not telling the truth.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Prof. Chandumajra, your party will get a chance. You can reply to all these things. Please sit down now.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been the responsibility and history of Congress party. We are bearing this humiliation because Congress has made contribution in development of this country. Chandra Shekharji has mentioned that Congress has certain shortcomings. We also admit this and I would like to say that we are trying to improve ourselves. I would like to say that Congress has made contribution in history and development of the country and has a natural attachment for it. Congress has no lust for power.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I did not intend to mention that but you may be aware of the fact as to what type of speeches used to be delivered in Assam during the period from 1982 to 1985. Congress promised them to give them a chance to rule for bringing peace in the State. It has been history of our party. What was happening in Mizoram? We made one agreement with Laldenga and he was appointed Chief Minister. What your party has done? ... (Interruptions). Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, a long speech has been delivered here on the issue as to how one can come to power. Shri Pramod Mahajan and Jaswant Singhji have raised here the issue of morality and power. Kanshiramji is present here. I would like to say that a few days back his party used to deliver speeches like—'Tilak, Taraju aur Talwar, Inko maro jute chaar'. We never said such things. What has happened today? Now they are preaching us... (Interruptions)

SHRI LALMUNI CHAUBEY (Buxar): Whose is this slogan, not of BJP... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Chaubeyji, please sit down.

SHRI KANSHI RAM (Hoshiarpur): I would like to give my clarification, as he has mentioned my name. Since long I had been saying that Congress is an 'A' grade pro-brahmin party and it consists of a large number of members from upper castes. 'Tilak, Taraju aur Talwar' it is not restricted to BJP only... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: It is matter of regret. Today, it is not a question of ours only. It is a question of the entire country. Today the country is facing a question that upto what extent the political character has been deteriorated. One of my colleague has just said that it was part of descendants of Manu, it is a party of the persons having Tilak on their foreheads. One day they enter into agreement with us while the other day with someone else. It has been only tactics of the politics how to secure power.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we expected from Deve Gowdaji that he will put checkmate on communal forces. We expected that co-operation would be increased. There will be shortcomings somewhere. Somewhere we had been lacking and somewhere they had been lacking. When their Government was formed, it becomes their duty to move forward, taking the cooperation of all supporting parties, to reach the destination for which we all are united. But some time the objective were reversed. I visited many states. I had been to Karnataka, the state of Deve Gowdaji. What feelings I observed there? The Chief Minister of this state gave his speech in the assembly that "If the Congress has courage, it may withdraw its support. What the Congress is doing? We are not surviving with support of Congress". After all we are also human being, political persons, ours is a political

[Shri Rajesh Pilot]

party. And inspite of all this they are shouting slogans against us. We are giving you our support and not asking for anything. We are giving you our support for the sake of country as well as to check the increasing trend of BJP. But what had happened? ... (*Interruptions*) We are saying that we will stop you, certainly we will prevent you. It is the Congress that can check you. But what happened? It was known to us that we have direct fighting against AGP in Assam. Our colleague has won from Assam defeating the AGP candidate. He has not come here defeating the candidate of BJP or any other party. We had direct fight against Janata Dal in Karnataka. In Andhra we had fought against Telgu Desam. In West Bengal we fought against Communist Parties for the sake of country inspite of it, we gave you our support against our wishes keeping in view that we all of us unitedly shall be able to achieve our objective. Whenever the Prime Minister used to visit any state I would think in my heart that the Congress is a supporting party. If he visited Janata Dal ruling state, I thought he will definitely visit Congress ruling state and ask about their problems. He will ask the Congress workers as to how his policies are going on, is there any scope of improvements therein? The same situation was earlier also in 1967 and whenever there was a coalition, all the parties used to sit together and discuss at national level. Not even a single joint meeting was held till today. You could not take decision regarding joint meeting. I think there is some lacuna somewhere due to which this distance continued to increase.

Today the issue of policies came under discussion. Shri Chidambaram stated that the Government has improved upon its policies. We are observing that upto December you were saying that

[*English*]

we are just following the policies of the Congress Party; we are just implementing the policies of the Congress Party

[*Translation*]

The fact is that you were following the policies of the Congress Party and the Congress party was giving you its support. When you formulated your common minimum programme, we on the behalf of our party said—

[*English*]

We are very happy that you are following the policies which the Congress party had started, but they should be implemented.

[*Translation*]

The Prime Minister will have to accept that there remains some lacuna somewhere. There was a issue of

rural development. Our Government had initiated some measures for rural development. But today the steps initiated at that time did not go further as was expected from Deve Gowdaji. He was expected to sanction advances in the rural development. In the same manner, today the issue with regard to North-East was talked about. The Prime Minister himself visited these areas which aroused the hope among the people of the entire north eastern area. The people had expectations that now peace will prevail in their area and everyone there used to say that only the initiatives being taken by the Prime Minister could give them riddance of the revolt going on there for the last 20-25 years. He had made a good start. He announced a package for North-East region. We praised his initiatives. All parties praised it. One feeling was created among the people there that the efforts were made, as were made by the Congress party, to bring them in the mainstream. Today our colleagues can say that the Congress did nothing for North Eastern region. I would like to say truthfully that no other party made as much efforts as were made to bring the North-Eastern region in the mainstream. We did not speak in a language having two meanings. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, today such issues are being raised. It is very easy for a Regional party to speak in one idiom in Delhi and another in its own region. Congress can not speak in such a way. Congress has to speak in one idiom which will be in the interest of the country. That is why the Congress is a looser. But I would like to say in this House that we don't have any problem if Congress loose something. There is no harm in it if the country continues to progress but the Congress will continue to adopt its own policies for which it was formed. We are worried about the country because we have an attachment for the country. We are not power-thirsty.

Some members have a misunderstanding that the Congress President wrote a letter regarding formation of a Government. But we are not fond of power. Today we are here to have discussion. We still make our efforts that the tree planted by us should not fall down. We are still making our efforts and shall continue to make efforts in this direction. I appeal to my all colleagues to meet cordially with each other. It is possible this spirit may be lacking somewhere. Don't be influenced by their words. They are eloquent in their speech. They have reached here due to their eloquency itself. Their number in 1984 was just two but through their eloquency they increased their number in 1989 and now they have again increased their number. We people took some steps to check them. We made such efforts that each worker activated from top to bottom. When the issue of secularism was raised in the interest of the country, I can accept that there may be some shortcomings in our party. But the incidents of 6 December, the reference of which all the members were making here just before, is far from truth. At time

we had clearly mentioned the circumstances prevailing there in the House. At present Atalji has gone out. On 4th December we had said in this very House that these people would demolish Masjid but you did not react at all, you kept silence. Atalji and Advaniji both were sitting here. They kept silence. Nobody refuted my statement. On 10 December, Shri Atalji stated that the apprehension of our colleague Shri Rajesh Pilotji was correct. Whatever has happened is not in a good taste. The idiom in which he spoke, he could have given a clarification in the same way here in the House. But when he became Prime Minister what was his first speech. He stated while delivering his speech in Faizabad that our Ramjanam Bhum: issue will continue. I am quoting the same which I read in newspaper that this issue will continue. The day when he became Prime Minister he stated that all these issues have been kept in abeyance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, until difference exists between policy and intention we cannot take the country on right path. BJP cannot do it. Its policy is wrong and its intention too is wrong. That is why they cannot take the country on right path.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is a difference between their policy and their intention. They are not so whatever they pose themselves. But no difference exists between our policy and intention. We may have some communication gap but there is transparency in our policy and I hope fully that having mutual discussion we shall be able to sort out misunderstanding if any exists, due to this communication gap.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, at last I would like to mention two points more. As Chidambaramji and Chandra Shekharji stated that unless transparency comes in the country, nothing can move smoothly. We continued to make our efforts. Alright some mistakes might have been committed by us. Some of our colleagues have been apprehended in the corruption but our party has taken action against them. Corruption charges have been levelled against the people of B.J.P. also. Would you tell us please what action you have taken against them? You read out India Today.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): The High Court has acquitted them.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is some peculiarity in Congress. If we commit a mistake we confess it. This is the difference which exist between you and us. We confess our mistakes and you not. Instead of confessing you suppress the fact. I believe that Deve Gowdaji and all our colleagues jointly shall bring out some solution to this problem. I would like to appeal to Deve Gowdaji and all of my colleagues to come forth in this direction. I appeal to all of you not to

be influenced by the eloquent speech of these BJP people. They always speak in the same tone.

With these words I would like to assure to the House and all the people of the country that the Congress would continue to fight for secularism, to frame policies for the development of the country. Every worker of the Congress will continue to fight against the policies of the Bharatiya Janata Party and he will make his all out efforts to sabotage the BJP policies. With these words I oppose this motion. There is no doubt about our old association.

19.37 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI KANSHI RAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when 10 months ago, Shri Deve Gowdaji had made an appeal in this House for vote of confidence, we had opposed that motion. We were of the view that there are such constituents in UF Government as which are encouraging 'Goondagardi' due to which there is an increase in such cases in several states. Unless and until these constituents remain in the United Front Government, 'goondagardi' can not be checked. We had said this ten months back. We also sought some more time to think about supporting the Government's stand. This was why we did not join hands with you. He had assured us to take prompt action for cleansing of goondagardi. During the discussion on the motion, we said that in case, this government fails to check goondagardi, it will be a great harm to the Dalits and the society as well. On this ground, we opposed the vote of confidence at that time. But what has happened during the last ten months. The United Front Government have used on large scale the office of the Governor to fan the goondaism during the last 10 months... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI RAMESH CHENNITHALA (Kottayam): Is the word 'goonda-gard' parliamentary? The hon. Speaker should give a ruling on this. I want to know whether the word 'goonda-gard' is parliamentary or not.

SHRI KANSHI RAM: I am using the word to explain the position.

[*Translation*]

I think whatever I had said ten months earlier, is now taking place in reality that too at the behest of this UF Government. I would like to say something about the Congress. Shri Pilot has just said that earlier we were having our alliance with Congress but now we are having it with BJP. We will always give our support to that party which will benefit the Dalit and downtrodden society...

[Shri Kanshi Ram]

*(Interruptions)* I would say emphatically before the entire House that we will always fight for the cause of our targetted objectives and that is to serve the interests of the Dalit and downtrodden society. We will make all out efforts to achieve this objective. Pilot Saheb has said that earlier our alliance was with Congress so I must tell him that we never approached the Congress for that alliance. We never go to anyone for entering into any alliance. Our endeavour is always to uplift the downtrodden people and we know that the day, the downtrodden people are on their own legs, they will be approached by everyone for every kind of alliances. After the parliamentary elections, Congress needed our help and their leaders, themselves, came to me...

*(Interruptions)* I will dwell on that later. Since the Congress has raised this point, let me explain the position. When leaders of Congress came to me they told us that their percentage of vote has gone down to eight and in case we did not help them, it might further go down to two to four percent and due to this fear in their minds, they came to us for our help. They made an appeal to us to have an alliance with Congress and save their credibility. To this, we thought that it may benefit to our party also and at the same time, help Congress to revive itself to some extent. Might be that the Congress, improves their graph through our alliance. We also made our efforts in that respect but when the matter of Punjab came, they started avoiding us by saying that like Uttar Pradesh, they would not allow their fallout in Punjab again. We would not allow Congress to finish in the Punjab elections. We took that as their own thinking. But when the election results were announced in October last year, I asked Kesri Saheb to withdraw his support from UF Government because during the elections he had assured us that in case UF Government did not support them in formation of government in Uttar Pradesh, he would withdraw his support at the Centre.

Many things have been said in the previous speeches. I told him to withdraw his support for it was the right opportunity to do so. Congress can be revived. Time and again you have expressed your desire to revive the Congress. But you can not revive the Congress just by including Tiwariji and other ousted leaders in Congress. The revival of Congress is in the hands of Kanshi Ram. The person who has ruined the Congress, can only revive it. I was not sure enough about the Congress game plan, even then, I told him that the revival of Congress was in the hands of BSP, therefore, you should withdraw your support from UF Government. But that time I was not listened and after five months we were convinced that this party does not want the upliftment of Dalits and downtrodden people. We were convinced that Congress Party is anti-Dalit and anti-downtrodden. I had thought about their revival because they had approached us.

Rao Saheb is not sitting here, or else I would have said it before him also. When the Congress Party withdrew their support, I thought as to what was going to happen to Congress or with what idea they have withdrawn their support? Today Congress has created a crisis by withdrawing their support which I criticise vehemently. I take this opportunity to condemn the UF Government sponsored *Goondagardi* also during the last ten months. Further, on behalf of my party, I would say ... *(Interruptions)* If you want to listen me about BJP then I would say that the spokesperson of BJP has been saying since October that they want to form the government with the support of BSP... *(Interruptions)* We will allay all the apprehensions whatever may be and in whosoever's mind. We have formed the government to allay these apprehensions very soon. On one hand, the United Front and Congress went on refusing our appeal and on the other BJP kept on moving their hands towards us. Ultimately, we did shake our hands with each other and now that hand is there in Uttar Pradesh to root out the goondagardi and mafia elements in the state... *(Interruptions)*

In view of the above, I oppose the vote of confidence motion and conclude.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Well, hon. Members, according to our original schedule, the Prime Minister was to reply at seven of the Clock and the voting was to take place at eight of the Clock. Now, it is ten minutes to eight of the Clock. I have with me thirteen names.

... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Listen to me further, please. The thirteen names include the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, the hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting, senior Members like Shri G.M. Banatwalla and Sardar Surjit Singh Barnala. Now, we have to decide at what time the Prime Minister should reply.

... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI P. NAMGYAL (Ladakh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, have a suggestion. Since this is the end of the 11th Lok Sabha, and it is the 11th month of Deve Gowda Government, therefore, we should continue our Debate till 11 p.m. because we had started it at 11 A.M.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not say irresponsible things. The directive of the President is that it has to be disposed of today. Why are you talking like that?

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI A.C. JOS (Idukki): The Ministers may not speak... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. UPENDRA (Vijayawada): Why should so many Ministers speak?... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Would you like to say something, Shri Paswan?

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): May I make a submission? There are smaller parties like the Muslim League, the Akali Dal and the RSP. Their Members have not even been given the opportunity to speak. Those smaller parties may be given a chance to speak because the Members of the parties like the Congress, the BJP and the Janata Dal have expressed their views. But there are smaller parties who should, in fact, be given the opportunity to speak. That is my suggestion... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Though it is a 13-Party coalition, 13 party Ministers need not speak. Let us give opportunity to other parties to speak

MR. SPEAKER: Tell me, guide me, what the Chair should do?

[*Translation*]

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA: Akali Dal and Haryana Vikas Party should also get a chance.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I am asking.

[*English*]

I am not going to decide myself.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI SRIKANTA JENA): From the side of the Government, the Prime Minister will speak. If you can accommodate ten, fifteen minutes, the Home Minister will speak. The rest of the time the Leader of the Opposition and one or two Members can speak.

MR. SPEAKER: How much time will you take, Vajpayeeji?

[*Translation*]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): I will finish within 10-15 minutes

MR. SPEAKER: Whom will you finish?

[*English*]

I think, finally, I would suggest all of you to please restrict your speeches for five to seven minutes. The Leader of the Opposition will take 15 minutes. The Prime Minister will reply at 9 o'clock.

Shri Barnala to speak.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: If you want to leave the House, please leave in silence.

[*Translation*]

SARDAR SURJIT SINGH BARNALA (Sangrur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the 1996 elections, there was a clear mandate but that was not taken properly. Before 1996 elections, Congress was in power. Congress remained in the power for full five years and in such circumstances the elections were held.

19.56 hrs.

[SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA *in the Chair*]

Verdict of the people in the elections was against Congress. Congress lost more than 100 seats. In the House they were finished and BJP emerged as the single largest party. But they all were bent upon to keep BJP out of power and they were making their all out efforts to do so. Hence 13 parties came together. As you know the number 13 is considered as unlucky. That time also people said that 13 is an unlucky number and, hence, the government is going not to last long. Outside support was given by the Congress. It was said that their support would continue. But they have withdrawn their support before the last day has come. During the last ten months, Congress get many opportunities to prove their might. Many Legislative Assembly elections and by-elections to Lok Sabha were held at several places in the country. By-elections were held in U.P., Punjab and Jammu-Kashmir but Congress was defeated badly. Though Congress was supporting the Government from outside but they were considered very powerful and it was thought that life of JF Government depends upon the support of Congress but what results they achieved? They lost the Assembly by-elections in these three states and two Lok Sabha by-elections in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. Defeat has become Congress's fate now. Pilotji is our friend. He was claiming that Congress had improved the condition in Punjab. I have said on earlier occasions that had the Congress improved the condition in Punjab, they would have got at least some votes. They would not have suffered such a major setback. People in Punjab, have understood that the condition of Punjab was worsened by none else than Congress. They were claiming themselves to have improved the condition in J & K also but people of that State also have understood the reality. These people never went beyond Banihal. These people had also engineered the collapse of Farooq Abdullah Government there and inducted their own puppet Government.

