

(viii) **Need to provide Central Assistance for better irrigation facilities in Fatehpur, U.P.**

SHRI VISHAMBHAR PRASAD NISHAD (Fatehpur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, people of Tindwari, Hasba, Bindki, Fatehpur and Kishanpur in Fatehpur Parliamentary constituency of Uttar Pradesh are facing a lot of difficulties due to non-availability of proper irrigation facilities. Therefore, setting up of Government tube wells, pump canals and construction of canals is very essential in the current financial year itself. Farmers are facing starvation due to erosion in Lower Ganga Canal and lack of irrigation facility. Jarauli Pump Canal under Fatehpur district is also lying incomplete. Therefore, I urge upon the Union Government to get Government tube wells set up and new pump canals constructed immediately by providing financial assistance in the current financial year itself.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : We shall now resume further discussion on the Motion of Confidence. Time allotted for this debate was seven hours.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No please, not now. Zero Hour is over.

We have consumed six hours and 37 minutes. We are left with 23 minutes out of seven hours suggested in the BAC.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No, not now. The time for raising serious matters is over.

Now we continue the debate on the Motion of Confidence.

Mr. Finance Minister.

12.14 hrs.

**MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS (Contd.) - Adopted**

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday we began another debate on another Vote of Confidence. It is not often in a nation's life that there is such rapid change of Governments and each Government is required to seek a Vote of Confidence in this House. By any standard, by any measure, these are indeed unusual times and therefore the experience that we gain would indeed be very valuable for the future. Because these are unusual times, one has to find unusual responses to the challenges that we face.

12.15 hrs.

(Shri P.M. Sayeed in the Chair)

Sir, I was disappointed yesterday, not because important things were not said or important things were not said by important people or important people did not say things with the importance that deserves to be attached to these matters, but I was disappointed because it was, in fact, a throw back to the debate of 27th and 28th May. It seems to me that my good friend, Shri Jaswant Singh is like a sulking child whose toy has been taken away and he cannot quite comprehend or come to terms with the fact that he is no longer in Government.

Sir, where did we end our debate? We ended it rather unceremoniously when Shri Vajpayee walked away even before the Speaker knew what was happening and he could pronounce an end to the debate or declare the Motion infructuous as the Speaker did in 1979 for adjourn the House *sine die*. But that debate ended, I thought, with the broad consensus that the mandate of 1996 elections was for a coalition. Perhaps, Sir, this message was not quite absorbed on 27th and 28th May. But if almost 15 days later one-third of this House refuses to learn or absorb this message, I am afraid, that does not portend well for democracy or for the functioning of this House.

I would most humbly submit to my good friend, Shri Jaswant Singh, who had very many nice things to tell about me yesterday and I hope I can return the compliment in some small measure today. The message of 1996 is that this country voted for a coalition Government. You have ridiculed us, you have criticised us, you have at least read the title of our common minimum programme even if you did not read the contents of it. But please understand the process, the churning that is going on in this nation which is reflected by all who are sitting on these Benches.

Sir, much has been said about support from outside. What did the BJP do in 1989? It supported a Government from outside. It is a different matter, its sense of political morality did not stand in the way of pulling the rug from under the feet after a few months, the political morality about which Shri Jaswant Singh waxed eloquent yesterday. What did the BJP do to the Mayawati Government in Uttar Pradesh? BJP supported it from outside and then as usual its sense of political morality encouraged it to pull the rug from under the feet. I do not think, we should give to each other lesson on political morality. If you believe what you are doing is right, please do it but go to the people and ask for their support. If I believe what I am doing is right, I shall go to the people and get my support.

Sir, much disinformation has been spread. It is Shri Maran, my distinguished colleague, who first described the BJP as not untouchable. I followed by saying, like all political parties, that we keep our options open, but we can support only a party or parties which share some basic values and basic policies. That is the fact; that is the truth.

Telephone calls poured into Madras congratulating us on our victory. I shall not disclose who the callers were. But I did not call anyone, we were called. Ministers assumed office on the 16th of May and we were called on the 17th of May. We did not call them. There is nothing wrong with that. But what the BJP failed to understand was, it was its duty to have worked hard, worked sincerely if it believed that the message of 1996 was to put together a Government which represented the will of the people. The BJP did not do that. It unleashed upon us a BJP-Shiv Sena communal Government. It imposed upon us a unilateral agenda and then said, "support us." What did they take us for, naive? Therefore, this House rejected the BJP's vote of confidence and said, "No thank you. We have no desire for the menu that you have served us, nor have we any room for the servers of that menu. Please take your seats where you rightfully belong, namely the Opposition in this House." But what did we do? We worked on a coalition. It was not easy to elect Shri Deve Gowda as the Prime Minister as the leader of the Third Front. It was not easy to transform the Third Front into a United Front. It was not easy to put together a Steering Committee and call that Steering Committee to meet day after day after day and work on a programme. It was not easy to swallow the disappointment when the Rashtrapatiji invited Mr. Vajpayee. It was not easy to struggle and defeat that Government in this House. It was not easy to put together a Government. It was not easy to put together a programme. But we did just that and nothing about that deserves ridicule or criticism. In fact, you must have great sympathy for the process which we are going through. That is the process which this country would go through for many many years. If it appears to you that this Government is fractured — and it is not Mr. Jaswant Singh, — it is because the polity in India is fractured. There are so many shades of opinion, so many currents of ideology which are running through this country. If you fail to understand them, if you fail to comprehend them, you will do so at your peril.

Sir, what is strange about parties coming together? In 1977, parties came together and this is how a very senior Member of that Government described that experiment. I quote :

"We have problems in our party. I am conscious of the fact and I am sure the House is conscious and the nation is conscious of the fact that we come from

six different streams to form one stream, we came from six different streams. Two and a quarter years ago we belong to six different parties or groups. There were four parties and all other organisations had come into existence. We came from these six different streams to converge to form one main stream. We were ideologically different, temperamentally different people. Of course we have ambitions. Why should I hide the fact? After all one is in politics, one is in public life. If there were no ambitions, which is also coupled with an element of altruism, one would not be in public life. If one were only altruistic person, then one would be a hermit, one would be doing service in some rural areas, one would not be in public life in the manner in which a politician is. When ambition and altruism blend in a proper mix, that is where you can really run the democratic politics."

Sir, the Member who spoke convinced over 200 Members, he was Mr. George Fernandes. The only person whom he could not convince was Mr. George Fernandes. And, therefore, the next day, the 13th of July, there was another turning point in his personal political history. But the point is, this is not the first time at which parties have come together to form a Government. But this time we did not fall into that error which they fell into in 1977. We did not say that we would erase our labels; we will obliterate our Party ideologies; we will obliterate our Parties; we will come together and form an artificial Party. That we did not do. What we said from the very beginning was an honest statement, 'yes, the mandate is for a coalition; we will work on a coalition; we will put together a coalition; we will write a programme'. And we have written a programme.

Sir, I have with me a sheaf of editorials. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Jaswant Singh and all other distinguished Members of this House have read these editorials. We did not mind being criticized in these editorials. But what is the thrust of these editorials? The thrust is, 'Here is an agenda which can work. This is the middle path in which the country should go. This is a welcome statement of intent. This is a good script, act on it. The United Front has a tryst with time. Keep your tryst. Here is a pragmatic approach, which will take the country forward. Modernization wins. This is a pragmatic and realistic manifesto. This represents a real national consensus onward with economic reforms.' That is the thrust of the editorials. The intelligentsia, the opinion makers have broadly welcomed the programme which the coalition has put forward and I am confident that we will be able to implement this programme in five years and when we do so, this country will take many steps forward.

Sir, now I come to my friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, I am sure he will not find fault with me if I call his role yesterday was unusually, aggressively assertive or if I call him, in some ways, presumptuous; or sometimes even overbearing. None of these words had any pejorative content. And these descriptions which I give of him and of his speech yesterday, are the dictionary meanings of the word 'arrogant'. But I will not call him that, since that has a pejorative content. But he started by speaking to a constituency outside this House and I take exception to that. The hon. Speaker and several Members of this House had to stop him in his tracks. What was his motive? He was addressing a constituency and trying to tell them in his very clever insinuating way that the Prime Minister does not know Hindi and, therefore, I shall speak in English. I object to that statement. In fact, I would have been extremely happy if he had spoken in Hindi, in which event I would have heard some understandable English translation. Of his English, Sir, he has not only acquired and preserved the British accent, he has also acquired and preserved the British tendency to divide and rule. All I can say about his speech yesterday was what my good friend Shri Jaipal Reddy said about another person in another context, "Please translate his English into English for me". There is no shame in not knowing Hindi. There is no shame in it. But, if you say, we must all make an effort to learn another language, we must all make an effort to speak in another language that is a different matter. Here I am sitting in this House trying to speak some Hindi. I told my friend "Baad Me". I am trying to speak some Hindi. Please tell me how many words of Tamil you know, Shri Jaswant Singh?

AN HON. MEMBER : Not a single word!

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I can speak passable Hindi, my Hindi may not be good. I cannot make a speech in Hindi. My grammar is bad but I can get along. I can get along. I can understand, what Shri Vajpayee speaks. I can understand what many of you speak. But there is no shame in not knowing Hindi, in not knowing English or not knowing any language. What Shri Jaswant Singh was doing was mocking at the process which elected Shri Deve Gowda as Prime Minister. He was mocking at the fact that a peasant, a child born in a peasant family, a person who had the candidness to say, 'Yes, I shepherded sheep. I have grazed cattle. I have made cow-dung cakes out of cow-dung for my mother'. He said that. There is no shame in that. In fact, we are proud of the fact that this is the first time the Prime Minister comes from a peasants family. Sir, may be the BJP will start being so exclusionary. I thought they excluded Muslims, they excluded Christians, they excluded Dalits. Now I think, they are excluding peasants also.

May be, in the States that they rule, there will be less poverty and greater growth if they share power with the farmers of this country and the peasants of this country. If the peasants and farmers come to power as they have in Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Kerala and in many many States, if this intermediate class, if these peasants and farming classes come and share power, may be there will be greater chance of growth in the other States of this country.

Sir, politics is not frozen at a point of time. Yes, I criticised the DMK in 1991. Whether I was right or wrong, it is for the people of Tamil Nadu to say. In 1996 we were faced with a demon in politics. We were faced with a most unprecedented situation. It is my misfortune that I could not convince I had tears in my eyes when I tried to convince, it is my misfortune - my colleagues and I could not convince the leadership of my party, that we could not go along with Miss Jayalalitha. That is my misfortune. It is my failing, it is my inadequacy. But that did not stop me and my colleagues from taking the gravest gamble in our political career and so, in order to rescue Tamil Nadu from the demon that dominated Tamil Nadu politics from the monumental corruption, from the complete disregard for law and order, we had to join with another democratic party, the DMK and win the election.

If Shri Murasoli Maran and I had responded to the many calls that we received, if Shri Maran had held the left hand of Shri Jaswant Singh and I had held his right hand, he would have risen and said, "Rama and Lakshmana have come to guide Sita of the BJP through the thicket of politics". Because we spurned his hand, he has to go back to the old policy of trying to divide and rule. Shri Jaswant Singh, no one will succeed as long as Shri Maran and I are on the right side of the Tamil People.

Sir, politics - political parties - tend to have illusions about themselves. All of us suffer from that illusion. I also do. Political parties are nothing but a boat and we are boatman, we are oarsmen. Who are the masters? The masters are the people who wish to travel by that boat. A boatman's or oarsman's duty is to ferry the people to where they want to go. The boatmen and oarsmen cannot decide where the people should go. The DMK and the TMC are boatmen. In the boat of politics of Tamil Nadu are the people of Tamil Nadu who have voted resoundingly that this alliance is the alliance which will rescue Tamil Nadu and the Tamil people. That is my vindication. I do not want any certificate from the BJP. I want vindication from the people of Tamil Nadu... (Interruptions)

Politics evolves. It is always an evolution. Today another evolution is taking place. If you fail to understand the forces which are driving this evolution,

you will be faced with outbursts of that revolution. What are we trying to do? We are trying to broaden the political, economic and social consensus that we need to build to govern a country so complex and so pluralistic as India is. We cannot be exclusionary and I salute Shri Vajpayee who visited Tamil Nadu only a few days ago. He was not accompanied by Shri Jaswant Singh. Shri Vajpayee is certainly wiser and understands the forces of the evolution. What did he do?

Here is a wonderful picture of Shri Vajpayee, that gentle cherubic, smiling, fatherly figure talking to two people, whom I thought Shri Jaswant Singh did not like too much, Shri Karunanidhi and Shri Maran!

And how did Shri Vajpayee describe the DMK? "The DMK is a natural ally of the BJP".

Shri Vajpayee goes on to say :

That he is happy with the regional parties; that he is happy that the regional parties are sharing power at the Centre as this will give them an opportunity to think about the entire country. This is the politics of evolution. Everybody has to evolve, everybody has to understand that there are other currents, other undercurrents, other shades of opinion. What we have done is to put together a programme which, I believe, today has a tremendous appeal to the hard-working middle classes, to the peasants and farmers of India and to the organised and unorganised labouring and industrial classes of India. With the C.P.I. and C.P.I.(M), R.S.P. and A.I.F.B., I believe, that we have widened our appeal and today all the hard-working toiling people of India are behind this Government of the Prime Minister, Shri Deve Gowda.

Sir, my distinguished friend, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj gave what some papers described as a sterling performance. Madam, I now know why you are regarded in some quarters as a popular and entertaining public speaker. But this is not a public meeting here. This is the Parliament of India. You should have done us the minimum courtesy of commenting on our Programme and even more minimum courtesy of reading our Programme before commenting on it.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ (South Delhi) : I did that.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I accept your word. Madam, on the first day I heard the spokesman of the B.J.P. say and this is reported in the newspapers that the Common Minimum Programme did not have any economic content at all. I thought that perhaps the copy she had did not contain it.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : I did not say so. I said, it is a bundle of contradictions. I never said that it does not have any economic programme. I said, the economic portion of this is a bundle of contradictions.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : There are ten pages on economic policies. Ten out of the twenty five pages deal with economics because we know that is what the people of this country look forward to. Then she said yesterday that we are going to privatise insurance. Where have we said that we are going to privatise insurance?

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : It is there on page 12.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Madam, I will read it again. I am sorry, I only have the authentic copy. I did not have an unauthentic copy...*(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER : Why are you saying Madam?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Since she was addressing me I thought I will address her.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not address each other and address the Chair only.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolgpur) : Sir, she has not said correctly about the point of view of my Party and also about other Left Parties because I knew that she was addressing the television camera and speaking looking at the T.V. camera and not in the House.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Shri Chatterjee, it is not correct. I did not say a word from my own side. I read each and every word from the Report which I laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Let us debate this question here and now.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Yes, I am prepared to do that.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Let us debate the question whether this Programme talks about privatising LIC and GIC. Let us debate that question. She cited from the Report of the Committee on Petitions. She ought to be on the defensive. But she is not on the defensive, she is aggressively defending what she said yesterday. So, let us debate it here. What does it say? It says :

"There is a strong link between infrastructure development and financial sector reforms".

Does anybody quarrel with that? It continues to say :

"Infrastructure needs long-term finances."

The thirteen days in the Finance Ministry should have convinced my friend, Shri Jaswant Singh that it is correct.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is not concerned with reality.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : It continues to say :

"The United Front Government will carry out further reforms of the financial sector so that the flow of both domestic and foreign funds to infrastructural sector is enhanced substantially."

It was Shri Jaswant Singh who raised the total from two billion dollars to four billion dollars. "There is room for public sector companies and private sector companies to coexist and compete in the financial sector". Is that privatisation? Is that privatising LIC and GIC? Let me go on to quote :

"We have gained considerable experience in the working of the banking sector".

Does Shri Vajpayee, does Shri Jaswant Singh, does the B.J.P. say that the coexistence and competition between private sector banks, public sector banks and some foreign banks is bad for India's economy?

If that is what you want to say, stand up and say that. I repeat that sentence :

"We have gained considerable experience in the working of the banking sector. The said experience..."

I would like to underline the word "the". I continue to quote :

"The said experience will be applied to the restructuring of the insurance industry, but at the same time, public sector companies like L.I.C., G.I.C. etc. will be strengthened".

Where is privatisation mentioned here?  
...(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : You are simultaneously talking in two terms about strengthening the L.I.C. and G.I.C. but applying the same banking sector experience to the insurance sector. What does it mean?...(Interruptions) Shri Chidambaram, why do you want to speak in an entirely different way?...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Madam, you can speak only when he is yielding.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Shri Chidambaram, do not mislead the nation ... (Interruptions) You go through the recommendations of the Malhotra Committee ... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, I am not yielding.

All that my learned friend has to do is to lean over her neighbour and ask Mr. Jaswant Singh whether strengthening L.I.C. and G.I.C., allowing competition and co-existence, applying the experience gained in the banking sector to the insurance industry amounts to privatisation and she will get her answer.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Allahabad) : Shri Chidambaram, will you just allow me?

Will you give us the whole gamut of the strengthening of Indian banks through the competition with the foreign banks?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I have understood your question.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Do you believe that the entire Indian industrial sector has been strengthened by the competition with the foreign banks? Do you know that many of the Indian companies are facing very serious troubles because of the so-called competition? And my friends on this side, Shri Somnath Chatterjee's counterpart in the Rajya Sabha has been shouting from the housetops and my friend Shri Chaturanan Mishra and all of them have been saying...(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : My party's stand is well known. You are not my advocate. You need not repudiate my party. Please do not mislead.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Shri Chidambaram, you are now saying that the competition with foreign companies and foreign banks and foreign industries has strengthened Indian industry. Let us have a full-fledged debate on this in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : We can have it some other day.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, on our Minimum Programme we are prepared for a debate. Let me, as one who along with many others and many senior leaders who drafted the Common Minimum Programme, say it very clearly. It is our intention to strengthen public sector insurance companies like G.I.C. and L.I.C. There is no question of privatisation. There is no question of privatising either the L.I.C. or the G.I.C. Let no dis-information go from here...(Interruptions) I have understood your question. There is no question of privatising the L.I.C. and G.I.C. At the same time, Sir, we will absorb the lessons of the co-existence and competition in the banking sector and we will apply those lessons to the restructuring of the insurance industry in a manner in which the flow of funds will come into India for our development and our social sector activities.

Sir, let me say once and for all clearly, and let no disinformation be spread, that there is no question

of privatising the L.I.C. or G.I.C. On the contrary they will be strengthened and in the days to come I will unfold to you how I intend to strengthen the L.I.C. and the G.I.C.

Sir, this programme will be debated from time to time. There will be an opportunity to debate it when the Budget proposals are presented. There will be an opportunity to debate it on many other occasions. But, for the sake of the country, I appeal to all sections of this House to give this programme a chance. Let us implement this programme. Let us do so to achieve the growth that we expect and the development that we expect.

Sir, I would like to conclude by quoting a poem from a very famous Tamil poet. Shri Vajpayee will be happy to listen to this poem because he has developed a recent fondness for Tamil poetry and I salute him for that. This is from Kamban, our equivalent of Valmiki and Tulsī. When Rama was asked to leave Ayodhya and go for 14 years to forests, Kamban describes Rama and he says :

Ippozhudhu Emmanoral iyambudarku Ezhilo<sup>6</sup>  
"Can a poet like me describe this scene?"

Sepparam gunathiraman thirumugam sevvinnokki

I now look at the face of Ram, who has millions of good qualities.

Oppade munbu pinbu avvasagam unarakketu

The face was the same before he heard the words 'go to the forest' and after he heard the words 'go to the forest' - There was equipoise and equanimity. *Oppader munbu* means 'before', *pinbu* means 'after' and *avvasagam unarakketu* refers to 'go to the forest'.

Appozhudu alarndha senthamaraiyai othadhamma

What was the face like? The face before and after was like a blooming lotus, something which is your favourite flower...*(Interruptions)* Unfortunately, what I find today in this debate and the debate on 27th and 28th May, 1996 - these faces are like wilting lotuses.

*[Translation]*

PROF. RITA VERMA (Dhanbad) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the important discussion going on since yesterday, covering many issues, centralises on the same very point again and again as to who has got the mandate and who has been empowered by the people to rule over the country? While considering this, we will have to see that the United Front is a weak combination of 13-14 or 15 parties...*(Interruptions)* and the main component of it is the Janata Dal. There are 44 Members of Janata Dal out of which 23 Members hail from Bihar. It means that the soul of Janta Dal lies in Bihar. The entire country will now be benefited with their good

administration as the people of Bihar have experienced the same. So, let us first consider whether they have got mandate in Bihar itself or not and after that, we will consider on the administration they have run in Bihar which they want to show now to the entire country.

So far as I remember, 39 Members of Janata Dal hailed from Bihar in 1991 election. But after this election, this number has reduced to 23 whereas before election they and the Chief Minister of Bihar, during campaign used to make speeches proudly that their party would bag all the 54 seats and opposition parties would not get a single seat. But what was the picture after election? From 39, their number came down to 23. Their alliance parties were badly defeated. We have heard the story of 'Bhasmasur', who had a boon that the person on whose head he kept his hand, was Vanished...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Silence please. There is a lot of noise in the House.

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : Are you speaking on Bihar?...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not disturb.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly be seated. Do not disturb her.

*[Translation]*

PROF. RITA VERMA : I would like to state that just like a person on whose head 'Bhasmasur' kept his hand, was vanished, so is the case with the alliance parties of Janata Dal. You can enquire their alliance parties CPI and CPI(M) as to what happened to Shri Chaturanan Mishra? It is said in Bihar that "CPI par path aur CPM bhi saaf". He has got such mandate that the party itself was swept clean. Thus the party was discarded by the voters of Bihar from where it has got maximum number of seats and they say that they have got people's mandate to rule the country. They have been discarded by the people in their own State and now they say that people have empowered them to rule the country...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please be seated. Kindly do not disturb. No interruptions please.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Sir, let us now consider as to what led them to such a plight in Bihar? How did they rule Bihar, which they want to exhibit to the entire country from the capital New Delhi?

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)\*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly do not disturb like this.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is a limit. Do not behave like this. Please be seated. Otherwise, I will have to name you.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, if this type of behaviour is not stopped, this House cannot function and the Member should be admonished for his behaviour. This cannot be tolerated in this House. If this type of behaviour goes on, I do not know how long this Parliament will continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I agree that this kind of behaviour cannot be tolerated in this House. If this House is to run properly, there must be peace in the House, not this kind of behaviour whether it is from this side or that side.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Cuttack) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when a lady Member speaks, there should be absolute peace in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is what I am also telling.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the whole country and the world is watching the proceedings of the House. I am sorry, I cannot approve it. But I would like to state that this... (Interruptions) would you not even allow to regret? Why? But one thing should be kept in mind that the Government of India wants to seek the Vote of Confidence and we are speaking on the Motion of Confidence. We are not speaking on No-Confidence Motion against the Government of Bihar... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI (Jhansi) : Why should we not speak? Did you not do so?

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not speaking on a No-Confidence Motion against the Government of Bihar. I am trying to explain as to why did they not get mandate in Bihar and their number reduced to half, and now they say that they have got

\* Not Recorded.

mandate to rule the country. I want to put forth this fact before you so that they can realise themselves and think as to why did they not get people's mandate in Bihar. This is what I want to explain.

[English]

SHRI P. KODANDARAMAIAH (Chitradurga) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is nothing unparliamentary in what she said. So, there is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : The people of Bihar discarded them for their involvement in large scale corruption, grave financial misappropriation, their bad administration and fodder scam engineered by them... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can give a reply when you speak. There is nothing unparliamentary in what she said.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly be seated. There is nothing objectionable. If there is any unparliamentary word, I will expunge it.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : She is making a general reference to corruption. What are you talking?

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Please listen carefully... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : She is not yielding to you.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : You can reply when you speak.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ANAND MOHAN (Sheohar) : Only these people have created anarchy in Bihar... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Mohan, please sit down. You should not behave like this. You are a new Member.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI (Darbhanga) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. I will not allow you.

(Interruptions)\*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Anand Mohan, I will have to name you. Behave yourself.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Nitish Kumar, kindly control your Member.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, it is a discussion on the Vote of Confidence. It is not a discussion on the Bihar fodder scam...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : She is referring to general corruption matters.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to appeal to the House to listen me attentively. I want to refer to what the hon'ble High Court has said about their Government. I want to read out what the High Court has observed.

[English]

"The people of the State, in different walks of life, have been made to suffer on the specious plea of paucity of funds. The limited funds of the State, which could be utilised for the welfare of the people, were allowed to be systematically plundered, assuming unparalleled proportions" ... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : I am on a point of order...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have to decide.

[Translation]

Please tell this House, under what rule it is a point of order.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Mr. Chairman, Sir, my point of order is that the issue being raised by the hon'ble Member has already been raised 50 times in this House. Therefore, I think that there is no need to raise this issue time and again.

\* Not Recorded.

13.00 hrs.

This is a Motion of Confidence. A person who is not able to give reply here, should not be charged by any Member and no serious issue should be raised in this House. I again raise this point of order ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is not a point of order. I would like to request this House that it is a very controversial matter and... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI QAMARUL ISLAM (Gulbarga) : Sir, I want to raise a point of order under Rule 353 ... (Interruptions)

PROF. RITA VERMA : It is stated,

"The limited funds of the State, which can be utilised for the welfare of the people..." (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is on a point of order and let me listen to it.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : In this way, they will not let me speak... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI QAMARUL ISLAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, my point of order pertains to the matter which has been raised by the hon. Member from that side. She is giving reference of the *chara ghotala*. Sir it is actually it is not a *chara ghotala*. It was an excess withdrawal from treasury which was going on in the Treasury from 1977. For the first time, the Chief Minister of Bihar has gone to the court and the court, has appreciated it. The hon. Members should read the last part of the High Court's judgement first and then should go to the Supreme Court's judgement. Please do not try to mislead the House. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please hear me.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : She is quoting from the judgement and that can be done.

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI T.G. VENKATRAMAN) : She should not mislead the House. (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Kendrapara) : Sir, I am on a point of order... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will see the proceedings. If there is anything wrong or if there is anything which is objectionable, we will expunge it.



[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Why are you so much afraid of C.B.I. inquiry?

[English]

"The limited funds of the State, which can be utilised for the welfare of the people were allowed to be systematically plundered assuming unparalleled proportions. In such a situation, people naturally have a legitimate expectation that the guilty be punished." (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Sir, I am on a point of order...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is on a point of order. I cannot suppress a point of order.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Sir, I draw your attention to Rule 115. I had drawn attention to this proviso of the rules and procedure last time also when the hon. Members Shri George Fernandes, participated in the debate and quoted the same judgement which the hon. Member is quoting now. He misquoted the judgment and I brought a privilege motion against Shri George Fernandes...(Interruptions) Let me complete. The privilege motion along with the Patna High Court's judgment and the Supreme Court's judgment is pending before the Speaker for his decision. Therefore, can any Member quote the same judgment when this privilege motion is pending for the order of the Speaker? Since Shri George Fernandes misquoted the judgement, I brought the whole thing before the Speaker and it is pending before the Speaker for his ruling. Therefore, can she quote from the judgement?... (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT; AND ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF COAL (SHRI S.R. BOMMAI) : Sir, the very point was raised when the debate was going on the Confidence Motion moved by Shri Vajpayee. This matter was raised. The Hon. Speaker has given a ruling that it cannot be raised.

PROF. RITA VERMA : No...(Interruptions)

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI : It is a matter of record. The Hon. Speaker has given the ruling. Please go through the proceedings.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I quote Rule 115 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha:

"At any time after the Bill has been so laid on the Table, any Minister in the case of a Government Bill, or, in any other case, any member may give notice of his intention to move that the Bill be taken into consideration."

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I am exactly on the same rule. I have written to the Hon. Speaker stating that Shri George Fernandes has misled this House by

misquoting the judgement of the Patna High Court and the Supreme Court also. My privilege motion is pending before the Hon. Speaker.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is from the Direction?

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : It is from the Direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I quote for the benefit of the House :

"A member wishing to point out any mistake in or inaccuracy in a statement made by a Minister or any other member shall, before referring the matter in the House, write to the Speaker pointing out the particulars of the mistake or inaccuracy and seek his permission to raise the matter in the House."

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I have exactly said that. I brought this matter to the notice of the Speaker when Shri George Fernandes raised this issue and the matter is pending before the Speaker. How can the hon. Member raise this issue again?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Admittedly it is pending with the Speaker.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Nalanda) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that on 27th of last month, I had read out the verdict of the Patna High Court. We had made all preparations to place that verdict before the House but I was not allowed to do so. At that time, the hon'ble Member, Shri Srikanta Jena had alleged that we misled the House. He had also read out the last sentence of the verdict and charged me of misleading this House. Before that, I had also read out whatever the court had said about the wrong doings of Bihar Government and then it was said that the House had been misled. Some Members also said that the matter was sub-judice. But the Supreme Court also gave its verdict in this matter within three days and upheld the judgement given by the High Court...(Interruptions) Mr. Chairman, Sir, now comes the question of Privilege Motion. That day I had said that I welcomed the Privilege Motion. I request that this Privilege Motion ... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I am going to conclude my speech with one more sentence. I would like to request that the entire House...(Interruptions) A full day discussion on that issue may be held ... (Interruptions)

CHAIRMAN : I remember when I was here, the hon. Member referred to the judgement last time and

now Prof. Rita Vermaji is also quoting some parts of the judgment, not something pending before the Court. If the hon. Member is quoting some parts of the judgement in some wrong context, I consider that the whole contents should be read out and then that can be even laid on the Table of the House for the benefit of the entire House. Shri George Fernandes, you are a senior Member. You know it. Why are you doing like this?

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I just now mentioned about the guilty persons ... (Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Supreme Court has given its verdict... (Interruptions)

PROF. RITA VERMA : No, no... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Prof. Rita Verma, you lay it on the table of the House.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the Supreme Court has also given its verdict after High Courts judgement, then the judgement of the High Court... (Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. RITA VERMA : I am not yielding ... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am allowing her to speak.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have already given the ruling. Kindly be seated.

13.12 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

MR. SPEAKER : Sit down, please.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am standing. Shri Ram Naik, I am on my legs.

SHRI RAM NAIK : Yes, you are on your legs. Could you ask them to sit down?... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I will ask them to do the same thing. Lodha ji, I think the matter is closed. The Chair has given a ruling. Prof. Rita Verma, you said that you need only five minutes. Did you not say so? Please conclude now.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : If these Members listen peacefully, I can conclude in five minutes ... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please remember that it is not a No-Confidence Motion against any other Government. It is a Confidence Motion.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I just now mentioned about the guilty persons. The judgement itself reveals it further... (Interruptions)

[English]

"The excess withdrawals could not have been made year after year without tacit support and blessings of high-ups in the Secretariat and at the Government level."

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please.

(Interruptions)

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : The Prime Minister should ask his Members to behave properly ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude now. This is enough.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : I have spoken only for two minutes, not five minutes.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. Do not behave like children here. You are all hon. Members of Parliament, both sides.

SHRI VINAY KATIYAR (Faizabad) : This childish behaviour will not be allowed. They are interrupting regularly... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jaswant Singh, see how your Members are behaving.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Very good, you are all very very hon. Members of this House. Very nice. People of this country are praising you for this behaviour. They are all praising us - the whole India. Why do you not understand that?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. You cannot stand like this. Do you want to sit in this House or not?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Do you want to sit in the House or not?

[English]

Ritaji, please conclude now. Otherwise, I am going to call the next speaker now.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, please give me an opportunity to speak peacefully. I will conclude within five minutes only. The time is being wasted due to repeated interruptions. I would like to say further that...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Ritaji, it is a Confidence Motion. It is not a No-Confidence Motion against any Government.

[English]

You must know this. Please limit yourself.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have said so.

[Translation]

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, an allegation has been made against Kalyan Singh Government. A Member should be interrupted only if he says something in the context of No-Confidence Motion.

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, whatever I am speaking, is a truth and truth is always bitter. We should be bold enough to listen to it. The hon'ble High Court has mentioned :

[English]

"The State Government gave patronage to officials who were already under a cloud and who are now the main accused. As such, the possibility of the Government influencing the course of investigation could not be ruled out".

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have heard as to who provided protection to the criminals and scamsters. These are not my words but it has been stated by the Supreme Court in its verdict that the State Government openly protected the scamsters...(Interruptions) Bihar has become such a state...(Interruptions).

Sir, I shall quote only one point as a telling commentry about the character of their Government.

[English]

Nero was fiddling when Rome was burning...(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I am on a point of order, Sir...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No point of order. I have called the next speaker.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : I want to speak for two minutes...(Interruptions) Sir, I would like to draw the

attention of the House as to at what cost the scam took place...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I am on a point of order. I have to call your attention to Rule 222. Sir, I am on a point of order. I am calling your attention to Rule 222. Under Rule 222, I had given a notice on breach of privilege on the same subject, i.e. on the Patna High Court judgement and the Supreme Court judgement in relation to the treasury loot in Bihar, which has been going on from 1977. Or that, Mr. George Fernandes has misled this House...(Interruptions) how the Supreme Court and their judgement are being misquoted in this House...(Interruptions) I will simply call your attention and I seek your protection. Ultimately, what has the Patna High Court said? The commentary of the Court is like this...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : He is on a point of order.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Its judgement reads like this :

"Before I part, I must make it clear that the observations or findings as contained in this judgement have been made for the purpose of these petitions. They should not be construed as Court's opinion on merit of the case in any way..."

Sir, I would simply draw your attention and seek your protection. This House should not be taken for a ride. Mr. George Fernandes and all the Members of the BJP have taken this House for a ride.

MR. SPEAKER : Okay, Mr. Jena, please sit down. The notice of privilege is still under the consideration of the Speaker. A point of order cannot be on a point of information. You are giving some information. It cannot be a point of order. It has to be related to the procedure of the House, interpretation of the rules.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want only 2-3 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER : Not 2-3 minutes, conclude in only one minute.

PROF. RITA VERMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, they claim that their Government is the Government of downtrodden, the oppressed and the exploited ones but from Bihar, you can have a glimpse of the administration which they are going to provide to the country. I would like to tell about it that the welfare schemes of the state have been worst affected by this fodder scam since all the welfare schemes have come to standstill for the last six years. When this is the impact on Dalits and the downrodden of the state then how can they claim...(Interruptions). All the developmental schemes have come to standstill and people are not getting old age pension...

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : It is enough. Now I call Mamtaji.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now. I have called the next speaker.

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : Sir, please give me one more minute's time... (Interruptions) You have been very kind to allot me time... (Interruptions) All the developmental schemes of Bihar have come to standstill. The amount of Rs. three lakh which is provided to the Legislators, for the developmental work at district level, has not been provided. The looting in the State has reached to such an extent that the amount earmarked for the district level schemes has not been released.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not cross the limit. Please do not cross your limit now. I have told you two or three times already. Rita Vermaji, your responsibility is much more than that of the other hon. Members of the House because you are on the Panel of Chairmen. Please understand that.

PROF. RITA VERMA : Sir, I am concluding now.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to conclude. They say that they have got mandate from Bihar. Had they bagged more than 40 seats from Bihar, the present Prime Minister would not have got this opportunity but the hon. Chief Minister of Bihar would have occupied the office.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND MINISTER OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION AND ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV) : Sir, I am on a point of order under Rule 179. I want to draw your attention to Rule 179, Sir... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Rule 179 speaks about Resolution and not about Motion.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA : How can they claim that they have got the people's mandate? Sir, the place where I hail from, is called Jharkhand and Vananchal. How much mandate have they got from there? They have not been able to win a single seat while we have bagged 12 out of 14 seats. Now, tell me, who has got mandate, we or they? The party was completely routed in that area. The hon. Chief Minister used to say that the separate Vananchal State

would be formed only on his dead body. The people have given clear signal in the election that the separate Vananchal State will certainly be formed let anybody live or die. I would like to urge upon the hon. Prime Minister to bow down before this mandate and fulfil the feelings of mandate by forming a separate Vananchal State.

Sir, I am very grateful to you for providing me time to speak.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Now, there should be order in the House.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I, as a Member of this House, am sorry to say that when the whole world and our people are watching the performance of the Members of this House, I do not know what performance we are giving. I, on behalf of me and on behalf of my party, apologise to the people of this country for our ill-behaviour and for our misbehaviour. Sir, I must congratulate our first Prime Minister of 11th Lok Sabha, Shri Atal Bihar Vajpayeeji and our present Prime Minister, Shri Deve Gowda. Sir, I convey my highest regards to all my elders and youngsters and also our elder sisters and younger sisters. On that particular day, on 24th May, when I walked out, though it is not proper, I know the rules. But Vajpayeeji at least appreciated and admitted the facts that what I wanted. I have never seen the cow slaughter or anything but I wanted that nothing related to the religious matter should appear in the President's Address so that no wrong message or wrong signal can go to the people that we are depriving the legitimate claim of the minorities. Sir, who is not a minority? I am majority in my State but I am a minority in Maharashtra. Somebody is in majority in Nagaland but he is minority in Arunachal Pradesh. Sir somebody is in majority in Assam but he is in minority in Bengal. So, everybody is majority in one State and minority in another State. Why should not we consider ourselves human beings? We are all member of human family. But I am sorry to say that this House debated this issue like this, by the divide and rule policy. The English Government is not in power. They are not ruling our country. After Independence the Congress ruled this country. The Congress stands for secularism and the Congress stands for dedication and determination of this country. Of course, I cannot say that whatever we have done is correct. According to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, the one who works has the right to commit mistakes also. The one who does not work, will not commit any blunder. But the thing is very serious. But I am sorry to say that the House is divided like this. Some people are pleading for communalism and some people are pleading for secularism. But what the people of this country are

thinking of us? We have to play that role of neutralism. We have to play the role for basic policies of this country. That is why, may I submit to all the senior Members and elder Members that there are sensitive issues like Uniform Civil Code and cow slaughter. There are other sensitive issues like Babri Masjid. Yes, there are sensitive issues.

That issues must be resolved through consensus. Unanimously we have to take a decision on that issue.

I must congratulate Shri Jaswant Singhji because in The Economic Times, Bombay edition, he admitted something about the Babri Masjid. He said that the responsibility is theirs. I congratulate him because he admitted that. Even Shri Vajpayeeji, at that time, was not in favour of that. But on 10th June, the General Secretary of *Sangh Parivar* has said that they were proud of it. I do want to mention his name, since he is not a Member of this House. That is the courtesy and that is the decorum of this House.

If you give me permission, I want to quote only one line. This is from the Bombay Times of India News Service. It says :

"It was a matter of pride of Hindus, the world over. It was like Hanuman, setting fire to Lanka."

How many Hanumans we want to see in this country and who will set fire? Sir, we have to stop it. We have to see the progress from the humanitarian grounds. That is why, I say :

Nazar unki, zuban unki, main kisko  
motbar samjhoon,

Nazar kuchh aur kahti hai, zuban  
kuchh aur kahti hai,

Wo Kahten hain ki kafila hamara  
manzil par aa pahuncha.

Magar is kafile ki dastan kuchh aur kahti hai.

[English]

That is why, I, say that we should not be hypocrites. We should not play double standards. We have to play our role as citizens of this country.

On 24th May, BBC rang me up from London and a person asked me as to what caste I belong to. I told him that I am a citizen of India and that I do not have any caste. I said categorically that I was born in Bengal and I am proud of it because Bengal has undertaken so many reforms. Today, the need of the hour is reforms — economic reforms, judicial reforms, electoral reforms, political reforms and value-based politics. Yes, we are really lacking this today. We need to restore value-based politics. Yes, we are really lacking this today. We need to restore value-based politics today. But who will restore value-

based politics? Politics stands for hobnobbing; politics stands for hotchpotch arrangement. We do not believe in hotchpotch politics. We believe that India should march forward towards the 21st Century so that whatever we can do, we can do for the people of this country. Yes, it is true that we have not got the mandate from the people. That is why, we are not in the Government. But our Party has clearly stated - according to our Working Committee Resolution - that we are going to support a secular Government. There may be differences about the definition of secularism. It is a fact that we are supporting Shri Deve Gowda's Government. Shri Deve Gowda is a nice man. I must congratulate him. We are proud of him because he came from a farmer's family, like Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. Today, I remember the slogan, 'Jai Jwan, Jai Kisan'.