These Congress people are responsible for terrorism in Punjab. Terrorists have been arrested from the houses

[Sardar Surjit Singh Barnala]

of senior leaders of Congress. I do not want to name them but terrorists were arrested from the house of President of Punjab Congress, Shri Santosh Singh Randhava. When these terrorists were just to be shot down, they said that they are known to Congress President. Whereas we people were the victims of terrorists and many leaders and volunteers of party have to lose their lives. We have sacrificed our lives, our leaders became the victims of terrorism. Shri Longowal was the victim of terrorism, Balwant Singh was assassinated, Shri Tohraj, who had been the President of Siromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee for more than twenty years was deadly attacked. He lost his thumb and two bullets were fixed on his leg. Similarly chief of Akali Dal, Talwandi Ji was also deadly attacked. But luckily he escaped. Several times we were attacked by terrorists and hundreds of our people died. Only these Congress people were behind all this. That's why this party is in a miserable state today.

20.00 hrs.

Now, the cases have been instituted against these leaders. Probably there might be any leader against whom no case has been instituted. Now they are blaming that Deve Gowdaji has got instituted CBI cases against us. Deve Gowdaji did not interfere. Cases have also been instituted against large number of his party members. They are exposed. That's why people do not want even to hear the name of this party—This party is going to fall. I cannot understand why such a situation is created today. If BJP and we the supporting parties would have join together to bring down this Government we might have not succeeded we were not in power. We can do nothing except to move a confidence motion and our hon. member of our party had even moved a confidence motion. But it was not possible to pass that motion. They have created such circumstances that you cannot bring down this Government. We assist in doing these things. Congress has withdrawn its support and that too at that time when they should have not act so. All members have expressed their views in this regard but I do not want to go in detail because of short of time. But he has not given reply as to why they had withdrawn the support particularly in these days. The Parliament Session was just to be start on 21st and a number of sittings was supposed to held. They could do it on any day then why they have withdrawn support particularly in these days only? The reference of a letter has also been made. Rajesh Pilot has left the House. The matter of that letter is also related to him. Just 2-3 days before a notice was also issued in a case. Probably it was also inter-linked. That's why it was done in hurry. Everything is open to the people as to what was the reason behind it?

Sir, I want to submit in this Hon. House that such circumstances have been created intentionally. They didn't realize their responsibility for the country. Many things

are involved in this. It is a confidence motion. It is understood from the prevailing circumstances that they are going to vote against them and we are already voting against them. What will be the result? They have jumped on the dark. No one is aware of any thing. When I reached Delhi, I asked my friends in Congress Party about what has happened? They said, we know anything about this. The proverb 'Bolt from the blue' appears to be true here. Why all this had happened? What is going to be happen next? There may be mid-term poll in the country. No body is interested in mid-term poll. I feel that parties are forced to take a stand. With a passion we say that we are ready for mid-term poll, but no other party is ready for this. No Lok Sabha member is interested in this, but as far as Rajya Sabha is concerned, it is different. ... (*Interruptions*) They have created situation of midterm poll within the period of 10 months only. They are responsible for it. The motion of vote of confidence is not a good thing. Only these people are responsible for mid term poil. The country will have to bear an expenditure of Rs. 600-700 crores. There is no limit of expenditure incurred by people. They have put the country in crisis. No body is going to be benefitted by this. They are repeatedly saying that they will not allow BJP to come in Power. This whole exercise is being done to bring them in power. It appears as if BJP will surely in power during the fiftieth year of our independence. Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji will take over as Prime Minister in this very year. When we will be celebrating the Golden Jubilee of our independence. They themselves have created such circumstances. The people of the country are experiencing the role of Congress very well. They are all wise. They know that the role being played by the Congress is wrong and they should have not done so but they have taken such a step. If elections are held, these people will be the most sufferers. Each member of the party have their own views. They are saying that they will suffer the most. I was just hearing the speech of Shri Patil. I liked the suggestions given by him. He said that the people of India have elected us.

[*English*]

We are wise elders or wise persons of the country; let us sit together.

[*Translation*]

You should sit and think what is in the interest of the country. Is there any way out or not. He also said about Presidential form of Government. He didn't completed his words. But I would like to submit that in such circumstances there is no other way then to form a National Government. In this very House Hon. Speaker of Lok Sabha was unanimously elected. May be from any party, but no one stood against him and that's why my suggestion is to sit together and think over this

problem. I do not understand why these people say we will not sit with one or the other. Suppose, if mid-term elections are held than what will they do? In these circumstances, I am sure we will win and form the Government. That's why I says

[*English*]

Let all the wise people sit together, join their heads and think it over for a day or for two days or for some more days and take the President also into confidence and take a decision in the interest of the nation.

[*Translation*]

So, my suggestion is to run the Government unitedly. With these words I oppose this motion.

[*English*]

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Chairman, Sir. I rise to support the Motion of Confidence moved by the Prime Minister. I begin my speech by saying this, in order to dispel any confusion which may be arising in the minds of many.

Sir, the United Front has been a 'phenomenon'—political and social. This phenomenon has arisen because of the mandate given by the people in the election to the Eleventh Lok Sabha. The people of the country did not vote for any single party to form the Government at the Centre, but have deliberately divided the political map of the country into three main broad streams. That is, on the one side, there is the BJP; on the other side, there is the Congress (I); and in-between, there is a combination of forces of secular, democratic, left and other progressive fronts.

A chance to rule the country was given to the BJP which could rule this country—of their adventure—for only 13 days.

I beg to submit this with all humility and with all respect to the Leader of the Opposition.

The defeat of the BJP in this House further indicated the desire of the people that, neither the Congress nor the BJP which should be entrusted the responsibility to form the Government at the Centre. Realising this, the thirteen parties—you may mock at it—combined together on the basis of a Common Minimum Programme.

Sir, the idea of the United Front was conceived, as I have mentioned earlier, as an alternative both to the Congress and also to the BJP. I mentioned, why it is an alternative? It is an alternative to the reactionary economic policies of the Congress (I) so far pursued. It is an alternative to the policies which led to the erosion of the economic sovereignty of this country and if economic

sovereignty is eroded then political sovereignty cannot remain intact. Therefore, the country needed an alternative to the policies of the Congress particularly on the economic front.

Sir, we wanted to become or we are an alternative to the BJP because they do not believe in secularism. They do not believe in democracy and India without secularism and without democracy ceases to be the India of our dreams. Therefore, these thirteen Parties are not merely Parties; it is not merely a number, it not just 192 after counting. It really means a political and social force which could smoothen the way to prosperity, peace, tranquillity and further development of this country.

Unfortunately, some of the Members belonging to the Congress feel that it is merely a number. Some Members unfortunately simply interpret it as a cold number. It is not a cold number, it is not a hard arithmetic, it is a perception; it is a conception; it is a political alternative which the country and the nation need.

Sir, unless we consider this crisis arising at the moment on account of the decision of the Congress (I) on the withdrawal of support from the United Front, we shall not be able to remove this confusion and clear the political atmosphere which is surrounding the country. We have the experiences of the earlier non-Congress Governments at the Centre. So far as my Party is concerned, I know, we are tiny we are small in numbers but it is not the smallness, it is not merely the number, it is the question of ideology and the pursuit of a particular principle and ethical policy.

We have the experience of the non-Congress rule at the Centre. There are two factors which, we think, were absent on the earlier occasions. There was no Common Minimum Programme. I would like to draw the attention of the former External Affairs Minister of the non-Congress Government. Was there any programme to run the Government at that time led by the late Morarji Desai? So far as I know, I know correctly, that there was no programme borne out of the exchange of views amongst those supporting Parties or constituent Parties of the Morarji Desai Government. But this time we took lesson from that. We took lessons from that gap. Members of my Party insisted that we are to support a non-Congress third front government provided there are two guarantees.

One guarantee is the Common Minimum Programme. Another guarantee is a Steering Committee, a monitoring committee, a committee of the political parties which shall function as a combination of political parties, instead of one single political party, to guide and steer the Government at the Centre. Therefore, these two guarantees were available with us and that emboldened us to become a constituent of the United Front. I was

[Shri Chitta Basu]

assured that the Steering Committee will steer the Council of Ministers. It is a political body. It is a political master of these 13 parties and this political master will steer the Council of Ministers in order to translate or put into effect the Common Minimum Programme. On these two conditions we agreed to become a part of the United Front.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I know your difficulty. I know the constraint of time. I will just take two minutes more.

I am glad that Mr. Dasmuni mentioned about the functioning of the Steering Committee and our stake. I, as a constituent of the United Front, discussed many problems, many weaknesses and many infirmities of the policies being pursued by this Government. On the economic issues, I had the privilege, the courage to discuss in the Steering Committee the negative aspects, the negative fissures of the economic policy. That provided me the scope to function as an independent political identity and the Government was responsive to that. It may be not to the fullest possible extent but to the extent permissible. This is the mechanism of the United Front. This is the mechanism of coalition politics.

The House has agreed, almost all the speakers have said, that we have entered into an era of coalition politics and if this coalition politics is to be strengthened, is to be sustained there must be certain norms to run it. I will have to ask the Congress Party benches, with all humility, whether they have maintained that norm. The Congress Party supported the United Front from outside as we did. The Congress Party was not a part of the Government; neither were we. Shri Somnath Chatterjee is also not a part of the Government. But we have fulfilled our responsibility to the nation and to the United Front movement as such. In the coming days, in India there is no other alternative than the politics of coalition, the politics of United Front. The question remains whether this coalition will be for the Right or for the Left or whether this coalition will be the Centre of the Left. I have chosen my path and the United Front symbolises that path, which means a package of programme which can lift this country out of the economic morass and also guarantees the economic sovereignty. By guaranteeing the economic sovereignty it can guarantee the political sovereignty of the country.

The withdrawal of support by Congress (I) from the United Front Government, as I have said, is not substantiated, is not justified. If you permit me, I would say it is unethical, un-principled and it is also prompted by narrow sectarian partisan interests and in order to serve the purpose of grabbing power in an unethical and unprincipled way.

Therefore, I have no alternative but to oppose them. Along with opposing them in this particular context, I support the United Front Government because that is the only beacon light for the progress of India. I think my hon. friend from the other side should realise this.

My question to Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev is, whether he is going to become a part of the right coalition or he is going to become a part of the left coalition. It is for him to decide. On his decision depends the future of the country. He may reconsider his decision. Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev, may please reconsider his party's decision in the larger interests of the country. Otherwise, he would also indirectly support a party which does not believe in democracy, which does not believe in secularism and, as such, does not want the prosperity, unity and integrity of India.

SHRI P.N. SIVA (Pudukkottai). Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Confidence on behalf of my party, the DMK, a constituent of the United Front Government, which can claim the right of running a Government which is dotless and corruptionless.

The situation today is unwarranted, the time is unexpected and the consequences are unimaginable, that too, when the country is heading towards a better tomorrow. To avoid this unimaginable, unavoidable consequences, it is the duty of everyone to share the responsibility at this juncture. I consider it my duty just to apprise the merits of the United Front Government and not to abuse anybody for it. I would like to confine myself to the constraints of time.

One healthy atmosphere, I think, which I should note here and which everyone will associate themselves with, is that so many untoward incidents and so many unhappy things might have happened, but amidst all this, there is one thing which is to be appreciated. I would like to recall the day when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee moved a Motion of Confidence, our Parliamentary Party Leader and now the Minister of Industry, Shri Murasoli Maran in his speech had said that we were against his Government. He also mentioned that Atalji was the right man but he was in the wrong place. That is all different. But he has also appreciated that the BJP has not indulged in horse trading to retain power. He magnanimously appreciated that and I wish that everyone should have the same broad-mindedness and magnanimity even at this juncture. We have not indulged in horse trading and we have not resorted to any means to cling to power. Those days have gone. Compare the situation prior to the coming of United Front Government and the situation prevailing in the country since our Government came to power. Then, the whole Government was corrupt, the country was in a turmoil and the bureaucracy was at its worst. Now, everything has been changed just in ten months.

I would like to call the attention of everyone here to the complex mandate which the people gave in the general elections and which had paved the way for a federal Government and which had kept away the ideology of a single party rule. Actually the United Front Government presented a Government of a true federal nature. The experiment was on, the inference was effective and was appreciable but this impasses emphasis has befallen. I do not want to go into the details—though it is true—because that may rake up a controversy which I want to avoid at this juncture.

The Congress Party had extended its unconditional support to the United Front Government to keep away the communal forces and to strengthen the secular forces.

I do not know how a charge has been levelled against us that we have become non-secular and pro-communal. Has any *Rath Yatra* been conducted in this country during the last ten months leading to communal tension? Has any Masjid been demolished? Has any temple been ruined? Has any Church been damaged? Has any Gurudwara been raided? No. The sentiments of none has been hurt by any such activities but yet we are branded as non-secular and pro-communal.

I am not able to understand as to what blunder we have committed to quit, what wrong we have committed just to be voted out. That is the genuine question we want to raise on this occasion. The elections would prove those things.

The voice of the States carving for more power was paid heed to for the first time only during this Government's regime. After Shri V.P. Singh's period, the meeting of the Inter-State Council was convened only by the UF Government which every State is appreciating. So also, 29 per cent of the Central tax revenue is devolved to the States, which is appreciated by one and all. As our hon. Finance Minister said here, I would like to quote him: 'The State Ministers are deciding the policies at the Centre and that is the healthy atmosphere which has been created, developed and which should be nourished by the UF Government'. It is the duty of one and all.

I would confine myself, due to constraint of time to the Budget which has been appreciated, which has got the acknowledgment of one and all in the country. It has brought down the inflation rate. It has brought down what all should be. It has concentrated every sector in the State, in the country. It was interpreted that if the subsidies are given to the agricultural sector, the burden on economy would increase. We have done it. We have given the subsidies. We have given the concessions to agriculture but the economy has not been affected.

The UF Government, in spite of its wonderful jobs during the last ten months, is being criticised, which is not clear to us, which we are not able to understand.

I would like to point out one important thing that as a prelude to 33 per cent reservations for women in the Legislatures and in the Parliament, we have given 30 per cent reservations for women in the petroleum and natural gas agencies across the board. Are those women, who have advocated for those things, prepared to appreciate? Are they prepared to recommend to their High Command that this Government has done such a thing? All those spinsters who have crossed forty years of age are given full financial aid which should be appreciated by all the women Members in this House. Have we not done anything right? Are we to quit? Are we to be voted out? Are we to be sent out?

Sir, in spite of the mounting pressure and the threat by the developed countries, India's firm stand on the CTBT has marked a milestone in its foreign policy. The relationship with Russia has been strengthened...  
(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is over. Please conclude

SHRI P.N. SIVA: Sir, I would take only one more minute. Sir, I am the only speaker from my party. I am a youth. You have given a chance to the youth for the first time today.

The enmity clouds between Pakistan and India have vanished and a new fresh chapter has been opened. The relationship with China has been renovated. The decade long problem of sharing Ganga waters with Bangladesh has been settled only in these ten months. The Philippines President has visited India for the first time to develop the cultural and trade relationships. Who is there to appreciate this? Why should we be abused? Why should we be asked to quit? Sir, seven million U.S. dollars have come into this country as foreign investment only in the industrial sector, thanks to the Minister of Industry.

Sir, I would like to point out only one thing that we are prepared to sacrifice power. We are not for power. We have not prostrated before anybody for the sake of power. We would not prostrate before anybody for power in future also. We are prepared to sacrifice not only power but even our life for the self-respect and we have got a very good track record for that.

All these, I have spoken not as a politician, not as a Member of a political party, not as a constituent of the United Front Government but I have spoken here as one among the youth who are watching the television now all over the country as to what is going on in this House and what will happen to their future. Everyone is there

[Shri P.N. Siva]

with a question mark. I have represented the voice of the have-nots, those who dwell on the platform, those who work and do not get a loaf of bread and those who do not even get a chance to work. Everyone here is prepared to face an election. But it is not the juncture to face an election. Since ample time is available, I request the Congress to reconsider its decision keeping in mind the welfare of the nation and those millions of poor whose need to be met out by implementing the Budget which this United Front Government has presented. Only one thing I want to add.

'NADANTHATHU NADANTHATHAAGA IRUKKADDUM  
NADAPPATHU NALLAVAIYAGA IRUKKADDUM'

These were the words which our founder leader Arignar Anna had said, "Let the past be past, let the future happenings, at least, be positive".

I wish the nation a very prosperous future. I expect all the elders here who have expressed their concern to be positive and I associate my feelings with them, not for power, not for Government but for the future generations.

SHRI N.K. PREMCHANDRAN (Quilon): Sir, first of all I am proud to be here on my legs to support the United Front Government which is headed by the hon. Prime Minister, Shri H.D. Deve Gowda. Also on behalf of my party, Revolutionary Socialist Party, the RSP, I extend my wholehearted support to the Motion seeking the confidence of this House in the Council of Ministers led by our hon. Prime Minister of this country.

Sir, the 11th Lok Sabha, within 11 months from the date of installation of this House, is witnessing the third Confidence Motion. The last two Confidence Motions are: the first one was moved by the hon. former Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and the second Confidence Motion was moved by our hon. present Prime Minister. Sir, the third Confidence Motion has now come before the House. It has come mainly due to the new development which has already been discussed here.

Sir, what is the new development? The new development is the decision taken by the Congress Working Committee President, Shri Sitaram Kesri to withdraw the support of the Congress Party to the United Front. I would like to say that the decision of the Congress Working Committee President is sudden, unexpected, unfortunate and untimely, considering the peculiar circumstances of this nature.

Sir, before analysing the reasons for the withdrawal of support, I would like to go back to June, 1996. What was the outcome of the 11th Lok Sabha elections? Everybody is aware that no party has been given the absolute majority to rule the country. As everybody knows,

the Indian National Congress has governed this country, ruled the country for the last four decades. That Party was having three-fourth strength in this Lok Sabha. That has now come to 140. So, no Party has been given the majority to rule the country. That means, it is an indication for a coalition Government. The United Front constituents have formed and approved a Common Minimum Programme. On the basis of the Common Minimum Programme, this Government has been going for the last ten months.

Today, so many eminent persons have participated in the debate on behalf of the Congress Party. I would like to put two questions. The first question is: what are the circumstances which prompted the Congress (I) to support this United Front Government? The second question is: what are the reasons which prompted the Congress to withdraw the support? The Congress could never answer the second question before the House nor before the country. It was answered in a controversial manner. If you listened to the speeches of various Congress leaders, you will find their speeches contradictory and controversial. For that two reasons are mentioned. The first reason is that the United Front Government has failed to consolidate the secular forces of the country. The second reason is that the internal security of the country is under threat.

What was the opening speech of Shri P.R. Dasmunsi? He was appreciating all the Ministers. He said that all the Ministers are good. He even appreciated the Prime Minister as a good gentleman.

Then what is the defect with the United Front Government and with the hon. Prime Minister?

Sir, due to time constraint, I am not going to read out the letter verbatim given by Sitaram Kesri to Rastrapatiji. However, I quote a few lines:

"The sensitive Defence issues and security requirement of the country have not been properly addressed."

Shri P.R. Dasmunsi was highly appreciating our Minister of Defence. What Shri Sita Ram Kesri's letter said and what has the speech delivered in this House said? Also considering the views of the secular friends I am not going to the speech of the former Prime Minister who has addressed this House. On the last Confidence Motion, the Congress Party said that they are giving unconditional support to a secular Government. I do not know whether there have been any changes in the circumstances in the United Front Government in the past ten months. Would he point out a single incident? It has not been highlighted by them.

As far as the Uttar Pradesh election is concerned, Congress (I) was the partner to the election campaign for the BSP Government. They were having a coalition in the election campaign.

I would also proudly say that during the last ten months there are no major communal clashes in this country. The United Front Government is really maintaining the communal harmony in this country. Is it not an achievement?

I would also like to say something about corruption. I am remembering my maiden speech. Corruption is a growing disease just like cancer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI N.K. PREMCHANDRAN: It has to be checked. I would like to know whether the Opposition parties or the persons who are withdrawing the support from the United Front Government can pinpoint a single piece of allegation of corruption against this Government. Is it not an achievement?

Then a popular Government was installed in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Is it not an achievement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI N.K. PREMCHANDRAN: Sir, I am concluding. So, the arguments advanced by the Congress(I) before this House is generally baseless.

I would also like to say something about our foreign Affairs. It has already been appreciated. After the demise of our late Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the United Front Government has already taken the initiative to convene the NAM Conference. Is it not an achievement?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. Your time is over. Please conclude.

SHRI N.K. PREMCHANDRAN: Sir, I am concluding. I strongly support the Motion of Confidence which has been moved by the United Front Government. I also appeal to the Congress (I) to reconsider its decision.

[*Translation*]

SHRI JAI PRAKASH (Hisar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion presented by the Hon. Prime Minister because 11 months ago the people of this country had given mandate to Bharatiya Janata Party and its alliance parties and a Government was formed under the leadership of Hon. Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji and the colleague sitting on my left talked about communalism when a discussion on Vote of Confidence on Shri Atalji was going on. I would like to ask only one thing from those

colleagues of mine who oppose the mandate of the public considering BJP as a communal party as to what are they going to tell the public now. I would like to know with what purpose Congress gave an unconditional support for five years and why is it withdrawn now? Is it simply because Shri Deve Gowda did not attend the offices of P.C.C. and A.I.C.C. or some people who were fully engrossed in their activities between 1991 and 1995 and C.B.I. has taken up the task of independent enquiry against all these persons. Whether the matters may be of any nature, a few days back it so happened that the Congressmen were upset on Dr. Tanwar's case. I would like to tell Shri Deve Gowda one thing, and that is his Government is a coalition government. There are chances that he may have to quit, but he should at least present all the facts of Congress party, United Front and this Government before the nation. The way you functioned during the past ten months, and the United Front Government which claims to be the Government of the Agriculturist fixed the price of wheat at Rs. 615 per quintal for the agriculturist, and when all the agriculturists pressurised, it was with great difficulty that a bonus of Rs. 60 per quintal was given. I would like to tell Shri Ram Vilas Paswan that after some days elections will be held. It is at that time that he will come to know that he has done something anti-agriculturist by importing wheat at the rate of Rs. 627 per quintal. It will not be tolerated by the public and the agriculturist of this country.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, secondly, I would say, that today the Congress is saying that we withdraw our support to the United Front and the United Front says that we should remain United it is not late even now. All these words spoken by your party reverberate throughout the country even these days. The eyes of the people of this country are fixed on the Lok Sabha today, and public is watching how the party which was given the mandate is side-lined and you have formed the Government with a slogan of communalism. You have also done the job of robbing this country and breaching the public trust. These things will not be tolerated by this country. This country will be ruled by the Bharatiya Janata Party. Whether elections will be held today or tomorrow but those will be held definitely and BJP will get the majority.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there goes a saying that if a person sets assail on two boats simultaneously, he is sure to drown. In the present case Shri Deve Gowda runs the Government while riding 14 horses simultaneously, which will ultimately result in the fall of Government. Today, I would clearly say that, if by the present Government somebody else is installed in the place of Deve Gowda and the Government is saved for the time being, after some time the same condition will emerge. There was a time when these people used to say that they will not talk to Congress people, but today these very people are saying for saving their own

[Shri Jai Prakash]

Government that Congress should re-consider their decision and re-constitute the Government of the United Front. Is it that the people of this country do not understand that they are begging before Congress only to save their Government.

Ram Vilas Paswanji has fought a battle against Congress and today he is seeking their help. It is better for him to resign and announce their readiness to face elections. People will decide. Is it that the fate of a country of 90 crore people will be decided by the 543 Members sitting here? The people of this country will not tolerate it. Today the people are worried that though BJP got the mandate, yet it is not being given support on a single ground of communalism. Now, the situation is such that if Shri Deve Gowda meets the Leader of the Shiva Sena, he is also labelled as communal. If the congressmen label Shri Deve Gowda as communal, then I would like to tell Shri Ram Vilas Paswan that he too ought to say that he doesn't require the Congress support. We would like to face the elections.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention here through you that although we may say that we want to face elections, but our brethren from the Congress, who are sitting in the Central Hall are saying that they do not like to participate in the elections. But it is the misfortune of this country that by making anti-defection law, Members of Parliament are made the bonded labour of the Leaders. Therefore, I would request Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that the country may be released from this politics of causing defections and permutations because very shortly he is to assume the seat of power in this country. Public shall have to support a party which can run this country. Today Congress is capable of running the Government of this country, but is there no other party. It is just like an admixture of various parties. People of the country will dethrone this Government of admixture also and BJP will come to power. The people who have tried to create an atmosphere of communalism will perish and Congress will also perish. I would like to tell the people of the country that if elections are held, United Front and Congress both should be voted out and BJP should be brought to power. With these words I would oppose this motion.

[English]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has moved a Motion of Confidence calling upon this House to express its confidence in the Council of Ministers. The United Front, along with the parties which were supporting from outside, represented more than two-thirds or even three-fourths of the total popular votes. It is tragic that such a coalition Government is required to seek a vote of confidence within 10-11 months of its assuming office. Indeed the United Front coalition Government is a Government with

a difference. It is an improvement upon the earlier coalitions. It has its own Common Minimum Programme. But it must also be known that some do have prejudices against coalition Governments. Their prejudices are irrational. India is a country of subcontinental size. A coalition Government, therefore, is most suited to such a country. India is a multiple society with multiplicity of issues and, therefore, with multiplicity of parties.

Therefore, I say that a coalition Government is most apt and appropriate under such a situation. India is a multiple society where the policies and actions of the Government have a different impact on different sections of the people and, therefore, I say that a coalition Government is the right response to a country of our nature.

Now, our hon. Member Shri Jaswant Singh may scoff at coalitions. He had the choicest epithets. He used the epithets for the United Front coalition. I have great admiration for the hon. Member Shri Jaswant Singh. But I was taken aback over one thing. Never before had the hon. Member made such a hollow speech without any substance. I started to think of another set of epithets to counter his epithets. But then I am spared of that effort because they can look into their own mirror.

The BJP had supported Shri V.P. Singh from outside without taking any responsibilities of the Government. Therefore, I say that the choicest epithets which Shri Jaswant Singh used for the United Front really rebound and recoil upon him and his party itself.

Now, indeed, it was a hasty step and I reiterate to say that it was a hasty step on the part of the Congress to withdraw the support. This was the first reaction of the Muslim League as soon as we came to know that the support had been withdrawn and till this day we stand by our perception, by our assessment that the step was hasty and not in the national interest. We are indeed in the midst of the Budget. The nation cannot afford one more election in a matter of hardly 10-12 months. It will be a great drain on the exchequer.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Banatwalla, please conclude. Your time is over. Each Member is given five minutes.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Sir, I have hardly started... (*Interruptions*) You just bear with me. I will resume my seat as soon as you ring the bell within fifteen minutes... (*Interruptions*)

I will run over the speech. I will cooperate with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You take another two minutes.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: I was saying that it will be a drain on the exchequer. Ultimately, it is the people who will have to pay and the anti-social elements are

going to exploit the situation. But while I say that it was a hasty step on the part of the Congress to withdraw the support and create a crisis, I must be fair enough to say that it is the stubborn, arrogant and egoistic attitude of the United Front which has precipitated the crisis. Let the United Front Government know very well that a coalition demands mutual respect, concessions, consideration and compromise. Let the United Front jettison its ego in the national interest. I am constrained to say that politically motivated anti-Congressism of the United Front has over-shadowed the considerations of the defence of the secular polity of our country.

We have our own complaints against the United Front. I do not want to detail out them now. But I would say that not a single step was taken by the United Front in support of the secular democracy and in order to deal with the anti-secular elements. Babri Masjid is forgotten by them in spite of their commitment in the Common Minimum Programme. The hon. Member Shri Madhukar Sarpotdar must know that it is not the Muslims and the secular people who have forgotten it, but it is the United Front which has forgotten Babri Masjid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat now.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: I will conclude in a few sentences.

It cannot be denied that not a single step has been taken to implement the Places of Religious Worship Act in spite of the blatant challenges that were being made with respect to mosques at Kasi and the Mathura Idgah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. Please take your seat.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: They totally forgot their commitment in the Common Minimum Programme.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Your time is over.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: I will appeal and conclude.

These and several other are the grievances. TADA detainees are still suffering. Then, I must only say that remedial steps should be taken and an egoistic and arrogant attitude should not be taken. I appeal to both the Congress and the United Front to come to a compromise in the national interest. It is in this spirit and with these sentiments that the Muslim League does not want to take any side in this particular Motion. If the voting is forced upon us, we will have to abstain, but let us not fail the nation, let us not fail the secular democracy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri G.M. Banatwalla, please take your seat.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Let us reach a compromise in the interest of secular democracy and in the national interest. If the voting is forced upon us, we will have to abstain with these sentiments that there may be a compromise in the national interest.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I start initially by offering a word of caution to the Congress Party. Here is a situation but I have no time to go into details at the fag end of the sitting. I have to be very brief. But I have really something to share with this august House. The word of caution for the Congress Party is this. Why is it that the Rajya Sabha sometimes, not the Rajya Sabha as a whole... (*Not recorded*) have created a situation for the Lok Sabha? I will go into the history very briefly. When the support was withdrawn to the Government headed by Shri Chandra Shekhar, I was in Kashmir at that time. When I came to Delhi, I met the then Prime Minister and I told him that it was not needed, because three or four spies were loitering somewhere around 10 Janpath. That was not a justification. I want to share with this august House that the then Prime Minister had finally felt that... (*Not recorded*) had created a situation for the then Prime Minister. Why am I giving this word of caution to the Congress party? It is because that there may be many more occasions when the ... (*Not recorded*) the Lok Sabha Members and it will happen again and again... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Sir, the hon. Minister is from the Rajya Sabha.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: The then Prime Minister with whom I have got an access had agreed with me. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI (Howrah): Your Prime Minister is also from the Rajya Sabha. So, who did it this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, please address the Chair.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, as far as the withdrawal of support to the Government is concerned, there is no time to delve deeper, but I can say that Shri Sitaram Kesri's letter to the President ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, you cannot refer to the Rajya Sabha.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, it is not a derogatory remark on the Rajya Sabha as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot refer to the Members of the other House. You cannot refer to the conduct of the Members of the other House. This will not go on record.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, as far as Shri Sitaram Kesri's letter to the President of India is concerned, I have only to say that... (*Interruptions*) Sir, please call the House to order. They are talking there

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let there be order in the House please. You go ahead.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, as far as Shri Sitaram Kesri's letter of withdrawing support from the Government headed by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda is concerned, I have only to say that some serious people, people who matter, some thinking people have rated that this action is ill-timed and they have called it political adventurism; whether it suits the Congress party for future is their concern. I want to share with them that it was ill-timed.

My party's position on the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir is known to you. The accession of Jammu and Kashmir State is final and it is a separate issue. But the people of Jammu and Kashmir along with the other people outside the State of Jammu and Kashmir want very good relations with Pakistan. But this situation was created when Indo-Pakistan talks were going on. Amity between India and Pakistan is necessary for us. When it is viewed from any angle, it was an ill-timed action.

Sir, as far as the performance of the Government is concerned, much has been said. But I tell you that, apart from the Prime Minister Shri H.D. Deve Gowda, some members of the Government got recognition at the international level.

**21.00 hrs.**

Shri Gujral created a situation of understanding not only with neighbours but also with the international community wherein 70 Foreign Ministers from NAM member-countries arrived at the Rashtrapati Bhavan. So many Arab Ministers and Foreign Ministers told me clearly that this Government is working very well. What is the need of removing this Government? I will not go into the Budget which has made an all time record for this country.

I want to tell you one thing, which only I can tell you. This Prime Minister created a situation of hope in Jammu and Kashmir State. He went to Jammu and Kashmir four times. For six years nobody went to Kashmir. You are all the time saying Jammu and Kashmir State is an integral part of India. Yes, it is. But why did the previous Prime Ministers not go there? Shri Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister for five years. Shri Chandra Shekhar got a short stint and he could not go nor could Shri V.P. Singh go. But Shri Deve Gowda went to Jammu and Kashmir State four times and he created a situation of hope and understanding there. He created a situation

of hope in North-East also. You cannot neglect North Eastern States and Jammu and Kashmir State.

I have a word of caution for BJP. Jammu and Kashmir is not an ordinary issue. It is a settled issue. But when you want to put up a bright face you pilot Shri Jaswant Singh but when you have to put up a dark face, you tell Kumari Uma Bharati to represent you. This double standard is not acceptable to me because she has run down Dr. Farooq Abdullah who should be rated as a hero. He performed a miracle in Jammu and Kashmir in the Assembly elections. ... (*Interruptions*)

There was an attempt to disrupt elections but he stood like a rock because he had a friend like Shri Deve Gowda here. Shri Deve Gowda was at his back and he performed a miracle there. Today the BJP put up Kumari Uma Bharati to denounce Dr. Farooq Abdullah. This double standard is not acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude. Your time is over.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, I am concluding with a couplet. But before the couplet I will tell you one thing. I hear Shri Pramod Mahajan and Shri Shivraj Patil with rapt attention. These two gentlemen tried to create an impression in the House that only a single party can keep this country united. I want to tell you on the basis of my experience in Lok Sabha that perhaps the days of a single party rule in this country are gone. This is my perception. There will be a party or a group of parties to rule in Delhi who will care for regional aspirations. Here was a true experiment of federalism.

I would go to Ram Vilas Paswan who brought Jammu and Kashmir on the map of Railways which the Congress had failed to do in its long rule. It was he who has done this ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA (Gwalior): It is very unfair. We had sanctioned the project for Udhampur line.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Sir, I am sharing my thought with the crores of people of this country that there will be a future Government which will represent the regional aspirations. I salute this Government because it represented the true federal structure... (*Interruptions*). When I say something to the Congressmen it is for correcting the situation for the future and not as an enemy. They should understand me.

Sir, I would conclude with a couplet.

[*Translation*]

'Barham Tha Mujh Sei  
Waqt Ka harek Charagar  
Kahta Tha Qatilon ka Masiha  
Woh Main Ne Tha.'

[*English*]

DR. PRABIN CHANDRA SARMA (Guwahati): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have taken the stand to support the Motion of Confidence moved by the hon. Prime Minister. Shri H.D. Deve Gowda, who is also the leader of the United Front.