I want to tell you something. I have seen this Government's agenda. Yesterday, Shrimati Sushmaji said that that agenda has not said anything about corruption. But it is mentioned in the agenda. Shrimati Sushmaji is not here now. But in page 11, if one goes through the paragraphs, then one finds that the United Front Government is committed to fight corruption, particularly corruption in high places and they would take such steps as are necessary and in accordance with the law to restore the confidence and credibility of the Offices and Institutions of the State.

This is what is said in the United Front Government's agenda. Where is not corruption? Corruption has become a fashion now. Mother of thieves shout the most. This is the recent trend. I am sorry to say this. Corruption is everywhere. If you go to a school, you have to give donation, is not it corruption? If you go to a hospital, you have to give donation, is not it corruption? If you go in for a deal, you have to give money. Unless and until the Lokpal Bill is brought before this House as early as possible and passed unanimously and the State-funding of election takes place, you cannot restore value-based politics.

Everybody will suppress the real facts and this is going on now. Can I tell you one party whose fund was zero when it was born but now this party may have more than Rs. 1000 crore as funds? From where have they got it, Sir? Is it from Aladdin's magic lamp from where they have got these funds? That is not true. I do not want to mention any party's name ... (Interruptions)... You must know as you are from Bengal. I do not want to say all these things. I am not going to make any controversial issue because of the interest of Parliament and I have committed that I am apologizing to the people for our ill behaviour and that is why, I am not going to quote all these things. Let me say what Mahatma Gandhi has said.

"Let communalism be our main enemy; let secularism be our new foundation; let nationalism be our main politics; let humanism be our main religion and let patriotism be our new ideal."

Equality is the rule of law. Nobody is above law, not even the Prime Minister, not even the Chief Minister, not even the public representative and not even the bureaucrat. Everybody is equal under one umbrella and that is why, I tell this Government who have committed that they will take strong action and Congress is not at all afraid; we are not afraid. You may take stringent action if you see anybody guilty of corruption but at the same time, you have to take action against corruption all over the country. Whoever is involved in corruption should be punished. There should not be 'haves' and 'have nots'. Though Comrade Lenin said that 'haves' and 'have nots'...(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Don't utter his name.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Yes, I can utter his name. Can't you utter the words of Rabindranath Tagore? I can utter everybody's words. I can utter Bhagat Singh's words; I can utter the words of Shri Maulana Abul Kalam Azad...(Interruptions).. Sir, the people of this country are very sensitive and very mature. This time, no party has got a clear mandate. Instead of giving the mandate, people have given a punishment to all parties. Instead of giving a reward, they have given punishment. It is not that the Parliament is hung but every party is hung in this country. If you behave like this, people will not vote for any political party and democracy will be abolished in India. That is why, I request the Members, the senior Members of parties and party leaders that we should behave properly. I must request the hon. Prime Minister also. It is all right that our party has taken the stand to support the secular Government though I have some reservations about secular parties of the United Front. Sir, you know better than me. I do not want to say anything about the combination but you may kindly see a photograph after the poll violence. In my State, 30 people were killed. In Andhra Pradesh, six Congress workers were brutally murdered yesterday...(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : It was by TDP.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : You see the paper; you will come to know about it. Why are you making a controversy unnecessarily? I think the House will apprehend what I want to say. More than 30 people were killed in my State. The body of a man who voted for Congress was burnt by acid. Do you want to protect the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes?...(Interruptions).. I can show Gana Shakthi, your party symbol also. Why are you trying to interrupt unnecessarily? I have not mentioned your name. Do not provoke me. Then, I will give you so

many documents....(Interruptions).. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and minorities people who voted for Congress are not allowed to have even drinking water. This is for your kind information.

AN HON. MEMBER : I would like to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not disturb.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : I have not mentioned any party's name.

On 30.5.96, the next day of Muharram, in the communal riots five persons were killed in police firing. I appeal the Prime Minister to give relief and help to these victims. I have so many papers with me which I got from people. It is a matter of shame that...

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bunkura) : You lay them on the Table of the House.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Yes, if you want, I can lay them on the Table of the House.

There is one lady, who is a Headmistress of a school in a place which is the birth place of Nazrul Islam, a Great poet of Bengal who worked hard with Rabindra Nath for the unity of Hindu and Muslim. The name of the village where that school is situated, is Churliya. I am sorry to say that a Headmistress of Sailabala Balika Vidyalaya was raped. I would like to know whether any action has been taken in this regard or not.

AN HON. MEMBER : Everybody has condemned that incident.

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : I am seeking justice from the Prime Minister. It is not a matter of Bengal, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra or Tamil Nadu. It is a matter of our fundamental rights. Article 20 (3) of the Constitution certain fundamental rights have been mentioned. If we are going to lose our fundamental rights - the right to vote, the right to acquire property or the human right - how can we protect the democracy? That is why I seek Prime Minister's personal intervention in this regard. The Prime Minister should take up this matter within the State Government. He should not take up this matter with the help of his remote control, Harkishan Singh Surjeet...(Interruptions)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPADAR (Barrackpore) : She is referring to a person who is not a Member of this House...(Interruptions) Please expunge it.

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : All right, I withdraw the name...(Interruptions)

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEB : She has withdrawn the name...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : She has withdrawn that word.

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : This is my third term and I know the rules. I withdraw that word.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Sir, have you allowed her to speak out of Agenda?

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : I know more than you, what is there in the Agenda.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Sir, she is speaking on the motion. She should restrict to the motion itself.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI (How Rah) : We are not here at their mercy.

KUMARI MAMTA BENERJEE : I never distrubed them when they spoke.

SHRI TARIT BARM TOPDAR : Sir, have you allowed her to speak out of the Agenda?

MR. SPEAKER : She is saying quite relevant things. I do not think she is speaking anything out of agenda. She is speaking perfectly relevant things.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is perfectly relevant.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, I do have a copy of the agenda of the United Front Government. In that it is clearly mentioned that this Government will give protection to women, to the minorities, to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, to the Other Backward Castes and to the downtrodden people. But, if the Head Mistress of a school in this country is brutally raped, and if the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribe people who do not have water to drink are not allowed to take drinking water, what action... (Interruptions) ...Sir, I seek your protection.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Sir, all these issues should be raised in the West Bengal Assembly and not here.... (Interruptions)...

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Sir, she did not name anybody, she did not name any Party and whe did not name any individual, Why is she being disturbed like this? ... (Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER : Mamataji, please conclude.

(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, they are disturbing me again and again. Please tell them to behave properly. Cannot I appeal to the Prime Minister inside the House? If I cannot appeal to the Prime Minister inside the House, what will happen if I go outside? Sir, I appeal to the Prime Minister that for the sake of the whole country and for the sake of what he stands by... (Interruptions) Sir, we have our reservations but we are supporting the Deve Gowda Government. But our fight, the fight against those

who commit atrocites on people, will continue in West Bengal and the Congress will fight their policies. The Congress will not compromise with the CPI (M) in West Bengal because I know that the CPI(M) commits atrocites on people there.

Lastly, Sir, I want to make a request to the Prime Minister regarding unemployment problem which is increasing day by day. Steps should be taken to stop its growth.

Sir, as you know very well, the communication system in the North-East is a matter of great concern. You will appreciate this, Sir, that the north-eastern region... (Interruption )

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, if they keep disturbing me again and again, how can I speak? ... (Interruptions) ... Sir, I visited all the places in the North-East. There is a lack of railway lines and other forms of communication there. People are very needy there, especially the people of Assam.

In Assam the ethnic problem is also going on. So many people have left their places and have gone to Bangladesh. They have also gone to Bengal border and Bihar border. More than 85 percent people have already died. So I appeal to the Prime Minister to please send a team from here so that they visit Assam and sort out this problem... (Interruptions) The Government should give some relief for them also. There have been killings in *danga* or political violence. I am not mentioning any names. Persons from all parties are being killed. The violence is increasing like anything. Election means killing ... (Interruptions) I am not taking your party's name please whoever died - CPI (M) members are also killed. I appeae for them also... (Interruptions) I appeal to the Prime Minister to give some relief to those victims - they may belong to any party but give them relief.

Lastly, I want to say that we are not afraid: we are not scared of anybody because I know better than anybody.

Sarfaroshi ki tamanna ab hamare dil mein hai.

Dekhana hai jor kitna baju-e katil mein hai.

[English]

We are not afraid. We shall overcome. This is our situation.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity, Sir.

[Translation]

SHRI SURENDER SINGH (Bhiwani) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion of Confidence moved by the hon. Prime Minister in this

House yesterday. Yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister ...*(Interruptions)* laid emphasis on one point only that the people of India have given their mandate for a full five year term Government at the Centre.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that was the essence of the speech of Shri Chidambaram today. I had no objection when the hon. Prime Minister and Defense Minister said so but I am closely acquainted with Shri Chidambaram. His logic that the people of India were in favour of a coalition Government that could last for five years is baseless. The main plank of the manifestoes of all the political parties was based on a crusade against the Congress. All the motley constituent parties forming the Government of the day spit fire against the Congress during their election campaign. What is the positoin of Congress party in this Government today? Trainer aircrafts are used in order to train the pilots in Air Force. The pilot under training occupies the front seat and the instructor pilot the back seat. It is the instructor pilot sitting in the rear seat who has the command to control the aircraft particularly at the time of take off and landing. This Government has also taken off and, yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister was saying that Congress has not laid down any condition for extending support to us.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Shri Chandra Shekhar is not present in the House. You may recall the experience of 1977 and 1979. How long did the Congress extend its support to Shri Chandra Shekhar in 1989? The emphasis of the speeches of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Chidambaram and other senior speakers was on one and only one thing that they have a mandate for five years.

Just now, Mamataji was speaking. You might have keenly watched the first trailer. Things will become crystal clear once they go to other states for implementing the Minimum Common Programme.

Shri Chidambaram dwelt at length on the economic policies. Paradoxically, whereas Shri Chidambaram is a great advocate of liberalisation, the other constituent parties have a totally contradictory outlook. Quite surprisingly, Shri Chidambaram is an eminent advocate. If Shri Chidambaram would have got an opportunity to be briefed from the BJP side, he would have more successfully advocated that the people of India gave their mandate in favour of Vajpayeeji. The essence of their Minimum Programme is to safeguard their seat of power and keep the BJP at bay. I know my friends in the Congress inside out. Our Congress friends are not happy sitting over there in the middle rows. They have an eye on Shri Deve Gowda's seat. Shri Deve Gowda looked very confused and perplexed yesterday in the presence of his Congress allies while he was delivering his speech. He looked at their faces. While our BJP friends raised questions

about Urea scandal, the hon. Prime Minister repeatedly said :

*[English]*

"Unless I have the details, I cannot mislead the House."*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh) : Sir, they are using a language which is not allowed in this House...*(Interruptions)* They do not know how to maintain the honour and dignity of this House ...*(Interruptions)* Sir, this is unbecoming of an hon. Member of this House.

*[Translation]*

SHRI SURENDER SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Vajpayee ji poses no challenge to Shri Deve Gowda. The real danger for him lies from this side. He does occasionally have a word with Sharad ji and Shri Rajesh pilot. The position of the Congress with its present strength of 142 will deteriorate further within 6-8 months when a by-election will be held.

My point is that I am an old Congressman and know them inside out. Suppose, Mamataji raises an issue regarding West Bengal in the House but she cannot work in tune with the Government of West Bengal there. You will try to exert pressure on her. How long can this drama go on? There was a Congress Government in Haryana during the last five years which had a programme of - one family, one job. The newspaper reports, and the the judgements of the High Court and the Supreme Court stand a testimony to the fact that there is no family left which has not paid Rs. 70,000 for employing a member to the post of a peon or constable. Two Congress Members of our state, Haryana, are present here. They may refute this charge. The former Chief Minister of the State harnessed the Congress Government so ruthlessly for his vested and business interests that the Supreme Court awarded punishment to the I.P.S. and other officers and they got a wild support from here.

Keeping the present situation in view, as has been said by the Congress President, Shri Narasimha Rao and other Members of the treasury benches that there may be by-elections within a year and that the Minimum Programme chalked out by them can not be implemented in public.

With these words I request that this Motion be rejected.

14.00 hrs.

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH HOODA (Rohtak) : My only submission is that the issue of SYL in Haryana pending over years...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : He has to utter a last word. Why are you interrupting him?



[Translation]

SHRI SURENDER SINGH : The issue of SYL raised by you...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHUPINDER SINGH HOODA : The Akalis have entered into an alliance with you. Now, at least the issue of SYL should be decided...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JAI PRAKASH (Hissar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Hooda did not utter a word till 1996 when their party was in power in the country and in that state. How come SYL has flashed in his mind today? You have come to this House after dividing the people of Punjab and Haryana. The Congress will not be able to secure even a single seat in Haryana in the ensuing elections.

SHRI G.G. SWELL (Shillong) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am totally conscious of the limitation on my time and having regard to the problems in your hands. I will not try to transgress it. I will confine myself only to a few minutes.

Notwithstanding the mere fracas what we had in this House a little while ago today to me was totally incomprehensible and irrelevant to the subject under discussion.

As I watched the proceedings of this House the whole day of yesterday and today, I detect that the whole fire and brimstone with which the BJP came to this House on the 27th and 28th of May when they sought the vote of confidence was missing. I had a feeling that the fight has gone out with them and even a little bravado which they sporadically displayed every now and then seems to be contrived and artificial. I detect a kind of demoralisation in this House. This debate today is being watched by the whole country. This is one great thing about Indian democracy, not only that it has gone to the grassroot but also the entire people of India are participating in this discussion. What is going to be the future? I think, the people of India today see the picture of the demoralisation of the BJP. I would like to give them a friendly advice that in this situation if they ever create a situation, then it would be necessary for us to go back to the people and I am afraid that they will have a bad deal.

Now having said that Sir, I would like refer to the speech of my friend, Shri Jaswant Singh because he was the first spokesman of the BJP yesterday. Normally I have a great regard for him. He has a flair for language. He has the ability to choose the appropriate words and he has the capacity to marshal his facts. But, I think, yesterday his speech was rambling and irrelevant. Almost half of his speech was spent in quoting what Mr. Chidambaram said more than a decade ago in a different context. Well, I do not know what relevance it has got. Many of us are faced with different situations at different times and we react in a particular way. How does the

reaction of one Member of the United Front at the particular time will vitiate the whole basis of the formation of the United Front and the mission that it has before it?

My sister Shrimati Shusma Swaraj, almost in an actress-like speech yesterday, which to me was filled more of Hindi verbosity or virtuosity whatever way you put it, spoke then about the theory, about the principle of a ban on the cow slaughter. On the last occasion I had an occasion to dwell on this. I say that by this act you are dividing the country and you are depriving a large number of people of this country of this cheap source of protein and apart from that, I think, it is totally uneconomic nonsense to talk about a ban on a cow slaughter.  
...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.D. SWAMI (Karnal) : May I draw your attention to the fact that the Constitution provides for this. Why are you saying 'nonsense'? It is in the directive principles...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI G.G. SWELL : All right, it is only a directive principle.

I would like some day that we have a full-fledged debate on this question because it affects the economy of this country. I hope my friends in the BJP aware that leather industry is one of the most important industries of this country. The shoe industry, the export of shoe and leather goods in one of the main sources of our economy.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Swell, you have made the same point last time. Why do you not come with new points?

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I think, it is uneconomic nonsense. Now we are dealing with the present reality. We are not dealing with what a particular Member said at a particular time. We are dealing with the present reality in India. Again and again, it has been said by many Members and the Prime Minister also said so, that the people of India have elected a Government of coalition. They have rejected a particular Party to rule this country. This is the reality with which we have to grapple. I am sure I am going to conclude before you ring the bell. Now the BJP had a chance to form the Government. It is their right and it is proper also because it is the largest Party. But I think by the formation of their Government, they had exposed themselves. The Government of the BJP which lasted 15 or 12 days in now a footnote in history. They have displayed themselves that they are not able to get off the confines of the cow-belt in this country. They had shown that they were not able to get out of the grooves into which they got themselves into. And, therefore, by their own action, they have ruled themselves out from a large part of this country. I think, there is no hope for the BJP now to try to appeal to the rest of the country. But even within the

confines of the House there are also a large number of people who do not think what they do. Therefore, there is going to be a general election again. I think, it is going to be counter-productive.

Sir, we are experimenting with the new thing in this country. There are many people here who have pointed out to the in-built contradictions, that are there within the United Front. Different Parties have fought the elections with different manifestoes. They differ with each other. But this is something unique that our people, despite their ideological moorings, have come together in order to relive this country, in order that there should be order in this country. It is destiny or fate that has selected our Prime Minister, Shri Deve Gowda, to head this Government. I wish that he succeeds and I think it is necessary that the United Front succeeds because this is the only way by which this country, a rich, a vast, a variegated country can be held together. There is no other way. And, therefore, I would appeal to my friends in the BJP who I think are patriotic as much as we are, that in all fairness, they should allow this Government to continue with their programme and there is nothing objectionable in this programme. What objection is there when they said that every Member of Parliament has to declare his assets at the beginning so that everybody knows? We know that corruption has been a bane in this country and it is necessary that every Member of Parliament takes the discretionary powers from the Ministers. Do you have any objection to these things? Why not talk about these things? We can discuss about it.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI G.G. SWELL : I am concluding, Sir. It is necessary, therefore that this Government must be allowed a reasonable time or even the full five-year time and given a chance to implement their programme. I think, it is necessary that the BJP should also join in this national adventure because we have a country which is bigger than any other political party, which is bigger than any group. All of us find a place here only when there is a Government and there is a Parliament that works.

SHRI ALEMAO CHURCHILL (Goa) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Confidence tabled by the hon. Prime Minister, Shri H.D. Deve Gowdaji. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform the august House that my Party, the United Goan Democratic Party and the people of Goa have always stood for secularism and integration. We have social justice as the prime issue in our agenda.

Time and again, we have proclaimed that we shall work for the upliftment of the Dalits and the downtrodden and that is why we had assured our voters to fight on behalf of Dalit Christians and Dalit Muslims on the reservation front.

I am happy to say that the present Government under the able leadership of Shri Deve Gowda, has sworn by secularism and social justice. At the same time, it has clearly laid emphasis on economic and industrial progress. This Government is a broad spectrum of our social and cultural diversities. For the first time after Independence we find that the real power has gone to those who are denied justice. This is the Government of the Bahujan Samaj and the person who head it, can be aptly called, a champion of the masses.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what we require today is an India which is multi-cultural, multi-religious and multi-lingual. Today the electorate by the voting pattern may have identified themselves regionally. But that does not mean that they wish to isolate themselves from their motherland. There is a large section of the society which belongs to different castes, communities, different religious followings.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I myself belong to a minority Christian community. I have my own language, that is, Konkani and we wish to develop Konkani and also my region, that is, Konkan. But we don't want this development at the cost of our nation. To us, India my country is as important as my Goa and my Konkani language.

Communal fundamentalism will spell doom for all minorities. For us the need of the hour a strong, With even-headed and secular leader to whom we can look up to, depend and rely on it for our security. Today in Shri Deve Goda we have found a right person and in his Government we have a right channel to more into the mainstream of Indian politics.

Shri Deve Gowda has displayed leadership and his skill in no uncertain terms as the Chief Minister of Karnataka. As Goans we, the neighbours of Karnataka, are close and are the best judges to decide and comment on his leadership. His recent tenure as the Chief Minister of Karnataka has left a telling mark on the surface and Bangalore has emerged as the foremost industrial city of India. And now we indeed like to have him as our Premier. I am fully convinced that this Government will lead us into the Twenty-first century with the zeal and enthusiasm never displayed before.

With this hope, Mr. Speaker, I support the Motion of Confidence.

SHRI S. BANGARAPPA (Shimoga) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to extend full support to the Motion of Confidence moved by the hon. Prime Minister Shri H.D. Deve Gowda.

Sir, many matters have already been touched by many of the speakers who have dwelt upon the several aspects of the subjects relating to the Confidence Motion. No doubt, the verdict of the people is there which has given us a hung

Parliament and naturally in favour of a Government of coalition of several parties having divergent views through their respective election manifestos.