Well, today, the House has seen a crisis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let there be order in the House.

DR. PRABIN CHANDRA SARMA: And the crisis is fraught with a great danger. Thirteen political parties made an experiment to prepare a vehicle of federalism. This vehicle was almost perfect and it carried its mission, that is, it has given due importance to the different aspirations and aims of different people living in different parts of the country.

But unfortunately, the founding fathers of our Constitution, may be due to lack of foresight, did not realise that even after five decades the country may run into such a chaos. It is simply because even to form a molecule of two different elements, there is the rule of science or there is the rule of scientific law. And here is a House of 545 MPs drawn from as many as 32-33 political parties. Therefore, the founding fathers did not realise that these 32-33-34 political parties may have different opinions, may have different outlooks and may have different philosophies. How to combine all these philosophies together to administer or govern the country was not thought of. That has led to this greatest crisis. So, that scientific basis must be evolved by all the politicians sitting here. We definitely have intellectuals amongst us, we definitely have philosophers amongst us, but then we do not have, probably, those persons amongst us who could think in scientific terms to form a polity. So long as that is not evolved, this crisis will continue to exist inside this Parliament.

I can tell you as a student of science that no political party in future will be in a position to govern the country without having a coalition partner. Neither the BJP nor the Congress nor any other political party will be in a position to govern the country on its own. We cannot befool the people of the country for all times to come. We may befool them temporarily, but then we cannot befool them for all times to come. We may arouse their passion, we may exploit their sentiments, but by simply exploiting their sentiments, the country cannot be governed. So, in order to govern the country, definitely, the Constitution must undergo a radical change.

Today, the crisis has been created by a political party, which boasts that they are 112 years old. What did they do? Probably, history will bear testimony to what they have done in 1947 for Assam. What have they

done in 1962 when this country was witnessing Chinese aggression? The country would definitely remember with pathos what this political party did in 1976. It is the saddest commentary that in spite of strong opposition from the people of the entire Assam, an election was thrust upon the people of Assam in 1983.

Therefore, we must have to be sagacious enough, we must have to be wise enough in dealing with the situation. Simply by taking advantage of a brute number, we are governing the country. The Constitution has given only one formula, that is, the brute number. On the basis of the brute number, today we are going to govern the country. A brute number can never be the solution for the governance of this country. That is why, I appeal to you that the whole of this House must have to sit together, must have to revise the philosophy and to find out a formula by which the country can be governed well irrespective of the different ideologies that we people have.

Therefore, I strongly support the Motion moved by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda. For the last fifty years, we have seen Prime Ministers. We have seen the governance of this country also. But it is for the first time in the history of independent India that the Deve Gowda Ministry has given the real governance to the people of this nation. That is why, I am in full agreement with his performance and also with the performance of his colleague Ministers.

It is for the first time that the North-Eastern Region has seen a Prime Minister who is sympathetic to their causes. We have seen many Prime Ministers in the past. They had no respect for the people of the North-Eastern Region. Even now, we see that there are many people who think that the people living in the North-Eastern Region are not human beings. We want a performing Government. We give full support to him. We have full confidence in Shri Deve Gowda and in the United Front Government. I believe that this experiment will be a real experiment and this is a vehicle of federalism. This federalism will have to, one day, rule the whole of this country.

Sir, I know that the time given to me is only five minutes. I only conclude by saying one thing. Our philosophy is that we are one country. It is based on the premises of secularism and socialism. It is based on the premise of federalism. Therefore, all the particular aspects must be taken into consideration. I think that Shri Deve Gowda will overcome this problem. He is our saviour at the moment. I, therefore, extend full support to him.

With these few words, I support the Motion.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SULTAN SALAHUDDIN OWAISI (Hyderabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I fully support the Motion presented

[Shri Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi]

by Shri Deve Gowda. All the same I do not want to criticise any nation. I will only say that history has provided us that when a nation, a party or a person faces decadence, it first of all snatches away its intellect when discrimination decays, every thing goes to dogs. Nobody bothers that elections would be held and what will be the result thereafter. I think the result will be, the present situation. The wealth of the nation will be spent, and the industries which are to arrive from foreign countries will not arrive, and the condition of the country that will follow will be something grave for which the History will never forgive. Posterity will blame us that we have not played the role which is played by a nation which perishes. We do not bother for all these things. Congress party emphasised only one point—that of secularism. I believe if the Congress party deletes the word "secularism" from its dictionary it would be far better. History will bear the testimony that Rome was burning and Nero was fiddling. Babri Mosque was being demolished and the Prime Minister did not issue the orders of a single fire, there was no lathi charge, no tear gas shells were thrown. On the other hand he was watching TV. You are using the word "secularism", but who will bear the testimony of secularism? We will do so, and the world will believe us. You will blow your own trumpet and talk about secularism, and will the world believe you. We shall have to bear witness for the secularism. For the time being, may the overlord bless you with good sense or give you what follows it. I will say nothing else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Surender Singh. He is not here, Shri Vajpayee may speak.

21.16 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, should I start? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURENDER SINGH (Bhiwani): Sir my name was called by the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: There are so many names. But what can I do.

SHRI SURENDER SINGH: You did not call my name.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the information that your name was called, but you were not present.

[*English*]

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, please give me some time to speak... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will give you some time on a better occasion to speak.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.C. THOMAS: Mine is a small party ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You are a part of the ruling group. You are a part of the United Front. I cannot give time to all the constituents of the Government separately.

Mr. Home Minister to speak.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA): While Shri Chidambaram was speaking, among other things, he had a feeling of sadness. I also want to say that I am also feeling quite sad. These last ten months have seen the coming into existence of a coalition Government consisting of 13 parties including nine Chief Ministers who are part and parcel of this coalition. This, I think, was truly reflective of the spirit of federalism which is growing in his country and which is showing a way for the future. That Government is going now. That Ministry has been killed by the senseless, irresponsible action of the Congress party. Its leadership has killed this Ministry, killed this experiment. So the blood of the United Front Ministry is on their head. They will have to pay for it.

Sometimes I use harsh words which I regret later on. I know, I had said, "if you withdraw your support to this Government, the people will do something to you."

That part, 'what the people would do to you', is still to come. I am afraid and I am sorry to say that this is a historic debate. It is only for this reason that a party which has withdrawn its support to this Government, after having pledged its support, has refused during this whole day from 11 o'clock in the morning till 11 o'clock in the night refused to divulge the reasons for this action. Member after Member has been asking, 'Please tell us why you did it, why your Leader did this at this particular time' and nobody is giving or trying to give an explanation.

I do not think that this has happened before in any serious debate in Parliament. Now, this is going down on the record. I hope, it would be recorded. They have decided in their wisdom that they would support the step taken by their Leader. All right, but they must explain it here; they cannot treat this whole House with contempt. They have to explain to this House why their Party or their Party President decided to take such an action which has wrecked everything. Their action has destabilised us; their action has wrecked us. That is why I say that they would be taught a lesson ultimately by the people of the country.

I could understand any political argument. If they say that there are some differences with some of the policies, say, the economic policy or the agrarian policy or the foreign policy or the industrial policy, I could understand that. Nobody talks about these matters. Only my young friend, Shri P.R. Dasmunsi made a point by

which he tried to say that our Government, i.e., this United Front Government had failed to consolidate and unite the forces of secularism. Though this was never said before, he has made a point, at least.

I do not accept his argument but it is a point which is worth debating. Otherwise, there is nothing to debate. Their Party President has gone on record not once but several times as saying that they have no other complaint, no other grievance, no other demand except that our Leader must go, our Leader must be changed. I may tell you—and there is no harm in telling you—that their Party President came to see me. I managed it in such a way that not a single line came out in the Press. I take credit for that. Otherwise, it would have been a news item in the newspapers. He came to my place on his own request. This was three days ago. He talked to me for one and a half hours. I tried my best to find out from him why he was doing this. I asked him, 'What is your demand? What is your complaint?' He went on making only one point. He went on saying,

[*Translation*]

don't want anything else. But please change your leader. I have no other demand. I do not want a Congress government either.

[*English*]

I do not know whether he was telling the truth or not but there it is. So, I think, this is really an issue without any precedent. I hope, if at least one of the senior Members of the Congress Party sitting here—now the debate would be ending—has still got time to speak, may try to explain to us why they have done something like this. If they want to justify it, let them please do it before the House. They cannot justify it.

One other point which I want to make is that I think, throughout the country the common people, the people at large are also very unhappy at the prospect of being forced into another election so soon. But they are not only unhappy; they are also angry. I am afraid that that anger is going to be targetted more and more against the political parties. The entire political system and the electoral system are losing credibility because of the way we are behaving. Tell me, why should people vote for us or for anybody, for that matter? Every few months, we will go to them and say, 'Come on, vote again. Vote for us. Send us there. We will go there, wreck the system, break the Government and come back to you again. So, please vote for us.'

People are not our slaves to expect that they will listen to whatever we tell them to do. Some people are very enthusiastic, I find, about the idea of elections again. I think that is the public posture that they are putting on.

I have also some friends in BJP. I know many of them. I do not think they are enthusiastic or happy at all. But anyway it is normal and that is to be expected. I think, we have done a bad service to the country. I do not know if anything can still be done. Many hon. Members have made suggestions here that after today's proceedings are over, the voting is taken, the Government is defeated, Shri Deve Gowda has to submit his resignation, I presume, to the Rashtrapati. After that, what is the future? If there is time, let all people who have got the future of this country at heart sit together, talk and see if any way out can be evolved and do something by agreement. I do not think it is beyond the bounds of possibility.

The other thing that I want to say is this. My BJP friends get very allergic whenever any mention is made of the 6th December, 1992. I only want to say one thing. Please consult the records of the Lok Sabha and see what the leader of BJP who is a very good friend of mine, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, said on the floor of this House immediately after the news of the demolition came. There was pandemonium going on in the House, everybody was excited, shouting and angry. Please see from the record what he said here. I was present here. I remember what he said and how he denounced it. He said that these people who have carried out this thing had gone far beyond what they were asked to do. He said that nobody told them to do what they have done. We should try to find out, he said, who these people are, identify them and bring them to book. I could not catch hold of these proceedings today. Otherwise, I could have read it out. So, whatever you may think, it is not an action, it is not an act which should be praised and lauded to the skies. The leader of BJP did not do it. He condemned it. He disapproved that and rightly so.

So, what I am saying is that let us not go on just branding us as communalists, pseudo-secularists. There was some reference here by Shri Pramod Mahajan to the figure of communal and castiest disturbances during this period. I have those figures which he has read out. I do not deny that some incidents have taken place. Our experience is that when your party is in power anywhere, then riots and disturbances go down. When you are in opposition, then different things take place. When you have the responsibility of maintaining law and order, then we find these disturbances go down. So, you may say that the best logic is to put you in power. You can say, 'Put us in power and there will be perfect peace all over the country'. So, I have given you an argument which you can use if you want to.

Sir, I think, the political instability will have very many adverse effects on the many sides of our nation's life. We are now again precipitating political instability. Stability

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

was returning slowly, a difficult job, as Shri P. Chidambaram pointed out. People were feeling that some measure of stability was coming back. Now, we have wrecked it. We have wrecked it again. One of the aspects I should remind you because I was the Home Minister. All these troubles which are taking place in the North-Eastern region and in one or two other places due to the actions of the armed insurgent groups will get further fillip now. It will get further incentive when they know that here at the Centre in Delhi the Government is being destabilised and the whole thing is being destabilised. We were hoping that in a few months' time some of that would be reduced also.

It is because some of them were beginning to show signs of being willing to come and talk across the table, the credit for which goes primarily to the Prime Minister who had openly made this appeal when he went to Assam, that we were willing to talk to them, without any conditions; they may please come and tell us as to what they want. Some response had just begun; it had begun and not more than that. He had one round of talks with some of their leading leaders of these insurgent groups. But I am afraid, what we are doing today and as the news of it spreads everywhere, these groups which are carrying out all kinds of violence, killing people, setting of bomb explosions and so on in the North East and in one or two other States also, will be further encouraged to continue with these kinds of things, whereas there is a recent improvement in our relations with Bangladesh.

I may tell you, it is not only a question of sharing of water. A large number of these insurgent groups have taken shelter there, across the border, in the last few years. They have got camps there in Bangladesh and they have been hiding there. Their leaders have been going there. But the present Bangladesh Government has assured us, at the highest level, that they are not going to allow these people to use Bangladesh territory for hostile acts against India, that they would see that their camps are wound up and that they are forced to leave Bangladesh.

I can tell you that last week we have got some reliable information. Their people came here and they have informed us that this thing has begun; some camps are being wound up; they have been forced to leave Bangladesh; and this will relieve much of the pressure on our security forces. Now, I do not know what will happen again.

So, all that I want to say is this. I do not want to take more time really. I am only worried seriously about Shri Kesri's motivation for what he did. I really, after talking to him for over one hour, could not understand what he was getting at. One thing he went on saying and I may tell you that now. It was that Shri Deve Gowda,

according to him, was systematically trying to break the Congress Party and that he could not allow him to do that. The Prime Minister would reply when he speaks. He said that he was trying to break that Party, that if he delays it any further, then he would succeed in this attempt of his; and so he had to act.

Has he shared that information with them? They are his leaders, they are his colleagues in the Working Committee and other leading bodies of the Congress. Did he ever take them into confidence? Did he ever take your consent to go ahead and do this kind of a thing? I do not know; they may please tell us.

So, all that I wish to say finally is that in all my experience in these years in Parliament, I have never witnessed such an extraordinary thing, that a supporting Party which was a party that ran the Government of this country for the last almost 50 years and which has so many members here—they declared their support on the floor of the House that they will unconditionally support a Government formed by secular forces—withdrawing its support. Of course, they have got the right to do that. But they have not got the right to keep the House in the dark. They must inform us; they must tell us as to why they have done this; and they must try to justify it. They cannot keep quiet like this. It is an insult to the Parliament and therefore, I hope, even at this late stage, some senior Members of the Congress Party should at least try to inform the House, what the mystery behind this whole thing is. Is there a mystery? I do not know.

Somebody talks about investigations, cases and this and that. I asked Shri Kesri—some papers are writing like this; a lot of gossip is going on—as to whether it is a fact that there were some cases of investigations against some leaders of their party and that is what prompted them to act quickly. He said, "No. No. No. This is all gossip. They are all rumours. There is nothing correct in that." Then, what was it? They may please tell us. I would be very happy to hear from some leaders here. They cannot treat Parliament like this.

Therefore, I conclude by saying this. Of course, we are going to press our vote of confidence. They would be well-advised—I do not think that they will take my advice—not to vote against the vote of confidence because tomorrow they have to go and try to get the confidence vote of the people which they would never give them... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Sir, Shri Indrajit Gupta has sought a clarification... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Are you going to reply to him? cannot allow like this. You have already spoken.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Wait for me to conclude. Is there any more speaker from the Congress? It is because I have two more names and the Member who would speak from the Congress side would reply to it.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a point.

MR. SPEAKER: There would be no end to it.

... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, some unparliamentary words have been used by the hon. Home Minister ... (*Interruptions*) Kindly go through the record and remove those words... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I would be giving an opportunity to your Party as well. I cannot go on giving chances to individuals like this. I have said that I would allow one speaker from the Congress. At that time he can reply.

... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, I am only asking you to go through the record and if there are some unparliamentary terms used, those should be removed. That is what I am saying... (*Interruptions*) I did not want to intervene when he was speaking and that is why I am saying now... (*Interruptions*) Kindly go through the record and remove those words... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Sir, the hon. Home Minister has sought some information.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, please.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Sir, I seek your permission. I consulted my party also. The hon. Home Minister has sought some information saying as to why our Party should keep Parliament in dark in regard to what has happened. He did divulge his conversation, which was a private conversation, with the Congress President. The Congress President was not here to defend himself. I do not like to say anything on behalf of the Congress President, I am not competent neither to do so nor to reply. It had been fair had the Congress President been here as a Member of the Lok Sabha to defend it. But the hon. Home Minister has divulged his conversation with the Congress President. I am not here to divulge the conversations that the Congress President had with the other Front leaders or individuals. That is not important here. What I would like to submit to the Minister of Home Affairs is that in the morning itself we made it clear that it was not against any individual; not against any constituent, not against the individual 'Deve Gowdaji', the gentleman we respect. The issues were made very clear. (*Interruptions*) Now, I have the right to reply...

(*Interruptions*) He had asked as to what has happened... (*interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No, please.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: If you speak now, then I would not call another Member from your Party.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Sir, he wanted to know... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I want to know if you are officially replying or anybody else from the Congress party would reply to it. I would like to ask the Chief Whip of the Congress Party. Mr. Chief Whip, shall I take it that this is the reply and I shall not call anybody?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar): Sir, anything that you please, I would abide by that.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. You can reply.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Sir, in regard to the clarification sought by Shri Indrajit Gupta I would like to submit that all the decisions, developments and all statements based on the observations of the Working Committee from time to time were successively conveyed, including the CPI. I would like to quote a few lines in regard to the last observation. The observation was, and I quote:

"The CWC reiterates its commitment to continue efforts for ensuring that Kumari Mayawati is chosen as the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. To prevent the BJP from forming the Government, the only course left to the United Front was to support the Congress proposal. But instead of following that course they created a difficult situation in Uttar Pradesh. In the situation, if the BJP forms the Government in Uttar Pradesh, the sole responsibility would be with the UF".

The final Resolution of 16 February says and I quote:

"The meeting of CWC asked UF to introspect and critically review its performance. They should not forget that Congress support to UF is not in isolation and absolute but with an objective of consolidating the forces of secularism. Therefore, there cannot be any compromise on the issue".

We did say what we felt. We only felt that the time has come where possibly the present Prime Minister is not in a position to respond to these proposals and to consolidate the forces of secularism. That was based on our observation.

[Shri P.R. Dasmunsi]

What wrong have we done? Where have we kept the nation in dark?... *(Interruptions)* You may explain. This is not correct. With all regards to Shri Indrajit Gupta, I would like to say that we are not obsessed with the idea that you are talking about but we would only like to say that going to the people and learning a lesson is not a new practice of the Congress right from its inception, whether we are one or hundred. That is not important.

[*Translation*]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion is coming to a close. I will not take much time of the House. My colleagues, Shri Jaswant Singh, Shri Pramod Mahajan and Kumari Uma Bharati have expressed our viewpoints admirably. It seems we have reached from where we started. Why this situation arose after 10 months, needs to be pondered deeply. Political manoeuvrings are relevant but, it needs to be pondered over as to what extent it is justified.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to clarify that the present situation is not of our making. I am surprised why no one has alleged that it is because of us the present situation has arisen. Attempts were made to show that both come together to fight us. If this is the case then why both are fighting?

The question asked now by the Home Minister was very relevant. I was expecting Shri Narasimha Rao to make a speech and so would Shri Sharad Pawar and Shri Antulay. But all are silent. Their silence is more eloquent than their speech.

I do not want to recall what Shri Pawar had said and the assurance given by Shri Narasimha Rao that support would not be taken back under any circumstances when the no-confidence motion was being discussed. That this pact would not be broken. But it did break. First, support was given and then taken back. Now the question has been raised, why this happened. Various clarifications are being given. It would have been better if full facts had been placed by an official spokesman of the Congress Party before the House and the nation.

Another question is, why 30th March was chosen? Was every thing alright till 29th March? And took a turn for the worse on 30th March? My Congress colleagues would say that, this is not the case, that they were waiting for the right opportunity. And that they had passed a resolution on the 4th and the 16th. But why did you thereafter take the decision to withdraw the support on the 30th? As if the Congress Party did not know about the type of conferences taking place and the important events taking place.

If more time had not been demanded we would have taken discussion on this issue on 7th itself because earlier

7th day of the month was fixed and if the discussion would have been taken on that day, our Prime Minister and External Affairs Minister, either would have been attending the Non-aligned conference or the conference itself would have been postponed.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as far as the external affairs are concerned, there are many learned persons in the ruling party as well as in the Congress party. I don't know why such trifling matter did not come to their mind? I apprehend there may be some mystery behind this date of 30. The mystery must be unveiled. If the Congress Party observes silence, we would request the Prime Minister to throw some light on the issue as to why the 30th date was fixed?

I was surprised to listen to that our United Front colleagues received two letters which they did not respond at all, even they did not talk, they did not discuss the issue with the Congress. I would like to tell to my United Front Friends that it is not a good practice. You should have paid attention to the grievances of the party on whose support your Government is in existence. You might be knowing that the day on which I introduced the motion of confidence and had said at that time that we should have mutual discussion at least for flow Coordination. Infact the Congress should have been given representation in the Steering Committee. Today such proposal are being made that Coordination Committee would be formed and the Congress people may become the member of this Committee and more over, if they wish, even their leader can become the Chairman of the committee. Infact such proposal should have come earlier.

But I know that there was some basic reason behind all that and that was the non-congressism. It is impossible to run the Government without the support of the Congress. Therefore, take their support but don't expose that you are running with the cooperation of the Congress. It should not come on the surface because we have come here defeating the Congress. We fought against the Congress throughout our life. We believe in congressism and that is why keep some distance. Take benefit but not their cooperation. This is the basic concept which did not allow this cooperation to become successful. This concept created a situation that if the Congress withdrew its support and thus the existence of the United Government is endangered.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, like congressism Anti-BJP-ism is also emerging and this party is endeavouring to make his entity public. After election whatever mandate was received no party could get majority therein. Alright, it does not indicate that the largest party should be ignored. The Congress having 144 members came at second position. You should realize what treatment it should have been meted out. If you have to form a coalition, a United

Government is to be formed, you should have realized what representation should have been given to the Congress? The untouchability has gone in the public sector but it is taking place in the political sector. The mandate was not purported in a right way.

This country is a secular, was secular and will continue to be secular, nobody can change it. Whether our secularism has been so feeble that such trifling matter may put it in danger and whether it will survive only with the political permutations? The increasing power of the Bharatiya Janata Party, its increasing influence, if you do self-introspection, is not a symbol of falseness of the secularism, it does not purport it. It has some other reasons in which I do not want to go in detail at present but you mind it that you are loosing election. The Congress has reduced to half. If we assess the performance of the Congress of the last five years, it was not so sad that the electorate should have punished it so heavily but the issue of corruption proved crucial. The number of Congress has been reduced to half. Now we are being blamed. If the people did not vote you. You are saying that the secularism is endangered.

What help can the United Front render you? The United Front is such a front which, far from supporting you, is unable to compromise in itself in selecting its own candidates. Its constituents work against each other. Where there is no any United front, how they shall be able to render any help to the Congress?

The Congress friends should also have self-introspection why their influence is decreasing. No other can be blamed for it. We don't want election but no alternative seems to have been left except election. Electorate also does not want election but in democracy, if the political leaders fail, if the political parties do not realise their limitations and decorum and the power struggle overpowers the principles, whose doors should be knocked at. What alternative is left but to go to the electorate?

It is said that it is a fight for respect. It is not a fight for respect, it is a fight for false prestige. It is an open struggle for power. You shall say that the struggle for power is not a bad practice. I agree that it is very difficult for our Congress friends to remain out of power. It is very difficult for them. Don't bother about us. We have been in this service for the last 40 years but our Congress friends have adapted themselves otherwise. They cannot remain out of power, you neither inducted them in the Government nor included them in the decision making body. You did not utilize their services due to which their grievances continued to accumulate. But I would like to say to my Congress friends that if you withdraw your support on the day on which United Front Government refused to accept Mayawati as the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, you could have got an issue and the people

would have come to know this fact and you would have been appreciated for this act. It has been mentioned in detail in the proposal that your president sent there, they said you cannot elect a dalit woman as a Chief Minister. After that you returned back and observed silence. At that time you did not withdraw your support.

No I come to the point what is particular in the date of 30. Whether any astrologer was consulted? I cannot swallow it easily. You could have allowed the session to continue. The whole economy of the country is crumbling. Such situation never occurred before.

Hon'ble Narasimha Raoji is sitting here. If I refer an incident, I think, he will not take it otherwise, we were taking lunch somewhere. It was hosted by the Government. At that lunch watermelon was served as sweet dish. The watermelon was tasteless. Someone sitting nearby Shri Narasimha Raoji complained as to why such tasteless watermelon was served? It is not seasonal. If my perception is not wrong, Narasimha Raoji said that if the support is withdrawn in budget session, why the watermelon cannot be served in every season? What are the facts behind this unseasonal decision? What is mystery behind it? Whether we are ready to learn something from the present circle of events? Alright, we would go to the people they shall decide but the need of the hour is to develop the tendency to work together. There may be struggle within the party itself but the struggle should be in limit. There should be a limit of breaking away, cementing again and again going on different paths. If coalition Governments can run successfully in foreign countries why not in this country. We are also running coalition Governments in the states in our own way. But to run such government on mutual faith, mutual transparent faith is most essential. Now if the Congress was under apprehension that Deve Gowdaji wants to split the Congress, the step which they took for self-defence, was essential to be taken. But I don't think that Sh. Deve Gowdaji wanted to split the Congress and if he wanted to do so would you allow your party to be split or your some members were ready to cross the floor. I don't have any answer to this question. But in the atmosphere of faith and trust it is not possible. The mandate received after election it was purported otherwise which resulted in many ill-effects. It is needed to be purported correctly. The mandate was not at all against the Bharatiya Janata Party. It is true that it was not in the favour of any party, no party attained majority. The meaning which was purported resulted in misfortune and after a short period of ten months the country is again on the path of election. We should hope that after election a stable Government would be formed. We should have this expectation also that after election the country will move on right path. But this exercise has resulted in one advantage. It is the first time when regional parties have

[Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

played a constructive role in Delhi. Till now they were confined to a particular region. The regional parties, who have won the election and come to the power in coalition government, have acquired national outlook. In their vision they have a picture of the country. We have also got an opportunity to increase our contacts with them. It is a good signal, it is a good happening. Therefore, in the national politics all the parties, whether national or regional, can run the country smoothly if there is uniformity in the programmes which is the basis of functioning together and you also admits that you have uniformity in your programmes but you don't have any uniformity in your principles. The Prime Minister is the morning listed several achievements. Nothing was done as per the Common Minimum Programme. There is no need to count all that. If some parties come together than trust is essential for their success. Due to the lack of this trust, this crisis occurred. The least we can do is to take a lesson from today's event, when we attempt similar experiments in future.

[English]

SHRI P.C. THOMAS: Sir, I would like to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: No, please cooperate with me. I am sorry.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA): Hon. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I would like to clear some of the doubts raised by the hon. members of this House.

First of all, I want to thank the hon. Members for having agreed to pass the Finance Bill on the 21st. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the entire House for having agreed to pass the Finance Bill, the Vote on Account and the Appropriation Bill, on the 21st of this month.

22.00 hrs.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, as a senior leader, has expressed that the supporting party should not be neglected in a manner in which the party which is running the administration with the support of the Congress (I) has neglected. It is a very good suggestion. Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev has intervened to say that when this issue was raised by the Leader of the Congress, both C.P.P. and the Party leader, nobody from the United Front met the Leader and tried to convince the Leader. That is one of the remarks which Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev has made.

Sir, before going into the details, I would like to say something about the two letters which were forwarded to me, according to the statement made by the hon. Member, Shri P.R. Dasmunsi. I have not received any

letter. The President of India, with a covering letter and with an enclosure, which was handed over by the Congress(I) President on 30th March, 1997, has sent that letter to me on 31st March, 1997. The letter of withdrawal presented to the Rashtrapatiiji on 30th March, 1997 was forwarded to me by Rashtrapatiiji on 31st March, 1997. Till then I have not received any communication from the Congress (I) President. On 30th March, 1997, I met the former Prime Minister, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao.

Before my Minister of Finance left Delhi for Calcutta on 29th March, he requested me that the Congress (I) has not submitted their party accounts to the investigating officer. 31st March is the last date. There is no other option except to take action to levy penalty. He said that he was going to Calcutta and then to Goa and coming back only on the 31st March; please try to sort out this problem. This is what the Minister of Finance told me. He also told me that he had tried his best to contact the Treasurer, Shri Ahmed Patel to get the necessary explanation. But he was not available. So, please see that this issue is sorted out. I went to Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao on 30th March because he was the President at that time responsible for 1993-94 accounts. I did discuss with him. He suggested that he would send Shri Pranab Mukherjee to discuss about it. I came back and I gave a phone call to Shri Sita Ram Kesri, the President of the Party and the C.P.P. Leader. I told him that I want to meet him and want to discuss some of the important issues. Please let me know when it is convenient to him. He gave me the time to meet him at 2 o'clock on 31st March.

I have got some basic ethics in life. I have not come here in search of this office, with any aspiration, with any ambition. I did not aspire to become the Prime Minister of this country leaving the Chief Minister's office. There is no need for me to make any manipulative politics. The people of this country who are politically very much awakened, are aware of that. 12.40 P.M. was the time chosen to hand over the withdrawal letter and he gave me the time to meet him at two o'clock. Was Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev not there when I met his President? I met him twelve times.

The allegation is that I am meeting only Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao. I am not a person to stab behind the back. Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was the Prime Minister of the country. Yes, I was here on the day when the Vote of No-Confidence was moved and I voted against him. On that day he tried to save the Government with whatever methods and with whatever means he could. Today, those friends who want to teach sermons and morals in this country, those who want to attribute motives against Shri Narasimha Rao, were they not enjoying the office in his Government? Today, everybody wants to

raise a finger against Shri Narasimha Rao saying that Deve Gowda is going to safeguard the interests of Shri Narasimha Rao. If he falls ill and is in the hospital and if Deve Gowda goes to see him, he is showing extra regard and respect to him! Just because he has lost the Presidentship, lost the CPP leadership, I am not a person to belittle him. He has done something for the nation. Whether he continued in office by using various political methods or not, I do not want to go into the details of that. He has bailed out this country from the economic crisis. I am not going to make sweeping remarks against everybody, but how some of you, friends, have belittled him, I know that. Even though it is not my concern, even though I know that I am going to lay down the office today, but friendship is not a marketable commodity in this country. Shri Narasimha Rao must be aware of these words. He is at the fag end of your life, so he should be aware of these words. These are the people who stabbed him. I am not going to stab him. On the day when he handed over the resignation letter to the CPP leadership, he was alone. I went to his house to know why this had happened.

Yes, I respect Shri Chandra Shekhar. My friendship with Shri Chandra Shekhar is very old. I had come in contact with him twenty years back. He is the seniormost leader and I respect him. Whether I was in office or not, I used to go to his house. Going to his house is a sin, going to Shri Narasimha Rao's house is a sin, meeting Shri Sharad Pawar is a sin, but meeting their President twelve times is not a sin! I have not neglected anybody in my life. Did I not go to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee's house? Did I not go to Shri L.K. Advani's house? We should have some basic manners in public life. It is not a question of wooing anybody or pampering anybody to continue in office. You must try to give respect to your elders. The office which I am holding today for another one hour, is the highest office. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was one of the tallest leaders in the world, sat here and performed his duties as Prime Minister.

The destiny dragged me here and made me to sit in this chair. When the former Speaker of this House, Shri Shivraj Patil, was speaking, I was hearing his speech. I appreciate some of the viewpoints he has expressed.

Sir, I would like to go in detail because this is my last speech in this House. I will go to the other House. I have got five years to stay there. ... (*Interruptions*) I only request all the Members, senior leaders, to cooperate with me. I have not interrupted even when severe attacks were made by several Members in this House. I never do it.

Shri Dasmunsi has said about my going to Bangalore and coming back.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is some defect in the sound system. It is disturbing.

MR. SPEAKER: I have asked them to check. It is being checked. Please bear with it.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: Shri Dasmunsi, you are a good friend of mine. You took me to Calcutta. Please touch your heart and tell me—what is the performance of this Prime Minister in the last ten months. Which Prime Minister has continuously visited for seven days the North-Eastern States? You are there from the days of the Youth Congress. You are a staunch Congressman. I do not want to question your loyalty to the Organisation. But you tell the truth. Do not suppress your conscience. There were people like Feroze Gandhi who exposed the corruption charges when his father-in-law was the Prime Minister. If you feel that the decision of your President to withdraw the support is going to held the so-called secular democracy, I welcome it. I have no regret. But I would like to tell you very frankly. I have not done anything else in the last ten months but to discharge my duties... (*Interruptions*) I am coming to it. Please wait.

Sir, my secular character was questioned. It is said that the Congress Working Committee is constrained to note that the United Front has failed to provide the leadership necessary to consolidate the forces of secularism and confront the forces of communalism. Am I responsible for their defeat in Punjab? Am I responsible for their defeat in the Corporation elections or the local bodies' elections in Maharashtra? Am I responsible for the defeat of the Congress candidates in all the bye-elections except in the bye-election of the seat vacated by me in my home State where the B.J.P. lost the deposit and the Congress won? I do not want to say that the B.J.P. and the Congress have come together. The B.J.P. got 23,000 votes in the 1996 parliamentary election and 27,000 votes in the Assembly elections. They lost the deposit and they come together to fight against secularism.

Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, you might have come to that opinion because of the communication gap. I would like to ask about the spirit of this Working Committee resolution. Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav is also here. There were three bye-elections for the Rajya Sabha. The Congress got 30 votes, the BSP 66 and the Janata Dal eight. If he had not passed on these 104 votes, could it be possible for any of these three parties, including the Janata Dal, the Congress and the BSP, to defeat the three official candidates of the BJP? You tell me. Do not regret the withdrawal. Do not worry about the withdrawal. Do not try to make any patching up now. It is not possible. Let the country know this.

I do not want to quote again in this House the appreciation by the media—in the editorial column or in

[Shri H.D. Deve Gowda]

'letters to editor'. Later on, I am coming to the point of the word used by the Congress (I) President about the performance of the Government and about the efficiency of the Government.