Now, it is not the fault of the political parties which are now trying to have or give a Government of coalition in the country. But the only point here is that the like-minded political will have to come together. The point before all of us is whether the Government that is now formed under the leadership of Shri Deve Gowda is having the support of all the like-minded political parties. That is the question before all of us.

I feel that it is there. But the question is on. Basically it is a matter relating to several aspects of democracy like the democratic norms that we have accepted in our Constitution like secularism, socialism etc. If these three or four points are specified by any political party, they can come together and extend full support to such Government where the Common Minimum Programme, within a time frame, is chalked out by the respective political parties. I think, they have done that job very well to the best satisfaction of the people of the country. There may be some flaws in future also which we may have to come across.

Supposing, Shri Vajpayee had continued as the Prime Minister, then with his Government the same coalition Government would have been there with like-minded political parties of his choice. Here the point is that if the programmes are to our satisfaction, as per the norms of democracy, then, I think, it is enough for us to create a Government and then move forward towards that Programme to which we are basically committed.

Now, I need not go into the detailed aspects of the Programme since all these matter have already been dealt with in detail by several speakers. The point here before all of us is why on that day Shri Vajpayee having moved a Motion of Confidence, did not go in for taking the vote on the Confidence Motion. The point is that he lost that chance of proving his strength on the floor of the House. Today, actually, I am appealing through you to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Shri Vajpayee, when he is going to participate in the debate and when the B.J.P. have already participated in the debate that under his leadership the B.J.P. and also their allies will participate in the process of voting on the Motion of Confidence in this House.

Another choice is there and that is the view of all the cross-sections of this House that Shri Deve Gowda comes from a farming community of this country. A Government is there under the leadership of a farmer from that section of the society. You please think of this. I am just giving you a suggestion through the hon. Speaker that if you feel that this is the best Government in your view and it should have

your support also then why do you not come out with a statement saying that: 'we are going to extend full support to this Government headed by Shri Deve Gowda?' Therefore, I am just giving this suggestion to the Leader of the Opposition.

Sir, I know the time constraint is there. But I would like to make my last point as many matters have been touched by several speakers. Now, the point is that this is a Government of a common man I should say. This is

[Translation]

It is the Government of the common man. It is not the voice of Shrimati Sushma Swaraj. It is the Government which honours people's mandate.

[English]

Therefore, I am appealing through you, Sir, that the B.J.P. should come out with a statement extending their full support and thereby supporting the Motion of Confidence.

SHRI LOUIS ISLARY (Kokrajhar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Confidence Motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister Shri Deve Gowda. Sir, I am making a maiden speech and, therefore, I hope all the hon. Members will kindly bear with me.

I have gone through the content of the Common Minimum Programme. I believe that if acted upon in letter and spirit, it will go a long way in restructuring the socio-economic condition of the country. I am happy that the United Front has spelt out its desire to initiate a political dialogue with the banned organisations such as ULFA, Bodo Federation etc. just to end insurgency in the entire North East region. I support what Shri Rajesh Pilot said yesterday regarding the urgent need for the early solution of the Bodoland problem, Vanachal problem and the Uttarakhand problem.

14.21 hrs.

(Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee *in the Chair*)

I hope that the Government will make a sincere effort to solve all these long-standing political problems at the earliest. However, I would have liked if the Common Minimum Programme had included some of the problems relating to the communication system specially with regard to the entire North East region.

As you know, Madam, the entire North East is linked up with only one National Highway - the National Highway No. 31. Therefore, I would like to request the Government of India to kindly construct an alternative highway originating from North Jalpaiguri across the Bodoland Autonomous Council area bordering the Indo-Bhutan border and joining the Majbat section of National Highway No. 52.

Secondly, I would like to request the hon. Prime Minister to kindly pay a visit to Kokrajhar and Bongaigaon district where in the recent ethnic violence more than 100 people were killed and as many as more than two lakh people were rendered homeless.

With these few words I conclude.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : Madam Chairperson, the hon. Prime Minister has sought the confidence of this House and I rise in support of the Motion of Confidence. What we want is strengthening of the democratic and secular values of our country. Indeed the United Front is a post-election phenomenon. But that represents the strength and democratic character of the United Front. The United Front and the parties supporting it, including the Muslim League, represent more than three-fourths of our electorates. Never before, Madam Chairperson, has the people's verdict been met and fulfilled on such a grand scale and in such a grand manner. I, therefore, extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister. The United Front has unfolded its policy and we have the Common Minimum Programme.

That this Common Minimum Programme was placed before the nation before this Motion of Confidence shows the political honesty of those who are today there on the Treasury Benches. I must compliment and commend them for that political honesty. This Common Minimum Programme covers a wide range of issues. We welcome the Common Minimum Programme, but at the same time, I must also express my disappointment at the Common Minimum Programme indulging into mere generalities with respect to various important questions confronted by the minorities, particularly the Muslims save and except the question of Babri Masjid. Otherwise we find that it is rather unfortunate that the Common Minimum Programme is evasive even with respect to some of the most pressing and urgent problems being faced by the minorities and the Muslims. Yes, the United Front deserves credit, it deserves applause for having accepted the demand to refer all the Babri Masjid cases including the title cases to the Supreme Court under Article 138(2) of the Constitution. I may remind this House that the Indian Union Muslim League was the first to demand that the entire issue, all the cases with respect to Babri Masjid issue be referred to Supreme Court under Article 138(2) of the Constitution for a binding and final verdict. The matter cannot hang in balance. It is a very sensitive matter and must be solved as expeditiously as possible. Of course, justice demands that the original site of the Babri Masjid be handed over to the Muslims, but if there are any disputes, unfortunate disputes, then we must have an expeditious solution. The solution can only come from the Supreme Court now. Earlier also during the '30s, there was an unfortunate dispute about Shaheed

Ganj mosque. Negotiations failed and then the matter was referred to the Lahore High Court and to the then Privy Council in order to solve it. Therefore, we are happy that the Government has taken the decision in that particular respect.

We are also happy that the Common Minimum Programme assures non-imposition of any uniform civil code or changes in the personal laws. But here, I must remind the Government that the Supreme Court in 1995 in Sarla Mudgal's case had given a direction that the Government must file an affidavit with the Supreme Court in August, 1996 about uniform civil code. I appeal to the Government that this policy of the Government mentioned in the Common Minimum Programme be brought clearly to the knowledge of the Supreme Court. The personal laws cannot be tampered with and specially the *Shariat* is a divine law.

Madam Chairperson, as I said earlier, it is the bane of our Governmental policies with respect to minorities that they indulge into generalities and common platitudes. In the Common Minimum Programme, there is no identification whatsoever of any concrete action plan for the economic and educational development of the minorities.

Various important questions have also been ignored. Take the question of the Minorities Development Financial Corporation. It was announced by the Narasimha Rao Government. So much time had passed, but I am afraid and I do not think that funds have been released for this Minorities Development Financial Corporation. The matter must be taken up in the interest of the economic development of the minorities.

Madam, India is a multi-lingual country. There is no reference whatsoever in the Common Minimum Programme to the rights and justice to Urdu and other minority languages. It is a matter that needs attention. The Common Minimum Programme again says that the same policy of reservation is going to be continued. But we have pointed out that it is also deficient in several respects. There is no reference whatsoever to any additional quota for the minorities in spite of the dismal and the appalling picture of the minorities in the educational field and in the economic field which has been described by the Gopal Singh High Power Panel on Minorities. The Gujral Committee Report on Urdu has been simply ignored and not a word has been said about its recommendations. But we must also express our disappointment with respect to these shortcomings. We are grateful to the hon. Prime Minister Deve Gowdaji that while moving the Motion of Confidence, he has assured the minorities of the nation of a just and fair deal. He will be watched; he will be judged on performance. I wish him well.

On behalf of my Party, the Muslim League, I congratulate the Prime Minister and wish him well in the successful tenure and full tenure of his office. I hope that the shortcomings that are there in the Common Minimum Programme will be removed, for therein lies the progress of the nation. If the nation is to progress, all who constitute the nation have to march forward on the road to progress shoulder to shoulder and therein lies the secret of the unity, integrity and solidarity of the nation.

Madam, I wish him well for a full and successful term of office.

[Translation]

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI (Nainital) : Madam Chairman, I rise to humbly support the motion moved by the Prime Minister in view of the political scenario which emerged as a result of the General Elections held for the 11th Lok Sabha.

Madam, all the national level political parties have tried their best to win mandate in this election. They tried their best through their manifestoes to get mandate in this august House. Our regional parties contested election from regional point of views. These regional parties formed Governments in their states and tried their best to send their hon'ble representatives by electing them from national perspective. In today's political scenario, it has become obvious that if we want to enforce the Constitution of India, it is imperative to form a coalition Government based on common minimum programme in this 11th Lok Sabha, which should be committed to implement the provisions of the Constitution and ensure a strong administration. There is no other such example possible in this world. This combined effort has been made not only in India but in other countries of this world as well. Today, this coalition Government based on this common minimum programme has been formed. We never wanted that we should not get mandate. All the parties made their efforts but whether we could venture to say to the world that we were unable to form a Government as no party got a clear majority and are unable to provide a minimum common programme based on the essence of the manifestoes of all the parties. If we reject this motion by the Prime Minister, then it means that the Parliament of India wants this. Today, is impossible that no Government should be formed. There is an atmosphere of uncertainty in the country for the last one month and we have got no right to put people of India in the atmosphere of uncertainty. We should make sincere efforts in the direction of forming a good Government. We should make these efforts while standing by our manifestoes and party-lines. These efforts have resulted into formation of the United Front's Government.

Madam Chairman, if we take into consideration the history of democratic system in several other countries, we find that efforts are being made in Germany, France, Italy and Japan on the basis of coalition Government. Today, such Governments there are discharging their national duties from progressive point of views. Today, the ideas are being globalised. Today, Science and Technology have forced the world to think with uniformity in several fields. Today, Science and knowledge are producing new criterion irrespective of differences in religion, caste, language and tribes etc. What are we doing? Whether we cannot release our political differences? Whether we cannot get united at the end of 20th century for building up the India of 21st century? You look to the common minimum programme and consider shorthand rule of the main opposition party and the address of the President. If you could set aside political differences then you will find that in 90 per cent matters there is unanimity in our approach in various programmes regarding foreign policy, economic policy, industrial policy, agricultural policy. You could see that in today's world, all the countries are forced to form their Government on the basis of consensus and therefore I feel like recalling a Couplet that in such a situation we should try to work unitedly and its outcome is the formation of United Front. As it has been said that :

Yahi dunia jo butkhana bani jati hai.

Isi butkhane se kabe ki jami paida kar.

Madam Chairman, I want to congratulate those political parties which have shown political resilience by favouring a Government burying their political differences in national interest. I am grateful specially to left parties who have made their efforts to give progressive leadership Keeping in view the propriety of the left parties and the experiences of China and other countries. I congratulate him. Similarly, I congratulate these regional parties that they too have made full efforts that they have demonstrated their regional viewpoints and regional languages be it Tamil, Telugu, Assamese, Malayalam, Marathi, Bengali and Kannada and unity in diversity which find place in the National Anthem 'Jan-gana mana adhinayak', this unity and feeling is reflected in the form of united front. Today, many questions arise in the mind of people. Various people say that they jointed him. Efforts were made in this House also that these were contradictions. We contested against each other and formed a front and got united. We stand by what we said in the elections but it is not a question of state nor a question of Uttar Pradesh only; nor a question of Tamil Nadu and Assam only. This is the question of India and if we rise above our regional considerations and then work together then such an atmosphere should be created whereby no hatred could be born. I feel very sorry with our few colleagues whom I respect said

something similar. It has always been my endeavour to learn something from our veteran leaders, well versed in Parliamentary decorum and dignity. We have learnt tolerance from our history. Today, in the name of religion, caste and language if anybody tries to generate intolerance and personal bitterness, then our political future cannot brighten up.

Madam Chairman, I will request through you that it is the need of the hour that the common minimum programme prepared by the front which is an essence of the ideologies of all the political parties be accepted. It is the minimum programme and not the maximum programme. It can't contain all the policies of each and every party. This eleventh Lok Sabha will discharge the responsibility of a great Parliament for building up a great India in the final phase of 20th century and in the interest of India's entry into 21st century. And we should create such an environment in this country. The opposition parties too have got their responsibilities. I have got full faith in the capacity of opposition leader. There are several others on their side. Who have maintained dignity of Parliament. I, therefore, urge all that they should give an opportunity to the Government led by Shri Deve Gowda, who never knew that his name was proposed for the post of Prime Ministership and allow the motion of confidence moved by him to be passed by a voice vote without voting. He has been elected by all by setting aside their past political vivapries.

I also expect full cooperation from the Opposition because they, too, have tried to run the Government on the basis of the same consensus. Today, I was greatly pained by the references made to my name by the hon. Member hailing from Haryana and elected from Delhi. I, too, have a 44 years long experience of Parliamentary life during which I have seen many vicissitudes and learned a lot in the company of many people who are no more with us today. But personal animosity has never found any place here. That is what I have learnt from Mahatama Gandhi, Pundit Jawahar Lal Nehru and in the backdrop of the experience gathered from the last ten Lok Sabhas. We launched many movements in Uttar Pradesh, a state that is still suffering for want of development. It is true that we undertook 'Vikas Yatras', pressed our demand for the full State of Uttarakhand and demanded a thorough investigation into the Muzaffarnagar episode. At that time we fulfilled our responsibility and even today we stand firm on it but we have never given a place to personal animosity. We neither had nor will have any personal differences and as a matter of fact we should not ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Member has not yielded.

'30s, there was an unbroken ...

*[Translation]*

SHRI GANGA CHARAN RAJPUT (Hamirpur) : We have been pressing the demand for Uttarakhand. Uttarakhand is mentioned in our manifesto ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please let the hon. Member conclude. His time is also up.

*[Translation]*

SHRI MANABENDRA SHAH (Tehri-Garhwal) : That has been brought forth before the hon. House. No movement was launched, only a mention has been made in their manifesto.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You speak extensively.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : I have had many opportunities of facing such interventions during my speeches and, then, this reference has been made by a dear friend, of mine, an hon. Member I hold in high esteem, who knows how many opportunities of service have I got during my long public career when I have discussed things with him. He knows it but at present he is looking at it from party angle. That is why he is saying so. I am not speaking from party's angle now...*(Interruptions)* What did you say?

SHRI MANABENDRA SHAH : It is you who have started this practice. It did not happen before. I respect you very much and speak to you with reverence...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Members, please do not make it a running debate. Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari to please continue.

*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI GANGA CHARAN RAJPUT : Please continue, Tiwari ji.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI : Sir, I do not want to enter into a direct controversy. But, I have been personally named and the hon. Member who made reference to my name knows that we are firm on our ideology. We have a history and a track record of pursuing our ideology with determination. I would request her not to make personal references here in the House. We do not will not harbour any personal animosity with any person and it should be done away with in our Parliamentary life.

Madam Chairman, through you, I would like to say that in the backdrop of the commencement of this golden chapter in Parliamentary history, when a Government is called upon to take India to 21st Century, this motion should be unanimously passed

on the basis of this programme chalked out in co-ordination with the new economic and social forces coming to the fore under a Minimum Programme. I would also urge upon the Leader of the Opposition to allow this Motion to be passed unanimously in the light of his beliefs, his speeches particularly the one he delivered while stepping down from the office of the Prime Minister and in case we do not make this experiment a success, it will be said for us in future that :

Bare shauk se sun raha tha zamana,  
Hamin so gaye daastan kahte-kahte.

14.48 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

SHRI SULTAN SALAHUDDIN OWAISI (Hyderabad) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fully support the Motion of Confidence moved in the House and welcome the change of power from the grips of the Upper castes down to the other sections of Indian society. I would also like to remind you that cent percent Muslims have voted for you. Yet, I am pained to say that no Muslim has been included in chalking out the Minimum Programme. Consequently, a mistake with regard to the issue of Babari Masjid has been committed. During the premiership of Shri Narasimha Rao this issue cropped up before him under Article 138 but there were many difficulties which led to a status quo in the matter. Then there was another difficulty as we had disparate Governments in Uttar Pradesh and Delhi and there were other allied factors. At that time also, in a meeting held at the residence of Shri Sharad Pawar I had suggested in the capacity of the President of Babari Masjid Action Committee that the Central Government should issue instructions to the Lucknow High Court Bench to conduct the hearing of this litigation on a daily basis and expedite the process of giving its judgment. You can do this even today. You are aware that there are 70 judges in U.P. whereas the hon. Supreme court does not have even half of this strength. So, how can the latter give its judgment expeditiously?

Secondly, after independence, the Muslims have been subject to constant injustice till date. Their proportionate representation in the Government services is on a decline. Therefore, I would like to urge upon the Government to set up a Commission to assess why all this happened and also what avenues can be opened up for their progress and development. Simultaneously, Muslims should also be given reservation benefits on the pattern of other sections.

Likewise, in my opinion, the controversy about the issue of Personal Law will die down once for all if Article 144 is abrogated. Another aspect that deserves attention is that in case the Minorities set

up a college on their own and no aid is received from the Government for the same, we do not either want to take any. Yet it is demanded that out of an admission of, suppose, 100 students, we should admit 50 Muslim and 50 non-Muslim students. Does it not tantamount to injustice to us? We are ready to admit only 25 Muslim students and 75 non-Muslim students provided this system governs the admission policy of all Government colleges also but the Government is not prepared to do so. I fail to understand this policy of grabbing any college set up by us by mobilising our own resources. I would like the new Government to deliberate upon all these aspects and put an end to the atrocities and injustice meted out to us.

Then, the Government should pronounce a comprehensive policy with regard to Urdu. It should also keep in mind whether Muslims have no room in their scheme of social justice. You say that a Harijan converted to Christianity is entitled for reservation facilities but a Dalit converted to Islam is not entitled for such facilities. Does it not amount to communalism that a person converted to Christianity or Buddhism is entitled for such facilities whereas one converted to Islam is not? I would request the House to judge it in the balance of justice as to why such discrimination is meted out to a particular religion? That is totally unjust. I do not object to grant of such reservation facilities to a Christian convert but same should apply to a Muslim convert also.

Lastly, I would like to say that the poor Muslims have been implicated in all types of cases under TADA. They have to frequently appear before the courts. A decision with regard to such prosecutions should be given soon because their work suffers on account of the frequent visits to the courts. I want you to find a solution to this problem.

I fully hail this Government and appeal to the hon. Members of the House to maintain some decorum because whatever we are saying here is being watched all over the country as the proceedings are being directly telecast by Doordarshan.

I will conclude after quoting a couplet of a poet:

Akhilak Ka Jalata Hua Ghar Dekh Raha Hoon,  
Dekha Nahin Jata, Magar Dekh Raha Hoon.

SHRI GULAM RASOOL KAR (Baramula) : Not taking much time I would like to say that I have been watching for the last two days that no justice is being done here with the B.J.P. The sole reason behind this is that they have formed Government at the Centre but the defeat they had to face afterwards has revived their old wounds and enraged them terribly. Everything has become intolerable now. You should give them a patient hearing and should take them with you.

Although there is a dispute almost on every matter in this House. But as Mr. Speaker has said that the whole world is watching, whole country is looking at us and whatever apprehensions were expressed by all the secular parties regarding B.J.P. have come to surface now. Their leader had said that they want to set up a Government of Hindus. We are not opposed to Hindu philosophy. Hindu philosophy is embedded in our culture, it is an integral part of our country and brotherhood. But bringing this Hinduism in our day today politics and to run a Government only on this philosophy or to view all the things on communal line, will not pave the way for taking this country ahead. This is not a country of Hindus alone but the population of Muslims is also very large and even Dalits are in large number, almost equal to the Muslims. Christians, Sikhs all are brothers...*(Interruptions)* My forefathers were also Hindu. We have not committed any mistake by accepting Islam. We know all about Hindu philosophy. Hindustan is ours, India is ours. India is our mother and no one would like to cut his mother in pieces. But I think that this religion based very philosophy will certainly be instrumental in dividing this nation and the Government formed on the fundamentals of religion will split it further.