First of all, I would like to clarify some of these issues because in the morning, I did not want to make a political speech. Some people were under the impression that I was in a depressed mood. No. I got the training from Shri Chandra Shekhar. I will never bother about the office. I have tendered resignation thrice even against his advice. Today, I would like to make it clear that the day I received this communication of withdrawal of support from the President's office, I would have tendered my resignation. But immediately, on the next day, the leaders of all the parties of the United Front assembled here and said, "No, you should not resign. You should go before the House. We must test and we must find out who is who". Because of that decision taken by the United Front, I bowed my head. It is because of their support that I was elected as the Leader and it is with the support of the Congress, I am running the Government. I have at least this much of background.

In the last eleven months, I have never used any occasion to belittle the Congress in any public platform. I might have addressed 66 meetings in Uttar Pradesh where the BJP, in the Lok Sabha elections, had got a clear majority in 236 Assembly segments. In the Assembly elections, they have got about 176 Assembly segments for their party. Is it not an achievement, Shri P.R. Dasmunsi?

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: Mr. Prime Minister, you did not try to unite the secular forces at that point of time.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: You do not know. That is why, you are saying this.... *(Interruptions)*. I do not want to reveal everything that has happened because it will be unethical on my part, if I say what I had done at various stages. I do not want to do it... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI: I did not accuse you entirely.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: Shri Patwa, please do not disturb me.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I never interrupted when the others were speaking. Now, they should please allow me to express my views in this august House as the Prime Minister, out-going Prime Minister. All right!

Sir, somebody told me, I think, my Home Minister, that the allegation was that the Prime Minister was trying to split the Congress Party. When Shri Madhavrao Scindia wanted to join the Congress Party, he came to me

because he was in the United Front at that time. Did I not tell him to go and join and strengthen the Congress Party? Let him say that...*(Interruptions)* Please allow me.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: You are a very nice man. But since you have taken my name, I would like to clarify that I have a very good equation with you, but I came to you out of courtesy to inform you that I may be joining the Congress Party. I did not ask your permission.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: There is no need to get my permission. But when you came and said that, at least you had maintained certain dignity and certain political ethics. You were in the United Front at that time and you came and informed me. What did I say? I said: "Please go and join and strengthen the Congress Party; I have no objection." Did I not say that?

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA: I agree. You are absolutely right. When I informed you, you said: "yes, certainly."

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: Thank you very much.

When Shri N.D. Tiwari and Shri Arjun Singh came to me saying that they were going back to the Congress Party since Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao was removed from the Presidentship of the Congress Party, I said: "Go, you are most welcome to do that and I have no objection." Had I ever tried to split the Congress Party? Let anybody say this.

Sir, another allegation made is that Deve Gowda wants to marginalise the Congress Party. When Shri Sharad Pawar had asked me to attend some of the programmes in his constituency, did I ever say 'no'? Even to the constituency of Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev, to the former Speaker's constituency, wherever I have been called, I have gone. I have not even gone to my Party workers' meetings because I did not want to create friction between the Congress Party and my Party workers. I never attended any party meetings when I had gone to the Congress ruled States to attend the official programmes fixed by the local MPs. How have I marginalised the Congress Party? I do not know what sin I had committed.

Sir, in the morning the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Shri Jaswant Singh, in a very dignified manner, tried to mention the language which was used by the Congress (I) President against the Prime Minister. When the Press people asked me about it, I said: "Just ignore it." Today, I would like to tell the nation, through this House, what the language used by the hon. President of the Congress (I) who is aspiring to become the Leader was. I have no objection. If the House wants, if all my friends, including that of the Congress Party want, I have no objection.

Sir, I am unable to understand the meaning of the Hindi word, 'nikamma'.

He said:

"You are foolish, coward and powerless. Just come into open and let us see who is powerful.

He has quoted in Hindi:

[Translation]

"Yeh Vyakti Nikamma Aur Kamunal Hai

[English]

This man is not only incompetent but he is also communal.

An incompetent Prime Minister, what he has done in the last ten months, I must apprise this House and through this House to the nation. I would just like to draw the attention of the hon. President of the Congress to an editorial which appeared in 'The Hindu' newspaper. You all have seen that. It says:

"Mr. Deve Gowda administration saw—as never before in the last few decades—the return of considerable autonomy to the Ministries. The role of the Prime Minister's Office has been substantially reduced. In various areas of decision making such as foreign investment which rightly has been returned to the Ministry of Industry.

I delegated the powers of the PMO because I am incompetent, inefficient and a foolish Prime Minister... (Interruptions). He is not a Congress worker. He is an All India Congress (I) President. He occupies the chair where great people like Shri Motilal Nehru, Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi sat... (Interruptions)

Sir, the *Washington Post* says:

"India has just made a demonstration of the new sort of leadership that the South Asian subcontinent badly needs. But now by an initiative of Prime Minister, Mr. H.D. Deve Gowda, India, the issue is being treated and removed about the Bangladesh and India on sharing of river Ganga water. If the Ganges Agreement is an example of the leadership Mr. Deve Gowda can provide, let us see more of it.

This is what the *Washington Post* said. I am not going to read the full editorial column.

Sir, a foolish and an incompetent Prime Minister, at least, tried to do something for the nation. I have not kept quiet for ten months. I would like to recall what I have said on the day when I replied to the Confidence Motion in this very same House. I know what is going to happen. Whether I remain for five days or five months or

five years, it is not my concern. Every minute I am going to use to serve the nation. That is the pledge I have taken. Yes I did work for 18 to 19 hours a day. I am proud of it. There is no regret in vacating this office. There is no regret. I have not wasted a single minute. Whenever I used to get an opportunity, I did my best.

There is no need of any certificate from the present President of the Congress (I). I do not need any certificate. I have fought ten elections in my life. Has he fought any direct elections in his life? Why I have chosen to come to Rajya Sabha, I would like to make it clear. I anticipated when the Congress would ditch me because Shri Chandra Shekhar was the victim and Shri V.P. Singh was the victim. I know about all these things and what has happened in the past. Shri Narasimha Rao was the victim. I am going to tell everything—how Shri Morarji Desai had been handled by the Congress, and how Shri Raj Narain, who was holding the Health portfolio and who fought against Madam Gandhi, was used to split the Janata Party. You know about it, I know about it and everybody knows about it. I know the game plan.

As long as Shri Narasimha Rao was the President, there was no problem. On the day when Shri Sitaram Kesri became the President of the Congress party, I called him for lunch. I have not neglected your President. We had two hours discussions in my House. He promised me and he also advised me as an elderly statesman. But on the fourth day, when one of my Chief Ministers, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, whose colleague, Prof. Saifuddin Soz, is representing in my Cabinet, went to see Shri Sitaram Kesri and he was told not to join the United Front Government because he was going to withdraw the support. This happened within four days.

I have taken the oath in the name of God, when I came to this House Narasimha Raoji, you may swallow so many wounds because you are a cultured person. I would now clarify, at least, some of the doubts raised by some hon. Members of the supporting party. The charge levelled against me was that I had neglected Shri Sitaram Kesri after he became the President. It is not based on truth, but based on something else. There is a headline which correctly says, 'India's old man in a hurry: Now or Never.' This was not written by any of the Indian papers. It had appeared in the *London Times*.

It has been stated that we are hungry of status. But it is a question of respect. We are not hungry of power. The post of the President of the Congress (I) is a high office. The Congress (I) is one of the historic political parties having a background of 105 years... (Interruptions) All right, it has a background of 111 or 113 years... (Interruptions). This is a place where Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to sit and I am sitting here today. I will call it the Congress, not the Congress (I). The Congress Party

[Shri H.D. Deve Gowda]

is a Party which has served the nation in achieving freedom. It has served the nation in running the country, to see that the country's development takes place. From all angles, it has done its service. But becoming the President is not a status. It is a question of respect. The Office of the President of the Indian National Congress has no respect, has no status. Only if he comes and sits here, then only the respect and status will come. That is why it is said that that old man is in a hurry... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. I seek your ruling... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Have the patience to hear, please.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : I want a clarification from you ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you trying to handle it? Keep quiet, please. I will handle it. You do not have to handle it.

Prof. P.J. Kurien, what is your point of order? Under what rule, are you raising it?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Yes, Sir. The hon. Prime Minister has said it.

MR. SPEAKER: No, "Yes, Sir", is no reason. "Yes, Sir" is not a rule

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: The hon. Prime Minister has said it... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I overrule it because when you say "He has said it", it is not a rule.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Listen to me, please.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given the ruling. You have said: "He has said it". It is not a rule.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Allow me, please. I am requesting you to listen to me. I will take only one minute... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Have the patience to hear it, please. It is for the Prime Minister to yield.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: The hon. Prime Minister has taken the name of the President of the Congress party. I only want your clarification and ruling on it... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Unless a Member yields, I cannot help you. The Prime Minister is not yielding. I cannot help you. I cannot allow you unless he yields.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: He has taken the name of the President of the Congress Party who is not a Member of this House. What is your ruling? I am only asking about your ruling. Can the Prime Minister take the name of the President of the Congress Party who is not a Member of this House? Do you not think that it is an important point... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Umpteen rulings have been given by the previous Speakers in this House. The name of a person who is not a Member of this House should not be taken. What is your ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot do like this.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: The hon. Speaker should give a ruling on this.

MR. SPEAKER: Ruling on what? I asked you: "Under what rule are you raising your point of order?" You said: "Yes, Sir." I said, "Yes, Sir" is not a rule." I have overruled it.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Can I tell you something? ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not behave like this.

... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: I say that that word should not be used which is being used repeatedly by the Prime Minister when a senior Member cannot come and defend himself... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have overruled it. There is no point of order.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a person who has written a letter leading to the destabilisation of this country, has committed a political crime... *(Interruptions)* I am expressing my opinion... *(Interruptions)*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: The hon. Prime Minister has used the word, 'old man'. Is it a parliamentary word? I am only having an objection to that word... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If that is the only objection, then it is all right... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat Chandra Shekharji.

Please take your seat, Prof. Kurien. You cannot stand up like this. If you do not obey the Speaker, may I request you to obey your leader?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: I always obey you.

MR. SPEAKER: Please obey your leader. That is very important.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Why do you not see that the Prime Minister is calling a senior person an 'old man'? ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you interrupting on this issue?

Cameras can be switched on now.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: I only say one thing. The letter that has been received from the President of India contains so many allegations against me and against the United Front Government. I should answer them. It is not a question of attacking an individual. It is my responsibility to clarify the position about the allegations made against my Government. The letter is with me and I am answering on those points. Nothing beyond that. If I wanted to show disrespect, there is no need for me to go over it twelve times. I have got the highest regard for you, Kurienji. But what is this *Nikamma* or *Akamma*?

The hon. Minister of Home Affairs wanted some clarification from the supporting Party; he wanted that hon. Members from that Party should clarify. He was telling that for one and a half hours he discussed with their Leader but the only argument advanced by the Congress President to him was, 'Your leader must quit'. Unless I vacate this place, how can he come and sit? I think, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs can understand that much. So, where was the need for any explanation by the supporting Party?

They have not done anything. I would like to tell very frankly that no member from the Congress Party has criticised in the last ten months—I am grateful to them—whether in this House or outside. The only ambition is that somebody else should occupy this chair and I should vacate it. That is all the secrecy behind that. When he tried to persuade the hon. Minister of Home Affairs saying, 'Your Leader should vacate the Office of the Prime Minister', there was nothing wrong. I do not find any fault with the hon. President of the Indian National Congress when he tried to persuade the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. At least, he has not brought this matter to

my notice; he has brought it to the notice of the House.

The hon. Minister of External Affairs has made a brief speech about our foreign affairs, the policy of the Ministry of External Affairs and what we have done. He has narrated some of the achievements made by our Government. When I was in Russia, I got the message from one of my colleagues, Shri Srikant Jena, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that there was all the likelihood that the Congress might withdraw the support. I told him, 'I am coming back. If they withdraw the support, why do you worry? There is nothing to bother. After all, as long as I am in this Office, I must do my duty for the sake of my country, whether I lose my office or I am going to continue.

I believe in destiny. The late Sanjiva Reddy was thrown out in 1969. He came back in 1978 and he himself administered the Oath of Office to Madam Indira Gandhi in 1980. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee told us about the clock.

I am not going to run away from Indian politics. I might not have passed in this House. I have been branded as an inefficient Prime Minister by the Congress President, but the final judgement is before the nation and 950 million people are watching us today. An ineffective Prime Minister would accept this challenge. I would go before the people and I am not going to run away.

There are three groups. The BJP also is not a monolithic party. I have got the highest regard for Shri Vajpayee. He is the seniormost leader. When I met him I only requested him to help us pass the Budget.

It is because I am more concerned. We have launched several new programmes. An incompetent Prime Minister for the first time has launched several programmes. For the slum clearance, we have provided Rs. 330 crore. Last year they have spent Rs. 250 crore for this programme. I am also in public life. I am not a new man. In the Central Budget when the money was allocated for the slums, we have launched several programmes. The Minister of Welfare is present here. The President of Congress (I) was also the Minister of Welfare. I am very much anxious and eager to ensure that even if I vacate the office, let the people get the benefit.

We have launched a Subsidised Food Programme. This PDS, I think, is in existence only in three or four States like Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. We have launched a national programme for which we have provided Rs. 7,500 crore this year in the Budget. Is it not a poverty alleviation programme? All the senior leaders who have spoken today have asked why they have chosen 30th March, before the Budget is

[Shri H.D. Deve Gowda]

passed. They could have decided to withdraw the support in the month of May on 9th or 10th after passing the Budget, after passing the Women's Reservation Bill on which my sister was attacking me and after passing the Lokpal Bill. What can I do? Heavens would not have fallen if they had withdrawn the support on 10th of May. What is that you have achieved? What is the sin that I have committed?

Sir, when I was sitting in the very same House, the former Minister of Finance, Dr. Manmohan Singh, in this very same place argued that we cannot give subsidy to the farmers. He said that subsidy would be removed through a phased programme in three years. He said that in the very same House. I argued from that place. Shri Shivraj Patil was presiding over the House at that time when I argued from that place. He said, 'In the next three years, in a phased programme we are going to remove subsidy because I must take care of the fiscal deficit. IMF is dictating'. What he has said about the fertilizer subsidy on the floor of the House is on record. Within fifteen days, before I came to Parliament I took a decision to provide Rs. 2,500 crore to my farming community. Do you mean to say that we are going to betray? You are under a dream. I may tell you today, knowing fully well about the problem of my fellow farmers, that they are an exploited class in the society. I know it because I come from that community and it is not a caste. It is a class. This year we went a step further, we tried to provide about Rs. 17,500 crore, including food subsidy and fertilizer subsidy for this section.

Sir, 32 crores of population is going to be covered under the PDS. Is this the sin that I have committed? The charge is that this Prime Minister has not taken care of poverty alleviation programme. Touch your heart and then you vote against the Confidence Motion. Touch your heart and then take a decision.

If I have betrayed the nation, then they can hang me and I would have no objection. You have got every right.

Sir, about the minorities—they have used them as a vote bank—I requested the hon. Finance Minister to provide at least Rs. 100 crore this year. It is not so simple to bring them up and we are not going to leave them as it is at this stage.

Shri Antulay has made a soieman pledge in this House that he is not going to withdraw and he is going to stand by me. He can go according to the whip of the party; I am not going to find fault with him. He has expressed his sincere and genuine feelings.

We have, for the first time, taken care of those people who had been totally neglected in the tribal areas. The rate of literacy is below two or 2½ per cent there.

Shri Bhuria is sitting somewhere here; he represents them and he took me to Tribals' Conference. They say that I have marginalised the Congress. I told the hon. Finance Minister to at least start 250 residential schools. Is that the sin that I have committed for which they want to punish me?

I have told Shri Narasimha Rao that whenever he feels that his party is comfortable, he could tell me and I would hand over the resignation. I did not want to pick up quarrels. He is also sitting in this very same House now. I told Shri Kesri also not to mention frequently about the withdrawal of support; whenever he feels that his party is comfortable to come to power, he could tell me and I could hand over the resignation. But why do they make this sort of an allegation against me? He could have told me, "Shri Gowda, we have decided to withdraw the support." If he had said it very gentlemanly, I could have told my Members not to pursue this matter and that we would close this chapter.

Firstly, did I ask for their support? They only took a decision on the 12th—the Congress (I) Working Committee took a decision spontaneously when no one approached them and without any one's request—to support us. On that day, they told the nation that they would not allow a communal party to come to power. But today what did they do? What is the outcome of their decision?

Now, they are searching for a new leader! Do you want to divide the United Front? When they are telling me not to divide the Congress, what moral right have they got to divide my United Front? They can tell straightway that because of such and such circumstances, they were doing like that. Yes, Shri Vajpayee had said that we would go for polls. Who is responsible for this? If they have got the moral courage, they should tell that in this House. They should not play dirty politics. Do they want to approach everybody individually? He says that now the united Front is over and that he would try to collect it individually; he would attract it, as if he is a magnetic force and the United Front is ready to be attracted by that magnetic force.

Let us accept—if he has got the moral courage—to go before the people. They can tell them what they have done. They can tell them that Deve Gowda's Government is not a secular Government, it is an incompetent Government. They can go to the people. Why do they want to search for a new leader? They search today, as if a new quality was found in the Defence Minister.

**23.00 hrs.**

Have you found some new qualities in my Defence Minister? You want to split us. That is not possible. We have understood your strategy. It is a political strategy. We have understood that.