Kashmir acceded to Indian Union in 1947. At that time the entire Hindustan was burning. On what basis all this had been done. On one hand Mohammad Ali Jinnah had formed Pakistan for Muslims only and on the other hand, we became a part of Hindustan in the leadership of Sheikh Abdulla. We acceded to it with the hope that Hindustan will continue to be a democratic country. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, who was associated with BJP, R.S.S. had been one of the founder members of our constitution drafting committee alongwith, Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar. Dr. Ambedkar and Mukherjee who were personally known to me were the honest and scholarly people. They stayed in Kashmir for some time. But today, these people have undone what has been achieved and are insisting on to withdraw the article 370. I want to ask the people of Bhartiya Jansang, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee I have a close acquaintance with him, this has always been their attitude...*(Interruptions)* I would like to say that Hindustan cannot afford to go on Communal Line but secularism is the only choice left for us. Without secularism, Hindustan will split into pieces. We had acceded to the Mahatma Gandhi's Hindustan, to the secular Hindustan, to the Hindustan of Mahatma Buddha...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Do not disturb please.

15.00 hrs.

[Translation]

SHRI GULAM RASOOL KAR : We have acceded to the Hindustan of Ashok and Akbar, we have acceded to the Guru Nanak's and Sant Kabir's Hindustan. We have acceded to Mahatma Gandhi's and Nehru's Hindustan. Therefore, I would like to say that if you really love Hindustan then encourage secularism only...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you disturbing him?

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI GULAM RASOOL KAR : Secondly, we have contributed a lot for the benefit of the country setting aside all our interests. When the people of the country assigned the charge of the Prime Minister to Shri Chandra Shekhar we had extended our support to you in the national interest. We were in majority, when an accord was signed with Shri Sheikh Abdulla. Sheikh Abdulla had no support of any MLA in the state. But to uphold the national interest the Chief Minister Meer Kasim resigned alongwith two other Members. On the basis of that accord, Shri Sheikh Abdulla was made the Chief Minister of Kashmir but now you doubt our integrity. I am putting all these points before you, only in the interest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when they did not get majority here, they started talking about communalism. I have great respect for both Lord Shri Ram and Shri Krishna. I consider them the great prophets of this country. I am an ardent follower of Buddha, Nanak, Chisthi and Kabir's philosophy. You should also follow their path. Then only Hindustan will march ahead...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude, Mr. Kar.

[Translation]

SHRI GULAM RASOOL KAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am concluding. My request to the hon'ble Prime Minister and our leader is that political process in Jammu and Kashmir must be continued. I would like to thank our former Prime Minister Shri P.V. Narsimha Rao for conducting parliamentary elections in Jammu and Kashmir. This credit goes to him only. He and his party took a decision and conducted elections there. All opposition parties were of the opinion that elections could not be held there. But they took a decision and elections were held there. The whole world had witnessed that elections were held there, people were standing in queues and casting their



votes. Here we have a free Press, we are free to write anything and likewise we have freedom of thought even.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during election, army had a good arrangement there. They were monitoring closely the entry of the people inside but were not bothered about what the people were doing inside. Here people exercised their franchise freely and voted for the candidate of their choice. Army was also keeping a vigil outside so as to prevent any sort of disturbance. They were deployed there with the sole aim of protecting the booth. The duty of the security forces was just to protect the booth but who casts vote to whom was not at all their job and as such they were also not particular about it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say about the situation prevailing in Kashmir at that time. Our press refused to take notice of this situation. Our enemies were desperately trying to create such a situation in Kashmir that no democratic process could even be evolved there. But the people of Kashmir have shown that they are not with them and they have full faith in democracy. They exercised their franchise and have turned down all the speculations about the sinister alliance of Pakistan and had even frustrated the evil design of the external forces.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that it is the need of the hour today that the elections to the state legislative assembly should immediately be held in Kashmir. All the people, political leaders want assembly election there. We have a right to demand assembly election, under our own constitution and our Peoples Representation Act which empowers the Governor to do so. But besides this, the Government has also a crucial role to play and I think that the Government should make all efforts to fulfil that responsibility.

I think that Centre should fulfill its responsibility and along with jurisdiction of Election Commission is also there. Assembly elections should be held there under the supervision of Election Commission. Electoral rolls should be up dated and foreign private agencies should be banned there and nobody should be allowed to run private agency. The hatred and terrorism should be checked and peace be restored there. This is our sole motive.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have several other issues but I would talk on them in detail during the next session. Elections should be held there at the earliest. Hatred should be suppressed and voter lists are required to be updated. We all are the sons of God, therefore the Kashmiri migrants should be brought back to Kashmir valley and they should be given relief. Even those people, who have political difference with us should be given protection from militants attack. Our administration, democratic system and cultural civilization of India do not allow this. We support this

revolution and assure you that the congress party would support them in the interest of development and benefit of the country. We are not Covetous of power. We supported Shri Chandra Shekhar and brought Sheikh Abdullah and many other people in our party. It will be better for you to admit your defeat here...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI (Autonomous District) : Sir, I request you to give me a chance to say a few words on this issue...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : No, Mr. Rongpi. I have given you chance last time. Last time I did not give chance to Mr. Bangarappa. I have compensated it. I have to maintain the balance. Everytime you cannot get a chance.

*(Interruptions)*

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI : Sir, you have given time to all other parties...*(Interruptions)* Is it a crime to belong to a small party?...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please cooperate. I have given you a chance to raise matter under Rule 377. I have given you a chance during the Zero Hour. You spoke during the last debate. I cannot give you a chance everytime. So, please sit down.

*(Interruptions)*

DR. JAYANTA RONGPI : Sir, I have great respect for you. But then the Motion of Confidence is an important issue...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot allow everybody to speak. How to run the House? Last time many smaller parties like Mr. Bangarappa's, could not speak?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I have to give them time. You are a one-Member party. How can I give you a chance everytime?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please behave yourself. You will get chance next time. If you do not behave now, you may not get chance next time.

*(Interruptions)*

15.07 hrs.

*At this stage, Dr. Jayanta Rongpi left the House.*

*[Translation]*

SHRI SIBU SOREN (Dumka) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, why are you not allowing me to speak...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Alright, this issue has been discussed much.

SHRI SIBU SOREN : Please allow me to speak. We also have our griefs to express here. There are six Members of my party but today only one M.P. is present. Please allow me to speak...*(Interruptions)* we are also staging walk out from the House.

15.08 hrs.

*At this stage Shri Sibusoren left the House.*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO (Berhampore) : Sir, much of the ground has been covered both in this debate and in the earlier debate. So, I shall take a very short while to express my Party's unstinted support to the new Government of Deve Gowdaji and marshal only a few points as to why we do so. The mandate given by the people this time, as all of us know, has been an extremely difficult mandate to implement. It has happened before on a few occasions. But this has been, perhaps the most difficult mandate the people of India ever gave. Every party, therefore, had to pass and think. There was no question of all of us going back to the people 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.

Number one, Sir, we were very clear as to what we were not going to do; and that was, to support the Bhartiya Janata Party. There is nothing new with this because as far as my memory goes, the Congress has never supported the Bhartiya Janata Party and *vice versa*. Our differences are too basic, too deep, long-standing and there is no common ground on many of the most vital issues faced by the country. Therefore, it was not difficult for us at all to say that we will have no truck; nothing to do with the Bhartiya Janata Party. There are no personalities involved in this, there are no relations involved in this. It is a question purely and simply of policies, attitudes and faiths.

Sir, we never did it before and in most of these issues, it so happens that their views and our views are diametrically opposite because there is no middle ground at all. I did try for a consensus for a little while - for two or three years, or two or two and a half years in the last Parliament, the last terms; but the parting of the ways, permanently, irrevocably came on the 6th of December 1992. That is a long story, known to everyone; I would not like to repeat it.

We are absolutely firm on secularism. It was Shrimati Indira Gandhi who brought that word, especially in the Preamble of the Constitution, although it was well-known that the Indian State was nothing but secular. For 25 years, it was understood.

But as a matter of abundant caution - and I must say, as a matter of abundant prudence - the Parliament in 1973, added that word. It is not just a word, it is much more than a word. There is a world of meaning and there is a world of difference in not having it and taking it for granted and understood and having it and expressedly, specifically putting it in the Constitution. The difference is really immense, as we have seen later. At that time, many people, cynical people said, there is nothing at all in adding it. It has always been there; there need not be any special significance to the addition of that word. But later on, events have proved, that word was very very advisedly added and in a very timely manner. What we say now and what the Constitution says is that India shall be a secular State; it is not a question of supporting secularism, believing in secularism. That is not the point. The point is the State itself is secular. The State, from head to foot, is secular. Whatever the activity of the State, whatever the thinking of the State, whatever the laws passed by the Parliamentary wing of the State, whatever the decisions given by the judicial wing of the State everything should be secular. That is what is meant by saying that the State is secular.

We are a democracy. Therefore, we have a secular democracy functioning in this country. By definition, it is a secular democracy. Now, what is a secular democracy? A secular democracy is one in which non-secular matters will not figure. This is very very obvious. You cannot have non-secular matters being brought into the democratic processes of secular India. Therefore, my humble submission is and has been that in any election, in this secular democracy, the issues coming before the people should all be secular.

You talk about your secular programmes; you have your competition in wooing the people, in convincing the people on these secular programmes. In this country, secular programmes and issues are very clearly demarcated with the non-secular issues. Even in the administration of temples, as is clear from the Supreme Court's decision in the Puri case and the Nathwara case, they have divided the entire secular theme, the temple administration into two. One is religious administration and the second part is the secular administration. They have said that the State has the right to interfere in setting right the secular administration of religious institutions. To that extent, they have made a distinction between secular and non-secular issues. This is my point which needs to be appreciated. I beg of you and I beg of this country and the people to appreciate that when a non-secular issue is taken to the people, that party and the other party which goes with a secular issue alone are not on level ground. People are prone to religiosity. They are religious. They are normally religious. Everyone has a religion of his own but in

a secular election where a minimum programme or a maximum programme or a political programme is brought before the people, if one of the parties goes with a non-secular, a religious programme saying that they are going to build this and that, I beg to say that this is against the spirit of the Constitution. This is against the secular spirit of our Constitution. We have allowed it; the people have allowed it; the people have responded to it with the results that we all know but this, I think, goes against the grain of the Constitution. There are communities which may be having lot of difficulties, differences and conflicts but election is not the way of resolving them. This is my submission. At an election in a secular democracy, only secular issues should figure and no other issues, particularly non-secular issues, should figure.

Sir, the BJP programme, as has been adumbrated for years and years, has brought out some very salient points on which we have not only a very strong reservation but we are diametrically opposed to those programmes. Some of them have figured in the present manifesto also of the BJP. For instance, they have very strongly advocated common civil code. I would say that there is a common civil code already to a very large extent in India. The law of evidence is common; the civil procedure code is common; the criminal procedure code is common; every law in the civil field is common. What is not common is the personal law part of it because personal law has not been tampered with. Even in the British days and after the Constitution came into being, there were some difficulties and they were resolved in this very House by the statement made by the then Minister of State, Mr. K.C. Pant on behalf of the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi that wherever a question of personal law arises, it will not be tampered with, it will not be changed unless those who are affected by it fully consent with it. This is the thumb rule we have followed and I do not know the grounds on which BJP, unfortunately, has taken to this particular issue. It is said by our Muslim friends that they will not accept it. In fact, there are so many laws and customs in this country having the force of law which will not be changed and which cannot be changed. If the Government wants to change them, the Government will be in deep trouble.

In South, for instance, a boy can marry the daughter of the 'Mama', which is absolutely sacrilege here in North. She is called a sister or the first cousin. But there it is done. In Muslims, there cousins of brothers, that is the 'Chacheri behan aur Chachera bhai' can marry. Can they marry in Hindu families? They cannot marry in any part of India among Hindus. We have this very peculiar legal fiction called 'adoption' in the Hindus. What is adoption? Adoption is rather based on a sinful concept, namely, that one

person's son is taken by legal fiction to be another person's son. In normal parlance this is something which can never be tolerated. But it is based on the principle of 'apurtasya gatirnasti'

We want somehow a 'Pragayi' either 'oorus' or a 'Dattak' so that the person who dies, he not only leaves his property, if any, but if he has no property even if he does not have a lion cloth his 'kriya karam' is done by the 'datak' son. It has nothing to do with the original father. He cannot perform the ceremonies of his original father. This is a legal fiction which has come for thousands of years. Is this going to be accepted by Muslims? Is this going to be accepted by Christians? In the name of uniformity how many horrendous things are you going to do! Therefore, we are absolutely clear that the Congress Party is opposed to any imposition, any imposition of anything in the personal law of several sections of people of this country.

Then, we have Article 370. Article 370 and Jammu and Kashmir according to me are inseparable. It is not only Article 370, how about 371 (a), (b), (c) and (d) in which many States have been involved. Andhra Pradesh is involved. Maharashtra is involved and Gujarat is involved. What about Schedule VI? This is where so many special provisions have been made for the tribal areas. Why did we do this? Why did the Constitution makers do this? They did this because these provisions were absolutely essential to keep the country together. Tribals were so backward. Even today they are so unspeakably backward that something more needs to be done in order to bring them to the level of others. We are all progressing. There is no doubt. Even the tribals are progressing. Even the poorest of poor is progressing. But how much is the progress of the upper classes and how much is the progress of the lower classes? So, the question of our having some kind of levelling up and levelling down in legislation becomes absolutely important. It becomes a *sine qua non* for a State like India. That is why we have so many provisions of ceiling, land ceiling and so many other provisions of social justice. They have been functioning but they have not succeeded to the extent we wanted them to. Maybe, because the others have progressed more and faster because they have the means of production in their hand. If you give five acres of land to a landless person, he will have nothing else to do and after two or three days he may even part with that land and contrary to your rule he will go and sell it to the nearest farmer. So, there is a lot to be done in making social justice a success and a reality. Governments have been grappling with that problem not with full satisfaction but at the same time we cannot say that nothing has been done. It is a matter for all parties to consider. There is no party matter at all, party bias at all, in this. Therefore, this is something which we have to

consider.

Abrogating Article 370 is just not possible, anyone will agree with it. Unless you want to party with Jammu and Kashmir, no abrogation of Article 370 is possible. This is where we have a fundamental difference with the BJP.

Then, Sir, much is being said about Hindutva, Hinduism, Indianness etc. Now the Supreme Court also has given a kind of pronouncement. But it appears that according to many of our BJP friends Hinduism is equal to Indianness. Is that right 'Doctor sahab'?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Yes. That is what I said. Hindusim, Hindutva, Bharatiyata ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Hinduism is equal to Indianness. Then is Indian Evidence Act equal to Hindu Evidence Act?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : It was in the particular context when you talk of the philosophy ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Is there any Hindu Evidence Act?

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Is there any Hindu Evidence Act?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : On the theoretical side, on the philosophical side, I have no quarrel with him. He may be right, he may be wrong and maybe a third pundit may be right, both of us being wrong. The point is, who is going to accept it? What is *roodhi*? What do you mean by *roodhi* in this country? Whatever word you may have in the Sanskrit dictionary, you will have ten meanings for it. But there is only one *roodhyartha*, the *artha* which has been sanctioned, sanctified by *roodhi*.

*[Translation]*

Many people use this word for the same meaning ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : If the usage is wrong then...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Even if it is wrong. I would like to indicate you many words being used wrongly in Andhra Pradesh. You will face many difficulties if you try to stop them in Telugu. You may be knowing otherwise ask any Member from Andhra Pradesh that they use the word 'accused' for 'Muddai' in Telugu. In Telugu, 'accused' means 'muddai' with Andhra Pradesh, for the first time I felt that something is wrong because it can create problem as they call 'mudai' to the person who is called 'muljim' or accused in Andhra Pradesh and according to them ...*(Interruptions)* I am talking about the word 'rudhi'. In the same way the use of Hindu in place of Indian

can be right or wrong in your dictionary but it is absolutely wrong in the entire country...*(Interruptions)* The difficulty is that you can call it communalism or religion but there is a reason for it. Fortunately or unfortunately the reason here is that 85 percent of population of this country belong to one community and the rest belong to all other communities.

*[English]*

The attempt is to polarise 85 per cent of the people of India on one side, and 15 per cent of the people need not be cared for. In all these programmes, all the overlay which we find on the consciousness of the people is religious. This is what I object to as being not secular, unsecular, non-secular. This should not be so. This polarisation is going to be disastrous for this country. I have said it in this House. If you take Rama as your weapon, I cannot fight Rama but I can fight you. I cannot fight Rama and I refuse to believe that Rama belongs to you. You are trying to monopolise Rama. You are trying to take Rama by a leash to help you. This is not admissible, this is not permissible, this is not acceptable. If one has to give practical examples of secularism and non-secularism, these are what one can go into. You have to have a secular face. The Parties, apart from everything else, have a face. That face they may not see because that face, that particular face, may not be available in looking glass but people know their face very well - which is a communal party...*(Interruptions)* I am not saying anything against anybody please. There is a face of the party. A party which cannot see - for instance, cannot find in this wide continent, subcontinent of India - one person to become their candidate; one Muslim to become their candidate in an election. What is the face of that party? Muslim to the Congress come and find - how is it that in Bihar you have given only 27 seats instead of 29 which we got last time? I am happy about it and we do concede to their demands. After all, the minority gets elected only with the votes of the majority. Let us not forget that. We have examples where people vote minority candidates whose community was less than two per cent in that particular constituency. So this is the secular approach that he is a candidate of the party. Therefore, whatever he is - no matter, Hindu, Muslim - whatever he is, he has to win.

We have the 'lamppost' theory only for this in those days. Unfortunately that has been completely washed up during the last 30 or 25 years. The 'lamppost' theory was very much there. We got Shri Ajit Prasad Jain elected from Tumkur. Where is Tumkur and where is Shri Ajit Prasad Jain, the Prime Minister's State? This has happened many times.

My friend Shri George Fernandes has made an *addah* of Bihar all the time. He was a permanent

candidate in Bihar. I am not sure what will happen to him if he goes to Karnataka. It is good that he has planted himself; planted himself permanently throughout the life and I would certainly recommend that he should be elected again and again and yet aga in in Bihar. That is national integration. So we cannot be dividing the majority from the minority; taking the majority along with us, along with the religious issue, along with the religious promise and programme. Why is it that the leaders of BJP have always said Hinduism will remain there. Then they say - No, No, that issue of temple is not that important for us. Then they find the things little rough - but temple will remain always there. So *mandir* comes to their rescue whenever they find the ground under their feet slipping away. Is it true? This is what happened. This is what I have understood. I may be wrong but this is what I have understood and do not think I am wrong in understanding it as I have just described.

Sir, the most amazing thing I have read today very deliberately the chapter on foreign policy from the BJP manifesto. Five years back, Mr. Advani and Atalji were sitting there. From there I told them : How is it that you can say you have the audacity to say in your own manifesto that Non-Aligned Movement is dead? This is what they say. Both were surprised. I read from the book. Both ended up by looking at each other. This is what happened. This year also I thought maybe five years of non-aligned summit - two summits have come and gone - and the Non-Aligned Movement has done something which no other Group has done. Today Non-Aligned view is respected. Twenty years back nobody bothered what the Non-Aligned Movement is to say; not even reported in the newspaper. Today, Non-Aligned view has come to stay; a view which is accepted sometimes but respected always.

You do not have one sentence, one word - even non-alignment - having been mentioned anywhere in that chapter. Imagine Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji going as the Prime Minister of India to a Non-aligned Summit in Djakarta. What will he speak? Mr. Chairman, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have come to announce on behalf of India that Non-alignment is dead. He has to be faithful to his own manifesto.

Now, today the Non-aligned Movement is the only hope for the developing world, not in that way when we had two super powers and we were trying to have a balance, that is not the case, we always took non-alignment as the right of independence of independent nations to decide on their own destiny. A non-aligned always feels foul of one group or the other but we had an opinion on every issue whether we are connected with it or not connected with it. That has been the nature of Non-aligned Movement.

[Translation]

"Sare Jahan ka dard hamare jigar mein hai"

[English]

Yes, because we were interested; we may not be having bombs but we were interested in war and peace on behalf of peaceful people. The millions and millions and billions of people, who want peace in the world are represented by the Non-aligned Movement today and no one else.

Let us be clear about it. We are interested in disarmament, we are interested in some kind of equitable distribution of wealth or whatever you say, we wanted some improvement, some perceptible improvement in the lot of the common man everywhere in the world. Of course, it varies from place to place. What the common man wants in America may be totally different from what the common man in India or Pakistan wants. But the matter is that we do stand for this kind of social justice all over the world. We stand for environment. Can anyone show me any other formation which has done more work than the Non-aligned Movement on environment and protection of the environment? It is only the Non-aligned Movement which has taken up all these causes, although it is a unipolar world.

The unipolar world does not really end the relevance of Non-aligned Movement. In fact, in Djakarta, even before that in Yugoslavia when we had that meeting with Rajivji as our Prime Minister, the question was when the cold-war is about to end? Is the Non-aligned Movement going to be irrelevant? Many people said 'yes', we said, 'no' and we showed in the last two summits - Djakarta Summit and Columbia Summit - that the Non-aligned Movement was as alive, as active as full of ideas, bubbling with ideas even more than before on the questions of war and peace, on the questions of poverty alleviation, eradication, on the question of environment, on all the live questions of the world today, the Non-aligned Movement is very very active through the exclusion of any other formation.

The big powers would not care what happens. Even today, they have been brought to the table, to some extent they are softening. But only softening, we do not know when they will harden again. So it is the Non-aligned Movement which has to be at the vanguard of the progress of human kind and that Non-aligned Movement is conspicuous by its absence from the BJP manifesto.

Sir, I have listed out these points which are not unimportant points. They are not subsidiary points, they are not trivial points. They have everything to do with the survival of mankind. So we have such differences. Having such differences, there was no

question of the Congress Party ever leading its support to a BJP Government. This is the long and short of it.

When we passed this resolution in the Working Committee, we did not know what was going to happen? But we did know what not to do, as I said that we recorded on the positive side. Otherwise, people would have said, 'you are only negative, where is the positive aspect of what you want to do.

It was a very good question. It would have been a very good question. If we had not answered it, we would have been in the wrong. So, we said : "We do not know who is going to form the Government. We know that we are not going to form the Government. Even with 196 when we did not want to form the Government in 1989, with almost half that number there was no question of being able to form the Government now. But, of course 136 or 140 is not a paltry number. It is not a number which you can just wish away. Therefore, we do have a say in the governance of this country. The numbers that the people have gracefully given us are not enough for us to form the Government but they are more than enough to have a very decisive say in the formation of the Government. We only felt that. But what Government, which Government, who is going to form the government, who is going to be called to form the Government, nothing of the rest was visible to us. So, we said : "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 three, four days of suspense, Mr. Deve Gowda was chosen and he was called by the Rashtrapatiji. Before he called him, he called me also just to write in the records that the next largest number party, namely the Indian National Congress, came and within less than a minute said that they are not going to form the Government. After that he called him. This is what happened.

Now people say, what is your understanding with Deve Gowdaji? I am sorry, Sir, I do not deal with, I do not believe in understandings, secret understandings. Whatever understanding there is, I am telling you what it is now here. My understanding with Deve Gowdaji is that this party will not allow that Government to fall under any circumstances. History will not say that it was because of the Congress party the Deve Gowda's Government fell...*(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER : Is it a guarantee?  
...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I am telling you what I can do, what my party can do. And that is why my party has determined to do.

We have seen the programme. Well, part of it looks like our manifesto. In some respects all manifestoes are carbon copies of each other. But in material particulars we find ourselves in agreement with what has been written there. Therefore, we have no difficulty at all in accepting in principle, in a broad way, what has been put in that programme. Tomorrow the Working Committee is meeting. It will go into the *nitty-gritty* of all these things. We may have some suggestions to give to them. We may have some new things to show them. All that can be done. But because they are not opposed to each other, basically the basics being the same, the approach being the same, the thrust being the same, there should be no difficulty in tapering these over or sorting these things as we go along.

Much is done while we work together. That is the greatest thing. The first thing is to agree to work together. Yes, among these parties also we have not been very favourite, very much treated well. That is true. But then today which is the party in this country which has not abused the Congress, Sir? So, what is the distinction I make? The only distinction I make is with whom am I going to work because democracy has to be vindicated in this country, because the people do not expect us to go back to them with long faces and tell them that we have failed.

That is the reason. And there is another reason. I feel that this is a very, very natural bifurcation of the House. When they were supporting some Parties here, they were supporting some Parties there, they were doing it on the basis of both of them being against Congress. That is history. I did not mind it at that time but then found that all this anti-Congress rhetoric had a built-in illogic in it and that illogic became disastrous with them in course of time. Now there is no anti-Congressism on this side, anti-Congressism on that side. What I have said is my principles are broadly acceptable to them and what I have said is their principles are broadly unacceptable to them. Therefore, this is a very natural division of forces that has taken place. I only pray to God that whatever personal angularities may appear from time to time, we will have this statesmanship, we will have the good sense to keep them aside and go ahead with a firm hand and with a firm resolve that democracy shall succeed and shall be vindicated in this country. This is what I would like to say. I am a supporting Party. On other matters, I think, it is for the Prime Minister to enlighten the House. I can only say that he will get full support from us in all matters, in the implementation of the programme, the rule of law and also whatever they have said in their programme about eradication of corruption and so on. Everything is acceptable to us and we will support them.

MR. SPEAKER : Order please.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion of Confidence.

A discussion was held on a similar Motion in this House fifteen days earlier. I thought that the debate would be some different this time. The serious and important issues before the country would also be discussed during the debate. Now the House will sit in July. I thank you for allowing us to raise the matter of public interest during the Zero Hour. But there is still a question which cannot be postponed for the next Session.

15.49 hrs.

(Shri Chitta Basu in the Chair)

My friend Shri Jaswant Singh has also mentioned that yesterday. The Disarmament Conference is going on in Geneva which is likely to conclude within a few days. The question of CTBT is there and India has to take a clear-cut decision on it. There had been national Consensus on this issue. We had been saying that we want such a world where no country would possess nuclear weapons. It is not possible that some countries of the world would possess nuclear weapons and some are deprived of the right to make progress in the field of nuclear science. The previous Government have said it and the new Government have also mentioned that our options should be retained in this regard I am quoting it from the manifesto of United Front :

[English]

"The UF Government will continue to work for Universal nuclear disarmament and will retain the nuclear option till the goal is achieved."

[Translation]

But my attention was drawn towards a portion of the speech made by the Foreign Secretary of India in Geneva in which he had said that nuclear weapons are not necessary for the security of India. What is the justification for retaining options when nuclear weapons are not necessary for national security? I would like to request the new Minister of Foreign Affairs to identify the facts in this connection. I have an authenticated information on the basis of which I am making this comment. I would be happy if this information is wrong. Such kind of statement should not be made if options are to be retained. I would like to reiterate that this matter should be decided within a few days.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND ADDITIONAL CHARGE OF THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL) : I am sorry to interrupt. What the hon. Member is telling is news to me and I would like to know from where he is quoting.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : Whose statement is he quoting?

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a statement of Foreign Secretary of India on behalf of Permanent Mission of India which was made in the Disarmament Conference on 21.3.1996. I am quoting a part of his statement.

[English]

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : I think the hon. Member knows that we came to power on the 1st of June.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : You have said that you are continuing with the policy.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I want to quote:

"Mr. President, India's objectives are different. We do not believe that the acquisition of nuclear weapons is essential for national security."

[Translation]

India is being deprived of a security weapon permanently.

[English]

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : I am sorry to interrupt again. I respect Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee a great deal. In my life I had a privilege of associating with him in various spheres. He was Foreign Minister and I was Ambassador at one time and also in various international spheres.

This thing — I am not defending anybody and I am not supposed to defend because he was not my Ambassador — but the impression that I get from what he is quoting is, what I am trying to say, perhaps is generalised statement and we believe it and I repeat it, that for the world as a whole nuclear weapons should be banished; they should be banished because nuclear weapons need not be used as an instrument of defence... (Interruptions)

This is an enunciation as old as Jawaharlal Nehru himself.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, people interpret differently the statement made

by the Foreign Secretary in the Disarmament Conference...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to know that ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is common ground for all countries of the world that nuclear weapons are not necessary for the security of the world. This has been said times without number, right from Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's days. Mahatma Gandhi also said it. Therefore, in that sense, if it is a general statement there should be no objection to it. But if it is in a particular context and in the context of particular country, that is a different matter and that will have to be gone into.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : In addition to that, for fifteen days when my friend was the Prime Minister this statement was on record. Did he take steps about this?...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, if his reply is what we were doing during last 15 days, I would say that we were doing nothing but what he is going to do now?

*[English]*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Let us not play volley ball with this. Let us find out if there is anything in line with the Policy at that time, if it is not, we can go through it. In a general way he has said and I have explained it...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Please, yield for a minute.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am not yielding.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : No, no. I am responding to you. If you are offering me to take a decision in the next two weeks, I accept it. But do not blame me for things for which you could have taken some action ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am not blaming you.

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not an ordinary matter. I do not want to make it an issue of the party. You have to take a decision about C.T.B.T. within few days. Will you be there in the conference? There are only two options left if you feel that nuclear weapons are not required.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : Let us have patience to hear him.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It is not a question of apportioning the blame. This Government and the hon. Minister for External Affairs of this Government has, in the context of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Disarmament, said that they are going to pursue the same Policy as the Narasimha Rao Government. And if this is the Policy of the Narasimha Rao Government, I would say, it is not a question of ten or fifteen days, it is not a debating point. The hon. Minister for External Affairs...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : What was your decision?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The question is that an official statement has been made in the Conference on Disarmament avowing/declaring that India does not need nuclear weapons for its security. The hon. Minister should not display this kind of hurry ...*(Interruptions)*. Does the hon. Minister for External Affairs want to engage in a verbal duel with me on an issue of a high national importance? He asked, "what were you doing for fifteen days"? His opening sentence was that this is not our policy. He said in other sentences that we are pursuing the policies of the previous Government. This is not a debating point ...*(Interruptions)*. It is the elementary and parliamentary practice.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Please allow me to speak.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am not yielding ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : I want to say one thing.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : This is not the manner in which he should speak on India's nuclear options. Is the Minister for External Affairs going to respond to the most important vital security question facing the country today in this casual manner? ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Jaswant Singh, you have made your point. You please sit down.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you making this kind of noise? It is a very serious debate.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : The submission that I am trying to make and before I make a submission let me repeat that I hold Shri Vajpayee in very high esteem. Having said that and I continued to do so because it is the continuity of the Policy because Government is a continuous thing since he was the Minister...*(Interruptions)*. What has happened to India that in the last two months different Governments have come. In March neither Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee nor our present Prime Minister was in Office nor somebody else was in power. Some statement has



been made. It is being read out of context. If the statement was particularly so important I see no reason why an eminent man, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, did not take the first occasion and struck to Geneva to retrace from that step...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Please state your Policy. That is the grievance....*(Interruptions)*

16.00 hrs.

Sir, can this Government state its policy on C.T.B.T.?...*(Interruptions)* Where is their policy? ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Let Shri Gujral complete his point.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL : Sir, we have come to office on 1st of June. In generality we have made a statement and I repeat it that India's foreign policy has a great element of continuity and that is its strength. I am sorry that in this debate I did not get an opportunity to elaborate the points of my foreign policy. But I say only this much that there are certain elements which will always be there. When Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee became the Foreign Minister and I was the Ambassador in Moscow what did we do? Was it not continuity of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's policy or Shrimati Indira Gandhi's policy? When Shri Narasimha Rao became the Foreign Minister and I was still an Ambassador, was it not a continuity? Continuity is an essential strength of India's foreign policy and will continue to be so.

So far as the nuclear policy is concerned, this programme says and I repeat it :

"The United Front will continue to work for universal nuclear disarmament and will retain the nuclear option till this goal is achieved. It will press India's case for permanent membership of the Security Council".

Sir, one point I want to repeat here again lest a doubt is created in the minds of the people of the country, as the country is watching, that this Government will do everything to see that this country's security is not damaged...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not want to create a controversy on this issue.

*[English]*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN (Mumbai North-East): Sir, we heard them with rapt attention. They are disturbing us...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please restrain yourself. That is not the way. The Leader of the Opposition is speaking. Please listen him.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : But I considered it my duty...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. Why are you doing so?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : As I have said earlier also, Geneva Conference will be concluding on 28th of this month and you have to decide the matter before this dead line.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Alright, we will decide that.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : There are two alternatives - either you oppose C.T.B.T. in the conference itself or as a mark of protest, abstain from the Conference. At present, it is the most important issue regarding defence of the country and there should be no difference of opinion on issues of national security.

Just now, I was surprised to hear the comment of Shri Narasimha Rao about non-alignment. If our election manifesto has no mention of non-alignment, then there is also no indication of non-alignment in the election manifesto of Congress party published this time.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN : There is not a single word...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you might recall that while speaking on Confidence Motion, I had said that we had been supporter of non-alignment policy since the days of Bhartiya Janasangha. Since at that time the whole world was divided into two blocs, India had no other alternative except promoting peace and making efforts to reduce differences between the two blocs. We had supported that stand then. But today, Narasimha Raoji has said that the Congress has differences with the B.J.P. on every issue. It is not necessary to tell all these things in order to give support to them...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Whether they remain in power or not but we are your devotee ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : We have basic differences with the Congress. We have been contesting against the Congress. We as well as the Members sitting on that side now, used to form a front collectively to defeat the Congress ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : Some mikes are working, particularly Shri Somnathji's mike is working. There may be...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It is because of your isolation that you are alleging...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please keep quite. It is a very serious debate.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is an historical fact that whenever people wanted to get rid of the misrule of the Congress, all non-congress political parties joined together and the Congress lost the election. But this time, the Congress lost election due to its own reasons and there was no need to join together to defeat the Congress. The Congress has been marginalised. Now they all have united to fight against the B.J.P...*(Interruptions)* On the one hand, it reveals the difference of opinion but on the other hand, it also reflects the growing strength and influence of our party.

Now we have opened our account in Tamil Nadu. One Member of BJP from Kanyakumari has been elected to the Legislative Assembly in Tamil Nadu. We have also got a good margin of votes in Nagarkoil Lok Sabha Seat. But we are not satisfied with it. A discussion is going on about the mandate and message of 1996 elections. It is a fact that no political party have got a majority but we have won the highest number of Seats in Lok Sabha. It reveals that people of this country want a coalition Government. We were also trying our best to form a coalition Government...*(Interruptions)* But our efforts and your efforts differ basically. It is not sufficient to say that the era of coalition Government has started. Such type of statements were made in 1977 and in 1989 also. However, coalition Governments are functioning in West Bengal and Kerala. Coalition Government proves more successful in a state where a big political party forms the Government in alliance with small parties. Had we formed a coalition Government, it would have been more durable than your coalition Government...*(Interruptions)* Now in this coalition Government, the largest party has only 44-45 Members and most of them belong to a specific area.

They all have joined together to protect secularism and to keep the BJP out of power, They are talking of the mandate. They did not fought the election collectively. Moreover, there was no common programme. They have united after elections. It is alright. Yesterday, Sushmaji has asked a crisp, question whether this mandate has meant to align with the Congress?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, we listened to Narasimha Rao ji peacefully and did not utter a single word in between...*(Interruptions)*

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, several microphones are switched on, so there is much interruptions. The microphone of Shri Santosh Mohan Dev ji and of several other members are switched on. Please give direction to switch off these microphones so that what is being said here could be heard and understood...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : I have ordered that all the microphones should be switched off. But it seems that there is something wrong with the machine.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will speak if silence is returned in the House ...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, from my side I do not want to say much on the coalition Government running with the report of its alliance Congress but I want to quote here the last part of the editorial of a pro-left magazine which is Economic and political weekly ...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I quote :

*[English]*

"It is as if the recently concluded general elections had not taken place at all, as if the parties now forming the United Front had not fought the Congress in these elections charging it with its wishy-washy secular record, its anti-people economic policies and its monumental corruption, as if the voters convinced by the veracity of the case put before them had not handed the Congress Party a resounding defeat, by their opportunistic manoeuvres in the brief post-election period, the constituents of the United Front have effectively negated the mandate of the people as it is possible to do...

Clearly the Left Parties, at least, have not been altogether successful in quelling their sense of unease as the political contortions they have allowed themselves to be drawn into such as being part of the United Front but declared that they will not join the Government which the Front may be called upon to form. Such contrived attempts to dilute their accountability will not very clearly wash."

AN HON. MEMBER : From where are you quoting it?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I am quoting from *The Economic and Political Weekly* which is known as a progressive weekly'.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on that day when the matter came for allotment of time for the discussion on this, it was asked that on what subject the discussion would take place. The Government has not taken any controversial decision. But in today's newspapers a news has appeared widely. The CBI filed a Special Leave Petition in the Supreme Court against the judgment of the High Court. The High Court had directed the CBI to register an FIR in respect of the complaint it had received in connection of horse trading of Members of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha. But the CBI did not comply it. The CBI changed its nature. There were serious allegations against the MPs of Jharkhand Mukti Morcha. The allegations were based on facts.

In 1993, when the then Government was facing No Confidence Motion, apprehension was before it then the members were purchased. They were paid money. One day money was paid to them. It was deposited in a bank in Delhi. We had raised this issue at that time also. A member of the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha revealed in a press conference that money was paid to them... (Interruptions) Now the matter is in the court of law. Can the CBI refuse to register a complaint in the shape the complainant intends to lodge the same and thus can change the shape of the complaint?

Learned advocates are sitting here. Shri Somnath Chatterjee is also sitting here. Every citizen has the right to lodge his complaint in the shape he wishes.

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : Under which rule are you raising it?

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Sir, it is under Rule 186(viii). It says :

"It shall not relate to any matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India."

MR. SPEAKER : Come on, it is for the admissibility of the motion.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The rule governs the admissibility of the motion.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order under Rule 352(i), which says :

"A member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending."

The entire matter pertaining to JMM is pending in the High Court... (Interruptions) Yes, it is still pending, it is not final adjudication. A Member can only quote from the judgment which is a public document, but a decision which is still pending cannot be referred to in the House.

I want to know whether the JMM case has been disposed of by the High Court and, if so, the hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee can quote the proceedings of the judgment. I have no objection to that. If it is not disposed of, then the matter is *sub judice*.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : No case is pending now. Both the Supreme Court and the High Court have decided the matter and no case is pending now... (Interruptions)

SHRI PINAKI MISRA (Puri) : The matter is coming up in the High Court on the 2nd of August. It is still pending and it has not been disposed of. It has not yet been disposed of by the High Court. Has it been disposed of? If it is so, you can quote the proceedings and we do not mind that. But it is still pending.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I think, what the hon. Member is referring to are two aspects. One is, whether the matter is pending, and the other is, though he has not said so, whether the matter is *sub judice*. Firstly, the matter is not pending. The High Court has ruled on it; now the Supreme Court has also ruled on it. Secondly, as to whether the issue is *sub judice* or not, I had occasion to mention this earlier also that in criminal cases, this is all well-established by our rules and our conventions and Kaul and Shakhdar is specific on it, as far as Parliament is concerned, a matter becomes *sub judice* when the charges are framed; in civil cases, when the issues are framed. Neither of those things has been done. The case is not pending because the charges have not been framed if it is a criminal case, as it is quite obviously. Therefore, Sir, the question of *sub judice* does not arise. This rule does not apply. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition is doing is perfectly in order.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : He is mentioning about Kaul and Shakhdar. But what about this handbook given to the Members from where I have quoted?... (Interruptions)

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : According to the judgment of the High Court, a direction has been given to the CBI to register and FIR in a particular manner. The FIR is yet to be registered. After the FIR is registered, investigation would take place. After the investigation, a challan will be filed. Once a challan is filed in the court and the court takes cognizance of it, then the question of *sub judice* arises. At the moment, no case is pending anywhere. Both the Supreme Court and the High Court have

decided the matter and they have directed that an FIR should be registered in which Shri Narasimha Rao and seven other persons should be made as accused. Now, it is for the CBI to register the case. An FIR should be registered and Shri Narasimha Rao should be made as accused...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : The Supreme Court did not say so.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Let me complete, Sir. According to the Code of Criminal Procedure, when a case has to be registered, it has to be registered by the police and not by the court. The court comes into the picture when the police, after investigation, either files a challan for prosecuting them or files a final report making that they are to be discharged. That stage would come later on, after the investigation is completed. At the moment, the judgment of the Supreme Court that was delivered yesterday rejecting the Special Leave petition and confirming the direction of the High Court has to be implemented by the CBI. The CBI has been pulled up and strictures have been passed for not proceeding against Shri Narasimha Rao.