Let us accept with all sincerity that you have committed a mistake. If I have done a mistake, let the people punish me. I am prepared to go for the ultimate—political judgement of the people of this country. Yes, I can understand the financial burden of conducting elections so frequently. I can understand as to what would be the financial liability for this. But the issue has been forced. You have forced the issue to go for elections. We were not going for elections. Now, you want to hang my head calling me an incompetent Prime Minister and a Prime Minister who is not secular. Yes, all right. But you want to search for somebody else.

I have met Shri Balasaheb Thackeray. You said that I was going to work as an ambassador to him—Shri Antulay. Shri Vajpayee, I can make a political speech also. You want to tell as to how to function in a coalition. I can say what happened to the Mayawati Government in Uttar Pradesh one year back. Do not talk about political morality. Every political party in this country is more interested in how best they could come to power. (*Interruptions*)

Yes, I fought in Karnataka to become the Chief Minister. I am not a political *sanyasi*. But I have never, never aspired and made any ambition to come to this office. Never, I am not going to hide the facts. If all of you are sincere, then try it.

We are one political force. Which one of our Parties is not a national Party? Is Janata Dal not a national party? Is the CPI not a national party? Is the CPI(M) not a national party? The BJP is a national party and has got influence in four to five States. Without the Badal group what is the BJP in Punjab? Shri Chandra Shekhar, please tell, what the reality is? You want to save your sincere friends. But there is no need. When we are appealing to all sections, you do not worry because you have got that much of an attachment. There is nothing to bother. If the destiny is there for me to rise again from the dust in the Indian politics, I would come back with the same force. That is what I want to prove.

I am never afraid of anybody who wants to play a bullying politics. I may be a soft man outwardly but if I start fighting then I have already shown in Karnataka as to what I am. Now, I am going to show what Deve Gowda is with the support of my United Front. Somebody wants to crack it. It is because if it cracks then only they can push through as they are the only alternative party. But we would not allow that crack. You also unite and fight. Shri Rajesh Pilot, as a sincere Party worker if you try to defend then I have no objection. Somebody was asking you as to what was the letter that you had written. I know that you have got that courage and you have said that but I do not want those details.

Now, under what circumstances did I become the Prime Minister? On the one side there was the CBI enquiry... (*Interruptions*)

On the one side, CBI inquiry ... (*Interruptions*)

COL. RAO RAM SINGH (Mahendergarh): What is the inquiry? ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: There are several cases. I do not want to go into details. I have all the details... (*Interruptions*) I have not ordered a single case for the CBI inquiry. I have not ordered a single case against any political leader in the last ten months. All these cases were the previous issues... (*Interruptions*)

COL. RAO RAM SINGH: What is that Shri Rajesh Pilot's letter, Mr. Prime Minister?

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: I do not want to go in detail about each case. I want to tell this august House and through this august House to the nation that I have not passed orders about anybody or to hold an inquiry or to conduct an inquiry by the CBI in the last ten months. But, I have not interfered. I can say this much that I have not interfered. That is what has been expected by the House. I have not interfered in any case, including that of my own Chief Minister. My own Party's prestige is involved here. Whether the things are moving in the right direction or not, I do not want to comment on that. I must be fair. Nobody from Congress made any influence on me about the CBI inquiry. I am not going to say that.

30th, 30th and 30th. What is that 30th? And some papers write 4th, 4th and 30th, 4th and 30th (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What is 4th?

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: When the matter is in the court, I do not want to give details. I will stop at the stage... (*Interruptions*) As the matter is before the Court I do not want to give any particulars or details about this Court issue. Before that, Government will go. What that I can do? Under what circumstances, have I been asked to shoulder the responsibility of the office of Prime Minister?

When I went to see Shri Narasimha Rao, he said 'you have accepted a very stupendous task. It is very difficult'. With his experience he has said that. He has given that advice. I agree. I totally agree. There is no problem with my friendly parties. Yes, there is cohesiveness. I too agree. That is one of the allegations. There is no cohesiveness among the Ministers. In last five years, was there any cohesiveness, Mr. Rajesh Pilot?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: I did not point out that...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: You were the Minister of State for Internal Security in the Ministry of Home. I do not want to go into details. Just I will leave it at stage...  
(*Interruptions*)

Hon. Speaker has also made that remark. I accept it. Sitting in that high office, if he says that, we have to bow our heads. He advised me. With one party when you witnessed such type of things, I have to manage 13 parties. You must give some grace marks... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please order now.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: Shri George Fernandes is sitting there. He is my old friend. Today I expected that you would speak but you gave an opportunity to Shri Nitish Kumar. You do not want to attack your old friend. At least you have shown that much of courtesy.

On the one side, Sir, there is the Enforcement Directorate. Sir, today, the judiciary has given the verdict that the investigative agency should directly report to the Courts. If somebody suspects me, what can I do? Shri Montosh Mohan Dev must advise me. On the one side, the media says that Deve Gowda has visited the house of Narasimha Rao for 28 times; Deve Gowda has visited the former Chief Justice's house at mid night, 2 o'clock. In the last ten months, I enjoyed all these things...  
(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you enjoy? ...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: There are no tears for our withdrawal. After the test is over, let us assemble here, in the Central hall for an exchange of our views. At all the three teams go for the test.

Sir, all have agreed for passing the Vote on Account and the Finance Bill on the 21st. Do not make any political gimmicks again in these ten days. Do not try at. I will also honestly give a word that there is no need for them. Enough is enough.

A Prime Minister of this country, whoever it may be, when once the honour and dignity of that Office goes, could not continue as a Prime Minister under the mercy of anybody. What is that we have to discuss again? With what courage do you want to go outside, Shri Gujral? If somebody wants to name you. You are the senior most member. I accept it but not under this circumstance...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I fully agree with you.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: A Prime Minister of this country who represents 950 million people must have at least certain dignity and certain honour to represent the nation as a Prime Minister when he goes outside, not with this type of, what is called, lease of life. I do not want that. There is no need. I appeal to all my colleagues that I have not betrayed you. I have never betrayed the nation. I have never given an occasion for a single corruption charge to be levelled against my Government in the last ten months. Go before the people with all the courage and conviction. Money is not the criteria. I have not begged any industrialist to allow any scam during these ten months.

Sir, I have got the belief; I am a believer in destiny.

Lastly, I would like to quote Gitanjali. This is the first time I am quoting. Shri Chidambaram has always used to quote *Thirukkural* in Tamil.

This is from *Gitanjali*.

"Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads!

Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut?

Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee!"

God will not accept this.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gadhvi, you do not have to demonstrate your knowledge.

... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA: Hon. Members I am only speaking for myself... (*Interruptions*) Please wait. Do not be in such a hurry... (*Interruptions*)

"He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the path-maker is breaking stones. He is with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil?"

These are the people who have been taken care of by this Government by launching several schemes. I cannot see God. I have not attained that spiritual power. I am an ordinary human being. I can see God through my people who are the worst sufferers in this country. '*Janatho Janardhar*' is my philosophy. I am going to work for this. What kind of people are they?

"Come out of thy meditations and leave aside thy flowers and incense! What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained? Meet him and stand by him in toil and in sweat of thy brow."

This is my conviction. I do not want to tempt others. The ambition in the whole of my life has been to serve those people who have been neglected for the last 50 years. Shri Chandra Shekhar had made a *padayatra*. He was not allowed to place his Budget on the Table of the House. He was not allowed to launch new schemes. He had walked 3,500 kilometres. But I did not lose my opportunity. I know the hanging sword. I wanted to prove what I am. That has been proved with the cooperation of my colleague, the Minister of Finance and I have done like this. The implementation part is left to the House. If everybody cooperates, as they have agreed to pass the Finance Bill, I am grateful.

I once again thank all of you and the country. Inevitably, when the issue was forced by a hasty decision, we had no option. The country was speaking. I agree that we have not solved all the problems. We tried to do something in ten months' time. The country at least started to feel a seeming stability. The country was about to take off but unfortunately, this has happened.

Again, to restore this Government's confidence in the investors, on the 30th December last year, we invited all the industrialists. We invited the financial experts. I went to Mumbai. I met the investors. Their own Party Chief Minister was there. I did not show any discrimination during my administration of this Government of ten months. I cleared all the projects irrespective of any State, irrespective of any political party in the country. Nearly 500 projects were cleared in the last ten months which are touched about seven billion dollars.

Is that the sin I have committed? We have given licences to 118 new sugar mills in ten months. I can quote any number of decisions which I have taken only with the sole object that this country may now come out of the wrecks and that the country's progress would be speeded up. With this background, we have taken the decision.

Sir, I would like to once again express my thanks to all the Members including the Congress (I) who have supported me to allow me to do something in these ten months.

I was not such a tallest man. But destiny has brought me here. I am satisfied. I have not betrayed my people, my nation or even my friendly partners in these last ten months. Today, Sir, with your cooperation and with the cooperation of the entire House what little humble service I could do I have done in these last ten months.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the media persons. After the withdrawal of support to the United Front Government by the Congress (I), all the newspapers including the regional newspapers have tried at least to give the correct version of the achievement of

this Government. So, I want to sincerely express my gratitude and thanks to the media persons. I also want to thank you, Sir, the Deputy-Speaker and to everybody for having given me full cooperation in these last ten months.

Lastly, it is up to the House to take a decision according to the conscience about the Confidence Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Why do you not sit down? Please take your seats now. You can go to your respective seats a little later, not now.

... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What is happening? Why do you not keep quiet?

I shall now put the Motion moved by Shri H.D. Deve Gowda to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against will please say 'No'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

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

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

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, some Members have not got their Division numbers.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I know that. I will announce that. It will all be taken care of.

Let the Lobbies be cleared.

MR. SPEAKER: The lobbies have been cleared.

Firstly, I would like to inform that those Members who have not been allotted any division number as yet shall be given the slips. We have their names.

I will read out the instructions how to operate the recording machine. Before a division starts, every Member should occupy his or her own seat and operate the system from that seat only. A Member has to press two buttons simultaneously for casting his or her vote. One of the buttons to be pressed is on the railing on the bench in front of the Member. Please check it. It is called the 'vote initiation switch'. I am sure you have checked it. A Member has also to press one of the three push buttons in front of his or her seat Green 'A' for Ayes,

[Mr. Speaker]

Red 'N' for Noes and Yellow 'O' for abstain—according to his or her choice. I am sure you have checked it. The vote initiation switch and one of the three push buttons are to be pressed simultaneously—it is very important—for a duration of ten seconds. You have to keep it pressed for ten seconds which is indicated in two ways—first by a count down on the total results display board that is 10-9-8 and it will go upto 0 and secondly by the period between sounding of the audio alarms.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Sir, I nope Rajya Sabha Members have no vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, a Member who has no seat here cannot vote.

The actual process of division starts with the first audio alarm which you will get it on the board. A Member has to press the buttons only after the first audio alarm is heard. After the expiry of ten seconds the audio alarm sounds for the second time when the two buttons being pressed should be released.

Thank you.

The question is:

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

*The Lok Sabha divided.*

Division No. 1

Time 23.43 hrs.

AYES

1. Acharia, Shri Basu Deb
2. Adaikkalaraj, Shri L.
3. Aiagiri, Shri Samy V.
4. Alemao, Shri Churchill
5. Arunachalam, Shri M.
6. Baalu, Shri T.R.
7. Bala, Dr. Asim
8. Balaraman, Shri L.
9. Balasubramoniyar, Shri S.R.
10. Barman, Shri Ranen
11. Barman, Shri Uddhab
12. Basu, Shri Anil
13. Basu, Shri Chitta
14. Bauri, Shrimati Sandhya
15. Baxla, Shri Joachim
16. Bhagwati Devi, Shrimati
17. Bharathan, Shri O.
18. Bhaskarappa, Shri C.N.

19. Chakraborty, Shri Ajay
20. Chandra Shekhar, Shri
21. Chari, Dr. S. Venugopala
22. Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kanti
23. Chatterjee, Shri Somnath
24. Chidambaram, Shri P.
25. Chitthan, Shri N.S.V.
26. Choudhury, Shri Badal
27. Dar, Shri Mohd. Maqbool
28. Das, Shri Anchal
29. Das, Shri Bhakta Charan
30. Das, Prof. Jitendra Nath
31. Dennis, Shri N.
32. Devadass, Shri R.
33. Devi, Shrimati Subhawati
34. Dharamabhiksham, Shri
35. Dome, Dr. Ram Chandra
36. Fatmi, Shri Mohammad Ali Ashraf
37. Gandhi, Shrimati Maneka
38. Ganesan, Shri V.
39. Gowda, Shri Y.N. Rudresha
40. Govindan, Shri T.
41. Gupta, Shri Indrajit
42. Hassan, Shri Munawar
43. Hossain, Shri Syed Masudal
44. Islam, Shri Qamarul
45. Jagannath, Dr. M.
46. Jalappa, Shri R.L.
47. Jena, Shri Srikanta
48. Kaikala, Shri Satyanarayana
49. Kandasamy, Shri K.
50. Kandasamy, Shri V.
51. Karvendhan, Shri S.K.
52. Khalap, Shri Ramakant D.
53. Khan, Shri Sunil
54. Kota, Shri Sydaiah
55. Koujalgi, Shri Shivanand H.
56. Krishna, Shri
57. Krishnadas, Shri N.N.
58. Kumar, Shri M.P. Veerendra
59. Kumaraswamy, Shri H.D.
60. Lahiri, Shri Samik

- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 61. Mahanta, Shri Keshab                  | 102. Ramalingam, Dr. K.P.          |
| 62. Maharaj, Shri Satpal                  | 103. Ramana, Shri L.               |
| 63. Mahato, Shri Bir Singh                | 104. Ramendra Kumar, Shri          |
| 64. Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar              | 105. Ramsagar, Shri                |
| 65. Maran, Shri Murasoli                  | 106. Ray, Shri Balai Chandra       |
| 66. Meghe, Shri Datta                     | 107. Rayareddi, Shri Basavaraj     |
| 67. Mehta, Prof. Ajit Kumar               | 108. Reddy, Shri Bhuma Negi        |
| 68. Meti, Shri H.Y.                       | 109. Riba, Shri Tomo               |
| 69. Mishra, Shri Chaturanan               | 110. Riyan, Shri Baju Ban          |
| 70. Mollah, Shri Hannan                   | 111. Rongpi, Dr. Jayanta           |
| 71. Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta             | 112. Roy, Shri Haradhan            |
| 72. Mukherjee, Shri Pramothas             | 113. Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar        |
| 73. Mukherjee, Shri Subrata               | 114. Sahai, Shri Harivansh         |
| 74. Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy               | 115. Saikia, Shri Muhi Ram         |
| 75. Murmu, Shri Rup Chand                 | 116. Sarma, Dr. Prabin Chandra     |
| 76. Nagaratnam, Shri T.                   | 117. Selvarasu, Shri M.            |
| 77. Naidu, Shri K.P.                      | 118. Shakya, Shri Ram Singh        |
| 78. Naik, Shri Raja Rangappa              | 119. Shankar, Shri B.L.            |
| 79. Narasimhan, Shri C.                   | 120. Shanmuga Sundaram, Shri V.P.  |
| 80. Natrayan, Shri K.                     | 121. Sharma, Dr. Arvind            |
| 81. Nishad, Capt. Jai Narayan Prasad      | 122. Shervani, Shri Saleem Iqbal   |
| 82. Ola, Shri Sis Ram                     | 123. Siddaraju, Shri A.            |
| 83. Owaisi, Shri Sultan Salahuddin        | 124. Singh, Shrimati Kanti         |
| 84. Pal, Shri Rupchand                    | 125. Singh, Kunwar Sarvaraj        |
| 85. Palanimanickam, Shri S.S.             | 126. Singh, Shri Raghuvans Prasad  |
| 86. Parasuraman, Shri K.                  | 127. Singh, Shri Rambahadur        |
| 87. Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas                | 128. Singh, Shri Ramashraya Prasad |
| 88. Paswan, Shri Sukdeo                   | 129. Singh, Shri Shatrughan Prasad |
| 89. Patel, Shri Jang Bahadur Singh        | 130. Singh, Shri Virendra Kumar    |
| 90. Patil, Shri B.R.                      | 131. Siva, Shri Tiruchi            |
| 91. Patrudu, Shri Ayyanna                 | 132. Sivaprakasam, Shri D.S.A.     |
| 92. Phoolan Devi, Shrimati                | 133. Somu, Shri N.V.N.             |
| 93. Premchandran, Shri N.K.               | 134. Swamy, Shri C. Narayana       |
| 94. Raghavan, Shri V.V.                   | 135. Swell, Shri G.G.              |
| 95. Rai, Shri Nawal Kishore               | 136. T. Gopal Krishna, Shri        |
| 96. Rajendran, Shri P.V.                  | 137. Tadiparthi, Shrimati Sarada   |
| 97. Rajesh Ranjan alias Pappu Yadav, Shri | 138. Taslimuddin, Shri             |
| 98. Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.                 | 139. Thammineni, Shri Veerabhadram |
| 99. Ramaiah, Shri P. Kodanda              | 140. Theertharaman, Shri P.        |
| 100. Ramaiah, Shri Sode                   | 141. Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan     |
| 101. Ramaiah, Dr. Bolla Bulli             | 142. Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran      |
|   | 143. Udayappan, Shri S.P.          |
|   | 144. Varma, Shri Chandradev Prasad |