Therefore, nothing is pending.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Guman Mal Lodha, you were the former learned Chief Justice of the High Court. Are you very sure about what you are saying?

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Hon. Speaker, Sir, I am very sure on this matter. Irrespective of the political complexion of this case, the legal aspect is that no case is pending anywhere and this rule does not apply. May I ask in which court it is pending? ...*(Interruptions)* The FIR is not registered so far and it is yet to be registered. After registration of the FIR, the police would make investigation to find out whether a case is made out or not. If the case is made out, then there is finding on that case.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Please refer to page 949 of Kaul and Shaktihar, bottom portion. It is very clear. I do not want to read it out and take the time of the House.

"The Committee of Presiding Officers has considered the scope of the rule *sub judice* and recommended the following guidelines :-"

They are very specific.

MR. SPEAKER : Please read for the benefit of the House.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : May I say with your permission that this is a Committee of the Presiding Officers and this matter has often come up in the House? Freedom of speech is a primary right whereas rule of *sub judice* is a self-imposed jurisdiction. That is the guiding principle under which Parliament

functions. So, where need be, the latter method which is the *sub judice* aspect must give way to the former. What is the former? The Freedom of Speech. As Shri Somnath Chatterjee knows - he is a very distinguished Chairman of the Privileges Committee of the former Lok Sabha - the rule of *sub judice* has no application in privilege matters. For example, a privilege motion was moved against my friend, Shri George Fernandes. Now both cannot, therefore, be cited on that occasion that we have moved a privilege motion, and therefore he cannot refer to the issue because it is *sub judice*. It is all that matters. Actually, I do not want to get into a slanging match with Shri Srikanta Kumar Jena.

Thirdly, the rule of *sub judice* does not apply to legislation. The rule of *sub judice* should apply regarding proceedings before civil and criminal courts and courts martial in any part of India and not ordinarily to other judicial or quasi-judicial bodies such as tribunals *etc.* which are fact-finding. The question of police investigation, Central Bureau of Investigation, is a fact-finding matter. Rule of *sub judice* applies to questions, statements, motions *etc.* Rule of *sub judice* applies only in regard to specific issues before a court. The entire gamut of the matter is not precluded. This specific issue is very important which takes us to rule 186(viii). Rule of *sub judice* has application only during the period when the matter is under active consideration of court of law or courts martial. That would mean as under :

"In criminal cases, from the time a charge-sheet is filed, till judgment is delivered."

This is what I briefly mentioned earlier. In court martial, it is not applicable. In civil suits, it should be applicable from the time issues are framed. As I submitted earlier, in writ petitions, from the time they are admitted, till orders are passed and in injunctions, from the time they are admitted till orders are passed and in appeal, from the time an appeal is admitted, till judgment is delivered. In this case, judgment has been delivered. Nothing is pending. The rule of *sub judice* does not apply. The judgments of both the High Court and the Supreme Court have been delivered.

The Special Leave Petition to the Supreme Court has been rejected...*(Interruptions)* After I finish, you will be allowed to speak. The High Court in a particular matter of high public importance ruled : do 'X', 'Y', 'Z'. The Central Bureau of Investigation in its judgement found that they were aggrieved by what the High Court had said. Therefore, they went into the Special Leave Petition to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has now ruled and it has said : "Do not be shy. Do not be timid. Go ahead and do the job which is entrusted to you." Therefore, where is the matter pending? Nothing is pending. Nothing is *sub judice*...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : Your leader has clarified one thing. You both belong to the same party. You clarify that argument and the argument which is being put forth now...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I have asked him to speak.

*[Translation]*

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN (Chandigarh) : The argument being given here is the same as put forth by the public prosecutor in the Supreme Court. Shri Parasaran appeared from the side of the Government. He had said that since this case was related to the Hawala scandal and the Hawala scandal being sub-judice, therefore, it is not applicable in this case. But the Supreme Court has rejected this.

MR. SPEAKER : We are not discussing what the Supreme Court's arguments were.

*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : It is not relevant. You mention your point of order and put forth your argument. Please do not tell what the Supreme Court has observed. We are not connected with that.

*[Translation]*

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN : The argument he is giving here is not applicable for two reasons. This argument has been rejected by the Supreme Court. This matter would be sub-judice in Civil and criminal aspect on the day the charge sheet will be presented and names of the accused will be filed. Narasimha Rao or any other person who is blamed will appear before the Judge. Before that it can not be sub-judice.

*[English]*

Let them name the court where the matter is pending. It is not good to allow speaker after speaker to state wrong facts...*(Interruptions)*

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : There is no court in which the case is pending.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : Sir, with great respect to Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Lodha, I would like to say that this is not the factual position. The factual position is like this. The writ was filed in the High Court. The High Court gave judgement but kept the writ pending. The High Court has, in fact, given the date of 2nd August when the Writ is returnable in the High Court. In the meanwhile because certain strictures were passed against the CBI, the CBI chose to go to the Supreme Court to say that the High Court's basic judgment commanding them to file an FIR was wrong and more importantly the strictures

should be expunged. Now, the Supreme Court has said; "The High Court has given a judgement. You investigate the FIR. There is no problem. No chargesheet has been filed and you investigate the FIR"...*(Interruptions)* I kept quiet when you spoke. Please listen to me. The point is that the FIR will now be registered and the CBI has been told to go back to the High Court to try and get the strictures expunged. This is the first point. Now, the Leader of the Opposition standing up on the floor of the House and saying that one of the so-called accused, in fact, sat with him in a Press Conference and said that he was an accused; he was an accused and he was guilty would seriously prejudice the trial. With great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, I would say that the order that has been quoted is absolutely in order. I feel it will seriously prejudice the trial; will prejudice the investigation and the man's liberty will be in jeopardy.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Das Munshi, I want one point to be made very clear. What is the position of the first FIR? Has it been registered? Or, has it been returned to the CBI?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You listen to me first. It has to be made very clear. What is the position of the first FIR? Has it been returned? Has the CBI been directed to file a fresh FIR? Or, has the Court directed the CBI to file an additional FIR? Please make the position clear.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : He has raised this question. I have to know about it if you do not have the information, do not tell me anything.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am submitting that I said it in the beginning also that a matter which is pending in the court cannot be referred here and the writ is pending in the High Court. It is returnable on 2nd August. Till then the writ is pending. How can you allow discussion on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. It is not the question of writ; it is the question of FIR.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : The writ is pending in the High Court...*(Interruptions)*.

*[Translation]*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Sir, my point of order is that in what capacity is Priya Ranjan Das Munshi being asked by you?

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : He has raised an issue here.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Let me Law Minister of the Government respond.

[Translation]

This is not the way...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. This is not the matter. This question has been raised so it will have to be answered. There is no question of the way of response.

[English]

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : I would only submit to you that our hon. Member Shri Pinaki Mishra knows about the case; he is associated with it. He is also an advocate of the Supreme Court. So, the answer to your question can be given by him.

MR. SPEAKER : Please be authentic. My decision depends on the position of the FIR.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : The writ is not infructuous. The CBI has to go back and report to the High Court about the investigation. The writ is not infructuous. The CBI has to report back to the High Court as to what has happened after the amended FIR has been filed. The matter is squarely within the jurisdiction of the High Court.

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN : The moment the matter is returned, it becomes infructuous. He is misleading the House.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : I am sorry, now I realise this is by design. I have been courteous to my learned friend. But this is by design that he is obstructing me because I am stating the correct facts. The High Court has given a direction to the CBI to file and amended FIR...(Interruptions)...

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now. It is a very serious matter.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : The High Court has given a direction to the CBI to file an amended FIR on the basis of the complaint and to report back to it as to the course of the investigation. Like in the Hawala case in the Supreme Court, the matter is an on-going matter; it is a pending matter; the matter comes up from time to time; similarly the High Court here squarely has the jurisdiction over the matter...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is an ex-Chief Justice and a self-appointed legal advisor to this House! I do not know the facts. So I have not intervened.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : It is a squarely *sub judice* matter.

MR. SPEAKER : My limited question is.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you disturbing? Do not try to show that you are an expert. Every Member of the House is an expert.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is very painful for me if I have to shout at an ex-Chief Justice. The limited information that I want is, what is the position of the first FIR.

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : The FIR will now be an amended FIR.

MR. SPEAKER : Is it with the CBI?

SHRI PINAKI MISRA : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : Then it is not *sub judice*.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to put restrictions on anybody's powers by raising the *sub judice* issue here. I was going to criticise the Government because the C.B.I. should have abided by the verdict of High Court and registered a new F.I.R. on the basis of complaint but the C.B.I. said that it would go to the Supreme Court with special leave petition against the High Court's verdict. During our Government's regime, this issue had come up before me also. I had consulted Law Minister and he was of the opinion that the CBI need not go to Supreme Court and the CBI should have abided by the verdict of High Court and registered a regular FIR so that the case could be pursued further. It was the last day. I did not have enough time to go through the entire file. I cited a reference of the Law Minister's opinion in my note and left the issue to be decided by the incoming new Government. Whether it was incumbent on the party of the new Government to allow C.B.I. to go to Supreme Court? The verdict of the High Court should have been sufficient. The High Court had passed a stricture against the C.B.I. The High Court had made an allegation that it was kept in darkness by the CBI. I have got a copy of the judgement. I could quote it. What was the need for CBI to go to Supreme Court? And what was its outcome? I have got a copy of the order of the Supreme Court? It has dismissed the petition of the CBI and told C.B.I. to go back to High Court and the C.B.I. has to come back to the High Court. Devegowda ji is saying that he has not taken this decision.

Whether it was not an important issue? If the sentiments behind this are taken into consideration, then it appears that you want to shield those with whose support you have formed your Government; infact you want to protect them...(Interruptions) I want an reply to this question...(Interruptions) Had I taken a decision that day, I would have been criticised that on 28th when your Government was on the verge of collapse and you were being given farewell, then

why you have taken this decision?...*(Interruptions)*  
Not, I am no longer in the Government. Now, I want a reply to this question.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the facts ascertained about urea scandal are startling. We kept fighting out scandal after scandal. But scandals kept on appearing one after another. The corruption was a major issue in the election. The Congress Party had to face the biggest debacle. But nobody had visualised that when election would be held and new Government would be formed, then urea scandal would emerge as the biggest ever scandal...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI ISWAR PRASANNA HAZARIKA (Tejpur) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : No, please, Mr. Hazarika. Please do not disturb now. He is not yielding.

*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, that day this issue was raised. Yesterday, when discussion on Vote of Confidence started, then the urea scandal was raised. Hon. Prime Minister had given assurance that he would collect all the facts in this connection and place them before the House. I do hope that he would reveal all those facts during this discussion as there are questions which are agitating the minds of people. The Bofors scandal has been much talked about and the hawala scandal has also been discussed. But the amount involved in both these scandals is far less than the amount involved in this urea scandal. This scandal outweighs these two previous scandals. The country needs urea yesterday, Branala Sahib was complaining about the scarcity of urea. As here is scarcity of urea, it should be imported. Taking advantage of this situation, this scandal has come up. The most important aspect of this scandal is that there is not middle-man involved in the scandal. The amount was deposited straightaway in the Swiss Bank. This was deposited on behalf of the Government. But the entire amount has disappeared. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to go into the details of investigation deliberately but I want to draw your attention towards some aspects.

The most important thing is that as per the old proverb no dog has barked in this case. If the watch dog does not bark, then it is understood that the it recognises the thieves and is well aware of the happenings. The officers must have a smelt that the Turkish Company would not implement its commitment because no action was taken. They kept waiting for the month of May. By that time the entire amount has disappeared. There are certain cases in the urea scandal that cannot be investigated by C.B.I.

Who is this Mr. Ramkrishna? Whether he has come through proper channel? How has he become all in all? Who has placed him there? Who is his Godfather? He is behind the bar and indeed he should have been in Jail. But no-officials involved in this scandal has been arrested so far. No action has been taken against them. Mr. Speaker, Sir, who is this Sanjeevi Rao? I do not know him, but having heard his name several times bell has started ringing in my mind. I have brought out the list of the persons, who have been allotted out of turn petrol pumps. His name figures among them. His name also figures among those who have been allotted out of turn gas agency. His name is also among those who have been issued licenses for Sugar Mills. He is known as the sole agent of IPL products in Andhra Pradesh. He has been given the entire sole agency. I am asking you on the basis of what I have heard and the facts available with me.

What is the background of Shrikrishna-Impa? How old is its relationship with NFL? How many times it have violated its contractual obligations? It is also pertinent to know the record of Turkish firm? Who is this Pinto sitting in London? What is the reality of Ruia-brothers? The most important thing that puzzles our mind is the way the money has been released. Why the Finance Ministry has accorded approval to it? An amount of thirty eight million dollars has been transferred but no security, no performance guarantee nor any insurance was sought. Is it not a fraud with the people of this country? Urea worth Rs. 133 crore is being imported and not a single grain of urea has come so far. Where the money has gone, no body knows. Therefore, I urge upon Prime Minister that the culprit should be arrested. To punish them is not enough, this Rs. 133 crore should come back to the treasury of the Government of India and for this purpose what ever action is possible, should be taken.

In this case, no one, how so ever high or big he may be, should be spared. C.B.I. says that the conspiracy was hatched. This may be the fact but what was the bank doing? Whether all these aspects would be investigated by C.B.I.? We have nothing to do as to which able son of which able father is involved in this case. We want the money back. All the money has been transacted through bank and its proof is there.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if this process of revelation of scandals after scandals go on unabated, then political stability will not be possible. I have seen the programme of United Front. So many things tally with our programme. There may be difference on some issues. You have come unitedly and the Congress has given its support to you...*(Interruptions)* But the country needs a stable and a answerable Government as well. If the Government is stable but

corrupt and somehow manages mandate through horse-trading or by enticing other parties and wins their support that does not mean that mere numbers will bring stability. How the democracy will work? Who will implement the programme which you have formulated? What is the machinery which implements it? How far this machinery has gone awry?

Today, the members of the treasury benches were saying something. They were quite right about it that see the condition of Electricity Board's in the States. The country is going to face a big power crisis. The drinking water and electricity are not available in various parts of the country but the electricity is being sold out...*(Interruptions)* Delhi is not out of India. It is a part of India...*(Interruptions)* I am not talking about the Government. I am talking of the system. I am talking in the interest of our country. That is why I have raised the question of security today though there was no need of raising such an issue at the moment. The country is incurring a loss of Rs. 6 thousand crore on petrol. The Railway should be modernised. Where are the funds? No capital investment is being made in agriculture. Whatever funds are available are being spent on subsidy. Although it is necessary, but the development of agriculture is not possible unless and until capital investment is made. Will these questions be deliberated upon?

Secularism is being discussed. I feel very happy that we wanted to make it an issue for national discussion and we have succeeded in it also...*(Interruptions)* I have heard the speech of former Prime Minister with rapt attention. Some time back, he had called me his 'Guru' out of sheer joke. I am talking in joke. I had said at that time that today no 'Guru' is required rather a 'Guru Ghantal' is required. As I have said that secularism is embedded in the very spirit of the country. There has never been any theocracy in this country. There has been conflict between state and the Church, in the west, but this has never been witnessed in this country. The Kings used to rule here and the Acharyas used to extend his advice to him as well as sermons about discipline. The Acharyas never tried to usurp the throne. This country is multi religious. Had Islam and Christianity not come here, even then this country could have gone, ahead with the object of 'Sarva dharma sambhav' in mind. Islam came here, it is a matter of happiness. Our Sikh brothers are following the tenets of their religion and Christians, their Christianity. Do not discriminate in the name of religion. nobody has demanded even after the formation of Pakistan that India should be declared a theocratic nation. I do not want to spell out the situation in Pakistan. We do not want to copy what type of system is working in Bangladesh. But the world should not preach us. We should not forget the fact that if India is a secular

state, then 82 percent people are Hindus. Therefore, we rise the issue of infiltration. We make strong objection to those coming in India on a large scale. We do not do this for the sake of votes and we have not got their votes as well. But is it not a question that should be pondered over and whether this question should be ignored? Should it not be viewed in national perspective?

Our Congress friends want debate on secularism and the statement by Shri Gadgil should be brought to the notice of everyone. The essence of what Gadgil jee has said is that he lost both Muslims and Hindus. "Nakhuda Himila' Na visale Sanam, Na idhar ka Rahe, Na Udhar Ke Rahe" and all the blame is being put on us. He has said that he is trapped between two schools. Why the Congress has reduced itself to this situation? This process started with Shahbano episode. I do not want to go into the old history. The secularism should be discussed. What is the concept of Secularism? What is its Indian concept. Our mind should be crystal clear on this count. No body talks about this.

As I have said that there is no question of declaring India a theocratic state nor the question of reducing non-Hindu and Muslims to just a second class citizens. There is no question. This is not the nature of Indian spirit. This is not in its atmosphere its culture and nature. Some people want to change this nature, as I am witnessing it. Mr. Sharad jee is not sitting here. The controversy concerning fanatic Hindu and liberal Hindu, has been going on in this country from the very beginning. Hindu society has never been static, it is a dynamic society. The evils have raised its head here, but it has fought against evils also. Several new social reformers have born here from time to time. They attacked old evil practices. They challenged temple and God, standing before them. The society gradually changed. If we had not witnessed the period of slavery and had the Britishers not followed the policy of divide and rule, then the picture of this country would have been quite different. I do understand the plight of those who are Dalits, and downtrodden, whichever class they belong to.

Now the demand is being raised that reservation should be provided in the name of religion. This was never visualised by the makers of our constitution. Reservation was provided to Dalits only. I have gone through the debate of the entire Constituent Assembly. One exception was made to our Sikh brothers. The national leaders of the then period had said that the exception was very necessary because Punjab has got divided, and the Sikh brothers have lost their original place. Nobody had even imagined that reservations should be provided even if such a conversion takes place.



16.59 hrs.

(Shri P.M. Sayeed *in the Chair*)

If reservation is to be provided to all. And even upper caste people should be brought within the parameters of our reservation system. What is the fault of Brahmins who are poor but we do not talk about them.

A Brahmin conference was convened in Karnataka. A special leader in Karnataka had invited me to participate in it. I said that I was a Brahmin, how you have remembered me. I have not gone into Brahmins Conference. I have said here that I go to participate in Hindu Conference and so I am criticised and you have come upto Brahmin Conference.

17.00 hrs.