145. Venkatesan, Shri P.R.S.
146. Venkataraman, Shri T.G.
147. Yadav, Shri Anil Kumar
148. Yadav, Shri Churi Chun Prasad
149. Yadav, Shri Devendra Prasad
150. Yadav, Shri Girdhari
151. Yadav, Shri Lal Babu Prasad
152. Yadav, Shri Mulayam Singh
153. Yadav, Shri Ramakant
154. Yadav, Shri Ram Kripal
155. Yadav, Shri Sharad
156. Yadav, Shri Surendra
157. Yerrannaidu, Shri Kinjarappu
158. Zahedi, Shri Mehboob

## NOES

1. Adsul, Shri Anandrao Vithoba
2. Agarwal, Shri Dharendra
3. Agarwal, Shri Jai Prakash
4. Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra
5. Ahmed, Shri M. Kamaluddin
6. Ahir, Shri Hansraj
7. Ananth Kumar, Shri
8. Anantha, Shri Venkatarami Reddy
9. Annayyagari, Shri Sai Prathap
10. Antulay, Shri Abdul Rehman
11. Anwar, Shri Tariq
12. Athawalay, Shri Narayan
13. A vaidyanath, Shri
14. Awade, Shri Kallappa
15. 'Bachda', Shri Bachi Singh Rawat
16. Badade, Shri Bhimrao Vishnuji
17. Badal, Shri Sukhbir Singh
18. Bagul, Dr. Sahebrao Sukram
19. Bais, Shri Ramesh
20. Baitha, Shri Mehendra
21. Baliram, Dr.
22. Banerjee, Kumari Mamata
23. Bangarappa, Shri S.
24. Banshiwal, Shri Shyam
25. Bamala, Sardar Surjit Singh
26. Begum Noor Bano

27. Benda, Chaudhary Ramchandra
28. Bhagat, Shri Vishveshwar
29. Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan
30. Bharadwaj, Shri Nitish
31. Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
32. Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal
33. Bharti, Dr. Amrit Lal
34. Bhati, Shri Mahendra Singh
35. Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
36. Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu
37. Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
38. Bishwakarma, Shri Mahabir Lal
39. Biswal, Shri Ranjib
40. Bose, Shrimati Krishna
41. Budania, Shri Narendra
42. Chacko, Shri P.C.
43. Chandumajra, Prof. Prem Singh
44. Chaubey, Shri Lalmuni
45. Chaudhari, Shri Manibhai Ramjibhai
46. Chaudhary, Shrimati Nisha A.
47. Chaudhary, Shri Padamsen
48. Chaudhary, Shri Ramtahal
49. Chauhan, Shri Jaysinh
50. Chauhan, Shri Nandkumar Singh
51. Chauhan, Shri Nihal Chand
52. Chauhan, Shri Shriram
53. Chavada, Shri Ishwarbhai Khodabhai
54. Chavan, Shri Prithviraj D.
55. Chennithala, Shri Ramesh
56. Chikhalia, Shrimati Bhavnaben Devrajibhai
57. Choudhary, Shri P.L.
58. Choudhary, Col. Sona Ram
59. Choudhary, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan
60. Chowdhary, Shri Pankaj
61. Damor, Shri Somjibhai
62. Das, Shri Dwaraka Naik
63. Dasmunsi, Shri P.R.
64. Delkar, Shri Mohan S.
65. Desmukh, Shri Chandubhai
66. Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
67. Diwan, Shri Pawan
68. Diwathe, Shri Namdeo

69. Drona, Shri Jagat Vir Singh
70. Farook, Shri M.O.H.
71. Fernandes, Shri George
72. Fernandes, Shri Oscar
73. Fundkar, Shri Bhaosaheb Pundlik
74. Gadhvi, Shri B.K.
75. Gadhvi, Shri P.S.
76. Gaekwad, Shri Satyajitsinh Dulipsinh
77. Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
78. Gamang, Shri Giridhar
79. Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai
80. Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar
81. Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya
82. Geete, Shri Anant Gangaram
83. Gehlot, Shri Ashok
84. Gehlot, Shri Thawar Chand
85. Ghatowar, Shri Paban Singh
86. Goel, Shri Vijay
87. Gudhe, Shri Anant
88. Gupta, Shri Chaman Lal
89. Mandique, Shri Bijoy
90. Hansda, Shri Thomas
91. Hazarika, Shri Iswar Prasanna
92. Hedge, Shri Anant Kumar
93. Hooda, Shri Bhupinder Singh
94. Imcha, Shri
95. Islam, Shri Nurul
96. Jadhav, Shri Suresh R.
97. Jag Mohan, Shri
98. Jai Prakash, Shri (Hardol)
99. Jai Prakash, Shri (Hissar)
100. Jain, Shri Satya Pal
101. Jaiswal, Dr. M.P.
102. Jaiswal, Shri S.P.
103. Jaiswal, Shri Pradeep
104. Jatia, Dr. Satyanarayan
105. Javia, Shri Gordhanbhai
106. Joshi, Dr. Murli Manohar
107. Kalmadi, Shri Suresh
108. Kamal Rani, Shrimati
109. Kamble, Shri Shivaji Vithalrao
110. Kamson, Prof. M.
111. Kanaujia, Shri G.L.
112. Kanodia, Shri Mahesh Kumar M.
113. Kanshi Ram, Shri
114. Kar, Shri Gulam Rasool
115. Karma, Shri Mahendra
116. Kathiria, Dr. Vallabhbhai
117. Katiyar, Shri Vinay
118. Kaur, Shrimati Sukhbuns
119. Khalsa, Shri Harinder Singh
120. Khandelwal, Shri Vijay Kumar
121. Kharwar, Shri Ghanshyam Chandra
122. Kondaiah, Shri K.C.
123. Kuleste, Shri Faggan Singh
124. Kumar, Shrimati Meira
125. Kumar, Shri V. Dhananjaya
126. Kunturkar, Shri G.M.
127. Kurien, Prof. P.J.
128. Kusmaria, Dr. Ramkrishna
129. Lodha, Justice Guman Mal
130. Magani, Shri Gulam Mohd. Mir
131. Mahajan, Shri Sat
132. Mahajan, Shri Pramod
133. Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra
134. Mallikarjun, Dr.
135. Mallikarjunappa, Shri G.
136. Mandal, Shri Brahamanand
137. Maurya, Shri Anand Ratna
138. Meena, Shri Bheru Lal
139. Meena, Shrimati Usha
140. Meghwal, Shri Parasram
141. Mehta, Shrimati Jayawanti Navinchandra
142. Mehta, Shri Sant
143. Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina
144. Misra, Shri Pinaki
145. Mohan, Shri Anand
146. Mohapatra, Shri Kartik
147. Mohle, Shri Punnu Lal
148. Mude, Shri Vijay Annaji
149. Munda, Shri Karia
150. Muniyappa, Shri K.H.
151. Muni Lal, Shri
152. Murthy, Shri K.S.R.

- |  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 153. Naik, Shri Ram                    | 192. Pradhan, Shri Ashok            |
| 154. Namgyal, Shri P.                  | 193. Pradhani, Shri K.              |
| 155. Nandi, Shri Yellaiah              | 194. Premi, Shri Mangal Ram         |
| 156. Nayak, Shri Mrutyunjaya           | 195. Purohit, Shri Banwari Lal      |
| 157. Nelavala, Shri Subrahmanyam       | 196. Raje, Shrimati Vasundhara      |
| 158. Netam, Shrimati Chhabila Arvind   | 197. Rajput, Shri Ganga Charan      |
| 159. Nimbalkar, Shri Hindurao Naik     | 198. Ram, Shri Braj Mohan           |
| 160. 'Nidar', Prof. Ompal Singh        | 199. Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally |
| 161. Nishad, Shri Vishambhar Prasad    | 200. Ramshakal, Shri                |
| 162. Nitish Kumar, Shri                | 201. Rana, Shri Kashi Ram           |
| 163. Oraon, Shri Lalit                 | 202. Rana, Shri Raju                |
| 164. Pal, Dr. Debi Prasad              | 203. Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha       |
| 165. Panabaka, Shrimati Lakshmi        | 204. Rao, Shri R. Sambasiva         |
| 166. Pandey, Dr. Laxminarayan          | 205. Rathwa, Shri N.J.              |
| 167. Pandey, Shri Manharan Lal         | 206. Raut, Shri Kacharu Bhau        |
| 168. Pandey, Shri Ravindra Kumar       | 207. Rawale, Shri Mohan             |
| 169. Panigrahi, Shri Sriballav         | 208. Rawat, Shri Bhagwan Shankar    |
| 170. Panja, Shri Ajit Kumar            | 209. Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh        |
| 171. Paranjpe, Shri Dada Baburao       | 210. Reddy, Shri G.A. Charan        |
| 172. Paranjpe, Shri Prakash Vishwanath | 211. Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara |
| 173. Parvati, Shrimati M.              | 212. Reddy, Shri M. Baga            |
| 174. Paswan, Shri Kameshwar            | 213. Reddy, Dr. Y.S. Raja Sekhara   |
| 175. Patel, Dr. A.K.                   | 214. Roy, Shri Devendra Bahadur     |
| 176. Patel, Shri Budhsen               | 215. Rudy, Shri Rajiv Pratap        |
| 177. Patel, Shri Dinsha                | 216. Sahu, Shri Anadi Charan        |
| 178. Patel, Shri Praful                | 217. Sahu, Shri Tarachand           |
| 179. Patel, Shri Shantilal Parsotamdas | 218. Sai, Shri Nandkumar            |
| 180. Patel, Shri Vijay                 | 219. Sakshi, Swami Sachidanand      |
| 181. Pathak, Shri Harin                | 220. Sandi, Prof. I.G.              |
| 182. Patidar, Shri Rameshwar           | 221. Sanghani, Shri Dileep          |
| 183. Patil, Shri Annasahib M.K.        | 222. Sardar, Shri Madhaba           |
| 184. Patil, Shri Madan                 | 223. Sathi, Shri Harpal Singh       |
| 185. Patil, Shrimati Rajani            | 224. Sayeed, Shri P.M.              |
| 186. Patil, Shri Shivraj V.            | 225. Sarpotdar, Shri Madhukar       |
| 187. Pattanayak, Shri Sarat            | 226. Scindia, Shrimati Vijayaraje   |
| 188. Pawar, Shri Sharad                | 227. Selja, Kumari                  |
| 189. Pawar, Shri Uttamsingh            | 228. Shah, Shri Manabendra          |
| 190. Pilot, Shri Rajesh                | 229. Shakyas, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh  |
| 191. Prabhu, Shri Suresh               | 230. Sharma, Shri Ashok             |

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 225. Sarpotdar, Shri Madhukar     | 259. Sinha, Shri Manoj Kumar                 |
| 226. Scindia, Shrimati Vijayaraje | 260. Sinku, Shri Chitrasen                   |
| 227. Selja, Kumari                | 261. Sonker, Shri Vidyasagar                 |
| 228. Shah, Shri Manabendra        | 262. Soumya Rajan, Shri                      |
| 229. Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh | 263. Subhash Chandra, Shri                   |
| 230. Sharma, Shri Ashok           | 264. Sukh Ram, Shri                          |
| 231. Sharma, Capt. Satish         | 265. Sultanpuri, Shri K.D.                   |
| 232. Sharma, Shri Krishan Lal     | 266. Suresh, Shri Kodikunnil                 |
| 233. Sharma, Shri Mangat Ram      | 267. Sushil Chandra, Shri                    |
| 234. Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore   | 268. Swami, Shri I.D.                        |
| 235. Silvera, Dr. C.              | 269. Swamy, Shri G. Venkat                   |
| 236. Singh, Shri Amar Pal         | 270. Swaraj, Shrimati Sushma                 |
| 237. Singh, Shri Ashok            | 271. Thakre, Shri Rajabhau                   |
| 238. Singh, Maj. Gen. Bikram      | 272. Thorat, Shri Sandipan                   |
| 239. Singh, Chaudhary Tejvir      | 273. Triya, Kumari Sushila                   |
| 240. Singh, Shri Chhatrapal       | 274. Tomar, Dr. Ramesh Chand                 |
| 241. Singh, Shri Devi Bux         | 275. Topno, Kumari Frida                     |
| 242. Singh, Dr. Hari              | 276. Tripathi, Lt. General Shri Prakash Mani |
| 243. Singh, Shri Jaswant          | 277. Uma Bharati, Kumari                     |
| 244. Singh, Shrimati Ketaki Devi  | 278. Upendra, Shri P.                        |
| 245. Singh, Shri Khelsai          | 279. Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari              |
| 246. Singh, Shri Mohan            | 280. Valyal, Shri Lingaraj                   |
| 247. Singh, Shri Nakli            | 281. Varma, Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh          |
| 248. Singh, Shri Prahlad          | 282. Varma, Shrimati Purnima                 |
| 249. Singh, Shri Radha Mohan      | 283. Vedanti, Dr. Ramvilas                   |
| 250. Singh, Shri Rajkeshar        | 284. Veerappa, Shri Ramchandra               |
| 251. Singh, Rajkumari Ratna       | 285. Verma, Shri R.L.P.                      |
| 252. Singh, Col. Rao Ram          | 286. Verma, Shri Ratilal Kalidas             |
| 253. Singh, Shri Sartaj           | 287. Verma, Prof. Rita                       |
| 254. Singh, Shri Satya Deo        | 288. Vyas, Dr. Girija                        |
| 255. Singh, Shri Shivraj          | 289. Wadiyar, Shri S.D.N.R.                  |
| 256. Singh, Shri Sohan Veer       | 290. Wanaga, Shri Chintaman                  |
| 257. Singh, Shri Surender         | 291. Yadav, Shri D.P.                        |
| 258. Singh Deo, Shri K.P.         | 292. Yadav, Shri Jagdambi Prasad             |

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction,\* the result of the division is:

Ayes	:	158
Noes	:	292

*Negatived.*

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Sir, the corrected numbers should be announced now itself.

MR. SPEAKER: If you want to remain for that, you can. Otherwise, the correction will take place later because it is 'subject to correction.' That is why it is said, "Subject to correction".

The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

23.54 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die.*

\*The following members also recorded their votes.

**Ayes:** (1) S/Shri R. Dhanuskodi Athithan (2) K.S. Rayadu (3) Pitambar Paswan (4) A.M. Valu (5) M. Ramanathan (6) Pratap Singh (7) Prof. R.R. Pramanik (8) R. Gnanaguruswamy (9) Prof. V. Venkateswari (10) Ajmeera Chandulal (11) Shrimati Ratnimala D. Savanoor (12) Dr. Arun Kumar Sarma (13) S/Shri D. Venugopal (14) Sudhir Giri (15) Birendra Prasad Balshya (16) Beni Prasad Varma (17) Mohammad Shahabuddin (18) Dinesh Chandra Yadav (19) S. Ramachandra Reddy (20) Shri N. Ramakrishna Reddy (21) Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq (22) S/Shri P. Shanmugam (23) R.B. Rai (24) A. Raja (25) S. Ajay Kumar (26) Kalpnath Rai (27) Louis Islary (28) K.V. Surendra Nath (29) A. Sampath (30) Wangcha Rajkumar (31) Nell Aloysius O' Brien (32) Shrimati Hedwing Michael Rego (33) Shri Ajit Singh

**Noes:** (1) S/Shri Madhavrao Scindia (2) Tilak Raj Singh (3) Narayan Datt Tiwari (4) Datta Meghe (5) Maruti Deoram Shelke (6) P.V. Rajeshwar Rao (7) Major Singh Uboke (8) Jayanta Bhattacharya (9) Mohammad Idris Ali (10) V. Pradeep Dev (11) Illiyas Azmi (12) Dr. B.N. Reddy (13) S/Shri Pradip Bhattacharya (14) Ravindra Chitturi (15) A.C. Jos (16) Dr. T. Subbarami Reddy (17) S/Shri Harbhajan Lakha (18) Lakshman Singh (19) Nivrutti Sheth Namdeo Sherkar (20) Ashok Argal (21) Gopal Tandel (22) Darbara Singh (23) Th. Chaoba Singh (24) S/Shri Ramsajeevan (25) Rammurti Singh Verma (26) Sukh Lal Kushwaha (27) O.P. Jindal (28) Shrimati Sheela Gautam (29) S/Shri Prabhu Dayal Katheria (30) Chhatar Singh Dardar (31) Virendra Kumar (32) Murlidhar Jena (33) Tarachand Bhagora (34) Pundlikrao Ramji Gawali (35) Rajaram P. Godase (36) Dr. Ram Lakhan Singh (37) S/Shri Gyan Singh (38) Krishan Lal Diler (39) Dr. G.R. Sarode (40) S/Shri Chandresh Patel (41) Shyam Bahari Mishra (42) Ganga Ram Koli (43) Chandrabhushan Singh (44) Shrimati Satwinder Kaur Dhaliwal (45) S/Shri Sunder Lal Patwa (46) B.P. Mirdha