And if I start going into Brahmin Conference, then I will have to go into Kanyakubza Brahmin Conference and then I will have to consider they are of how many bigghas and viswas. One more thing has been said by Gadgil Sabib. Where secularism should be discussed, casteism too should be discussed but casteism is being encouraged. Today, efforts are being made to put the casteism to an end, and for this purpose, radical pronouncements of forming a casteless society are being made but what is happening today is that caste feelings are becoming more strong and attempts are being made to convert the caste factor into a political element. If it is unfair to incite the feelings of the people in the name of religion, is it fair to exploit the feelings of the people in the name of caste? But you have entered into an alliance with those elements whose political existence is based on the caste itself. The Congress Party has no objection in extending its support to them. It is hostile towards BJP only. Bharatiya Janata Party is marching ahead while keeping itself engaged in the service of the people. There will be two major parties in the country and this is needed too. The regional parties will have their own place. It is a matter of great pleasure that the regional parties have joined the Union Government. While ruling the country from Delhi, they should strive to solve the problems of their states keeping in view the national perspective. Many a times the Centre neglects the interests of the States. There is a saying "Dilli se door to dil se door" (Away from Delhi, away from the heart). Such a situation should not come. Now, the communication facilities are there but we have not provided the needed air services to the North-Eastern states. It takes too much time to reach there. Does it not put hurdles in the national unity? Thrust should be given to the education of Muslims and children. We did not make the primary education compulsory otherwise it could have covered one and all.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, an attempt is being made here to present an altogether a distorted picture of Uniform Civil Code. Shri Narasimha Rao has referred to some customs and rituals as to how the marriages are solemnised there and what is the system of succession in vogue there. Many customs and rituals are in practice in such countries. But it was the intention of the founding fathers of our Constitution that there should be uniformity in the laws relating to marriage, divorce and succession. The Supreme Court has also given its option in the matter. It is not a question of imposing any idea or system on someone. If all the political parties say that such laws are the need of the hour then an environment can be created but you are opposing any such move. After all women should have equal rights. If such demands are made, I do not think that there is anything objectionable in it. It is not our intention to impose Hindu Law on any one. I like one thing in Muslim Personal Law. The willingness or otherwise of the girls is taken before the marriage. It is not so in Hindus. The girl is like the sacred cow and is handed over to a man whom she does not know.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Moreover, he has not to carry any dowry.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Now, the time is changing. When the majority of the people comprising 82 percent are changing, then the remaining people should also try to change. There is nothing objectionable in raising demand for a change.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : Dowry is not required in their case.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Dowry should be banned. No doubt, we enacted the law but we did not create environment accordingly. The lust for more and more money in a short span of time is increasing and unlimited consumerism developed due to new economic liberalisation is also responsible to encourage dowry. Will our leaders not set an example in this regard? Will corruption and scams continue unchecked? Now, only the faces of the rules have changed but actually their character also change and unless this happens, the change which you want to bring about in the country, is not possible. However, if people at higher levels are honest and their record is unblemished, honesty is bound to percolate to lower level and then each and every individual will discharge his duty honestly. Today everyone is engaged in minting money and looting the exchequer. Sweeping the scam under the carpet will not help. Similarly, to say that in comparison to corruption, other issues are made important will be of no avail. We should give weightage to other issues but if corruption continues unabated scams continue to come to light and media continues to give them headline coverage, people will not listen to any excuse and the politician will be in the dock and the

politicians will increasingly lose credibility among the masses. True, the country is passing through a crisis but if we have to find a way out then we will have to develop a consensus. I welcome the hon. Prime Minister's assurance that he would not compromise with the corruption at any cost. But mere announcement is not enough. It should be put into practice. Some times, I wonder as to how much money does a man need?

"Sab thaath pada rah jayega,  
Jab bandh chalega banjara."

Nothing will remain there. Yet the people are after money. People have lust for power because it is easy to make money once they get power. Economic reforms and liberalisation should have transparency. If bungling is done even in selling the shares of Public Sector Undertakings and in the name of privatisation, factories are handed over to friends at throw away prices then anything is possible. I can give an instance because I represent Lucknow. Is it the benefit of privatisation and liberalisation? The industrialists should understand that they have to do justice to the country. Their aim should not be only to earn profit, rather they should work as trustees. They should also not be allowed to drain out the money to foreign countries. They think that under liberalisation they have got full freedom. They were praising me when I was in power and now when you are in power, they are praising you more than me. When neither you nor I were in power, they were singing praises of the persons then in power. People in the country should be rewarded for their hard work. There should be competition in the country and controls and restrictions should be kept to the minimum. It has been our policy from the very beginning and we did not support and welcome the new economic reforms due to any compulsion. We are opposed to this quota and permit system from the very beginning but the benefit of liberalisation has not reached the grassroot people in the States. Officers are still not ready to shed their powers. The idea is that the Ministers should take maximum decisions. By giving an end to discretionary quota, you have done a laudable job. There was large scale bungling in the allotment of the Government houses in Delhi. The house were meant for Government employees and they should have been allotted to them. Agreed, you have abolished this discretionary quota system but what will happen to those who have made crores of rupees in this endeavour? This bungling was known to one and all. This situation should change but I doubt if this situation will really change. First of all, you have not ample powers at your command and secondly, who knows as to when the person on whose crutches the future of your Government rests, may withdraw his support to your Government and leave you in the lurch. The speech

given by Shri Narasimha Rao today, is very meaningful. The first part of the speech was meant for me but remember that the second part of it was meant for you. But he should also take a lesson from the debacle of the Congress at the hustings. Is it not a matter to be deeply pondered over as to the state in which the great organisation which had thrown itself into the struggle for freedom, and the association with which was a matter of pride for me when I was young, to which it has been reduced today? But I do not think that there is right environment today to think over it deeply. Everyone is running after power and, therefore, we have decided to oppose this Motion. We shall watch as to how this Government functions. When this Government was formed at that time also I had said that we would extend our cooperation in all good works. We will not oppose for the sake of opposition. You do not need our support as according to you, we are anti-secular elements and I do not think that you need our support.

17.12 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA) : The hon. Speaker, Sir, since yesterday several senior Members including two former Prime Ministers participated in this Motion of Confidence.

Sir, I have gone through the manifesto of the Bharatiya Janata Party and also the speeches of the former Prime Minister and the present Leader of the Opposition on 27th and 28th May, 1996, delivered in this House. At the same time, he has expressed his dissatisfaction, his dejection at one stage by saying "I wanted to retire from politics but things are not coming in favour of my retirement." That is what it when it is translated from Hindi to English. I have gone through that. Why has such a situation happened in this country? A person like Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee expresses that type of dejection in public life, why? What exactly is the reason for this? Today, we have all assembled here. We are representing nearly 90 crore population and nearly 545 Members sitting in this highest, apex institution.

Sir, I was here only for a short span of time, just three-and-a-half years, sitting in the back bench. I used to hear the speeches of all the senior leaders and I was just observing myself as to what for I came here. In fact, honestly I will tell you today, what for I came here. Is it for this type of performance in the House? Sir, to what extent this institution has been denigrated! I must feel sorry - whether the Member belongs to that side or this side. Is it not the responsibility of everyone of us to maintain the dignity, decency and decorum of this House? When everybody was talking, I was sitting silent, I was

keeping quiet, I did not even open my lips. Whatever may be the type of criticism, I tried to keep mum and hear them with all rapt attention. The former Prime Minister, Shri Chandrashekhar, today stood up in anger and said, how can we run this House if this is the situation! In utter disgust he has mentioned that, if I am correct.

Sir, I do not want to take the issue of corruption first. If you want to deliberate on corruption - from the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, I have gone through the proceedings in the library.

But I have at least tried to understand the corruption issue that is prevailing in this country.

Let us start from the days of Independence when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was sitting in this very place as the Prime Minister. It was Pandit Nehru who is one of the tallest statesmen of this country who brought Haridas Maniwarke. At that time, his son-in-law, Feroze Gandhi had brought that issue on the floor of this House. Today, let us touch our hearts. Only for two weeks the BJP was in the Government. In how many States the BJP Governments are there? Are there not any corruption charges? ...*(Interruptions)* I am going to prove it...*(Interruptions)*

When I speak, I speak based on certain background. When Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was speaking, I never opened my lips. I do not want to go into the merits and demerits of it when the former hon. Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition said, 'both father and the son are very intelligent people and there is no need of any guru to protect them.'

I am sorry to say this but it is not correct on the part of anybody to make insinuation unless the matter is proved otherwise. Unless the issue which is now under investigation is proved, I cannot accept this position.

Sir, I will come to the corruption issue later on. I am going to deal with all these matters ...*(Interruptions)*

Yes, we are all corrupt people sitting on this side pleading for secularism. Only the saintly people are sitting on that side. Yes, that is why the people have given them only 23 percent of votes. They have come here and now they are pleading that the people's mandate is for them and all other people sitting on this side are corrupt and only they are the people who have come from heaven with all virtues ...*(Interruptions)*

Yes, I say it. Please, for God's sake, do not argue.

Sir, that an amount of agony? Your good self, I hold highest respect for you. Even now whether we sit either on that side or this side, I will say only one

word that in my 35 years of political life, I have never attributed a single word either to Advaniji or Vajpayeeji.

He took up the RSS issue. Even now I say that on that particular day I applauded the rule played by the RSS at the time of Emergency. But what happened subsequently? My whole speech has not been quoted. I have brought all those details but I do not want to waste the time of the House. Mr. Arun Shourie is not a Member of this House and that is why I do not want to take up all those issues that have been said on that particular day. All those things are reported here.

Sir, corruption is a part of the issues which we have before us. There are other burning problems in this country which, according to me, are major issues. I am a humble politician. I am not the tallest personality in the Indian politics. There is no lust for power in me. They have said that 'the United Front comes with a programme and convinced that old bitter experience will not be repeated due to political ambition and lust for power.'

Shri Chandra Shekhar is sitting in the last row. I would have become the Chief Minister of Karnataka in 1983. It is he alone who prevailed on me not to attempt to become the Chief Minister of Karnataka in 1983.

It was because of you, I sacrificed that position. I am a person who tendered my resignation to the office thrice. If you know my background, I have not come to Delhi in search of any office. My people of Karnataka, 5 crore population of Karnataka, have given the mandate to run the State without the mercy of, without the support of anybody. I had that courage to tell this august House. I had the people's support and on the people's support, I sat in Karnataka as the Chief Minister and ran the State Government for one and a half years. I myself accepted this responsibility. Yes, all the senior leaders who are sitting here tried to prevail on me and said, "In the given situation, you should take the responsibility." When all these senior leaders who are much more experienced than me asked me to shoulder this responsibility, at that time I bowed my head.

Sir, while accepting this responsibility, I know the position, I know the composition of the House. I know the complicated problems of this country. Knowing fully well, I have accepted this responsibility. I will try my best to discharge my duty. The people and the party, the United party, the United Front including the Congress support have reposed confidence on me. I am going to discharge my duty not to satisfy these people but to satisfy the nine hundred million people of this country. That is my one pledge here. Whether I may remain here for five years, whether I may remain here for five days, I am not going to be afraid of that. I am totally a different

man. You please note these words. Please mark these words. I am not going to be afraid of any of these things. That is my temperament. I may talk at a very low profile. But when things come, I am not going to yield to anybody. That is my temperament. I had fought many more battles in my life to come to this position.

Sir, let us now go back to our achievements. Let us go back to our achievements. It is not a thing to be laughed at. Construction of a *mandir* is not the issue today before this country when the people are suffering for the basic necessities like drinking water, communication facilities. The village has not road today. The people have no drinking water. This House is debating all this. My hon. esteemed colleague Members, whichever political party they may belong, whichever side they may belong, whichever side they may belong, I am not going to say anything wrong. Is this House to discuss about the drinking water problem? Is this the House to discuss about the communication facility to village? That is the responsibility of the State Government. But what is the position today? Even after 48 years of independence, today you yourself have said, the late Rajivji had said that 'for one rupee central grant is released, only 16 paise reaches the grassroot'. That is what is quoted in your speeches. That means, corruption is at all levels. In every walk of life, corruption is there. Lastely you have said one word about corruption, we should all sit together and take a conscious decision so far as corruption is concerned. Before taking up that issue, the Lok Pal issue, I am going to deal with other matters.

Sir, I must compliment the Congress Government for one thing. When the former Prime Minister was sitting here, he said, "I am going to provide this time a sum of Rs. 30,000 crore for the rural development." That was one major area in which he had changed the programme, for which I appreciated on that day itself.

Sir, today I would like to give one more suggestion. I have not taken any major decision. I am going to change certain priorities in consultation with all of you, friends. The priorities are: first is drinking water, second is communication, third is primary education, health care and then housing. Sir, on public distribution....(Interruptions)

Please wait. You may appreciate it or you may not be going to appreciate. It is left to you, left to the august House. What I am going to say in this House is about what I have done in the last one-and-a-half years as the Chief Minister. That was my first concern. I am going to say that if you all agree, if the Chief Ministers of the concerned States agree, I would like to again revive the priority.

In Karnataka, when I took over as the Chief Minister, I called a meeting of all District Collectors. I had asked them to enumerate how many villages had no roads, how many families had no houses, how many villages had no drinking water facilities. I gave one month's time to enumerate all these deficiencies, the shortfalls in every village. That was the first decision I took in the District Collectors meeting. For your information, for the information of the august House, I will tell you that in Karnataka - it is not a big State; it has a population of five crores - in my home State, there are 19.86 lakhs persons who are without houses or sites. This is after 48 years of Independence and after implementing so many programmes. From the time of Shri Nijalingappa and even from the time of the undivided Congress, I will tell you today, housing programmes have been implemented. Today when I asked the District Collectors to go and enumerate how many houses are not there, how many people are without houses - I wanted to know that - after enumeration, the figures I got from all the District Collectors are that 19.86 lakhs of families have no houses in Karnataka. When Karnataka situation is like that, I do not know, what is exactly the situation in the whole country. Some people say, Deve Gowda does not know Hindi; some people say Deve Gowda does not know English; some people say Deve Gowda does not know Meghalaya; some people say Deve Gowda may not know Shimla, Darjeeling. Some people will go to Darjeeling; some people will go to the Kashmir Valley; some people will go to Shimla. For what? They are summer resorts.

I am a person who lives in my village. I am a person who lives with my farmers. I am a person who lives with my peasants. I am a man who lives with my workers..That is how I have come to this position. I may not be able to know the entire India as a whole. At least I have seen it in map what India is. I have seen that much at least as the Chief Minister of Karnataka.

Sir, the decision which I have taken I would like to tell you today. If all the hon. Members including our senior leaders agree in the next Budget to oblige and formulate certain programmes, apart from what the document the United Front has now placed before the nation, I would like to place certain priorities and come before the House to see that the basic necessities in this country, at least, should be completed with a time-bound programme, whether it is drinking water, whether it is primary education, whether it is health and education. These are some of the areas on which my heart is dwelling. I wanted to see that this should not prolong for the Ninth Plan, Tenth Plan and Eleventh Plan. I am not a person to accept that position, whatever may be the position.

Regarding financial implications, yes, your goodself has said with your vast experience, 'Where do you find the resources?' I do agree. This country is not poor. This country is rich but that richness is in the hands of a few individuals.

I will tell you today that in every political Parties, there are good people. Bad people are also there. Do not be under the impression that BJP has no bad people or BJP has no good people. In every political Party, there are both good and bad people. At this juncture, I would like to appeal to everyone of the hon. Members of this side and that side that let us try to make a common effort as to how to mobilize our resources. If you all agree, resource mobilization is not a big issue. We can mobilize the resources. I would like to make this point...*(Interruptions)*. Please wait. I have also some basic knowledge, at least, about administration.

Even though I am not an expert, I am not an eloquent speaker in Hindi, or an eloquent Speaker in English, a forceful a speech in English or Hindi is not going to solve the problems of the poor man in India...*(Interruptions)* I have seen enough! I have seen enough!

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : The first decision I took was about reservation, Shri Vajpayee said ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Why should you react like that?

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : About reservations Shri Vajpayee has asked about what we did in two months. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. House. In two months after I took over, I was here, when the Seventy-Second Amendment and the Seventy-Third Amendment with regard to the Zilla Parishads and Taluk Panchayats and with regard to the municipalities or local bodies were passed. The Amendments were passed in this very same House. I was also a member of the then Joint Committee.

Some States had disagreed for giving reservations to backward classes. We left it to the States. In the Seventy-Second Constitution Amendment it was given to the States. In Karnataka, I would like to bring it to the notice of the House, that for the first time, reservations were made for the backward classes. The debate has been going on from the days of the late Shri Karpoori Thakur in Bihar and Shri Devaraj Urs and so many other people have fought for reservations. May I tell you only one word? We have enjoyed powers for certain periods. I do not want to go back to 5,000 years of old history. Let us think of the present.

I took a decision; there are some communities, it is not on the basis of class, backward classes. Some communities and castes after Independence,

were unable to elect even a Panchayat. They were unable to elect even a municipality; they were unable to elect even a corporation. I took a decision to provide 27 percent reservation, what Shri V.P. Singh had given for the backward class in the Central Government service. I applied the same norm for political reservation, to those communities which were unable to participate in any administration.

Today in Karnataka all the institutions whether town panchayats, zilla panchayats, taluk panchayats, city municipality, corporation, all these institutions — my friend Shri Dhananjaya Kumar is sitting there — we have given reservations on the basis of caste. He may be a *Dhobhee*, he may be a barber, he may be a weaver, he may be a Toolmaker, he may be a potter maker.

He may be a Muslim. For the first time in India Karnataka has given political reservations for Muslims. When Shri Banatwalla was speaking, in the House, I had gone for taking lunch. I heard his speech there. For the first time in India, the Muslim minorities have been given political reservations. This is for the credit of the Karnataka State Government. I would like to bring this to the notice of this House.

I will come to the next point.

AN HON. MEMBER : You are talking in your manifesto about reservations for women.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : I will come to it later. Not only reservations at one stage but even as Chairperson 27 per cent of this community, whether he is a *Dhobhee* or a barber or a goldsmith like that I enumerated, for small small castes for the first time in the Indian history, I gave political reservations. I want them to participate in every field and that they should feel that this Government belongs to them. That is what I have done in Karnataka. If you all agree with me, I want to introduce the same system here. Or otherwise, on this question you can tell hundred and one things. You can tell that God is everywhere. Even good is in the pillars. I have read in primary school. My father was not such an educated man. I was taught that God is present even in pillar through the story of Hiranya Kashyap and Prahlad. You have got a secular face. Shri Narasimha Rao has said that you have got a secular face. That is why they have named you as the future Prime Minister of this country. Otherwise, they would not have named you. I will tell you very frankly. I know what it is. Sir, I have got the highest regard for you. I came to your house. You have advised me on so many issues. I take your advice and guidance for my future administration. You have got some secular face. That is why, they have named you the future Prime Minister of this country. You were able to get twenty or thirty seats more because of that; otherwise things would have been totally different. I would like to tell you this much.

Today you must come forward; with your liberal outlook you must come forward. These are the communities which are suffering. They have not got the real benefit after independence. What for is the independence? For whom is the independence? For whom and for what purpose is this House? For whose purpose is the Supreme Court and the judiciary? At a later date, maybe in the next Budget Session, I can debate on judicial reforms, electoral reforms and all these things. But today I would like to confine myself what certain progressive measures we have taken in Karnataka. That is the issue which we can go into to bring to the notice of the hon. Member ...*(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER : What about *hawala*?

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : please listen to me. I know about *hawala*. Please do not bother about it. It is not only Congress but you are also there in *hawala*, everybody is there in the *hawala*. Do not argue on this *hawala* business. *Hawala* business is not going to confine to any one political party. Do not argue on that.

You have said in your manifesto about reservation to women. In Karnataka, we have provided 50 per cent reservations in the posts of teachers for women...*(Interruptions)*. You cannot hear these things...*(Interruptions)*. I would like to mention that if all of you agree, I am going to introduce those things here also. That is what I want to tell you. Out of all the vacancies of primary school teachers in Karnataka, 50 per cent have been reserved for women and in all other posts 30 per cent reservation has been made. We have implemented these things.

I have also written to the former Prime Minister to bring a Constitutional Amendment to see that the reservation for women should be given in the Assembly and in the Lok Sabha. This is the letter I have written to the former Prime Minister. If you all agree and give me cooperation, I will introduce these amendments in the next session itself.

Now, I would like to mention one or two other points. When I say something about the achievements as far as the social justice is concerned, then you feel irritated. I do not know why. Are you not interested in the poor? Are you not interested in the downtrodden? Let me speak about that. I am not going to say that you have no concern about this section. But when I speak about what I have done in one and a half years, please listen to me. The reason why I am enlightening all those things in this august House is only to get your cooperation, if possible to make it a national programme and see that it is implemented in all the States. I am only mentioning this with that document.

Shri George Fernandes, one of our senior colleagues once upon a time whatever may be the

political differences now — has written to me once ...*(Interruptions)* I am not going to deliberate upon the achievements which are made in Karnataka. I am now coming to the issues that have been raised here...*(Interruptions)*

Shri George Fernandes has compared the manifestoes of all the political parties in his speech last time on 27th and 28th of May. He tried to attack as to how these people can come together. How? According to him it is the eighth or ninth wonder of the world. I would like to ask a straight question to him. When the Government of Shri Morarji Bhai stepped down — I am not criticising about the role of Shri George Fernandes at that time - Shri Vajpayee, our senior leader at that time was in the Government. He was in that Government...*(Interruptions)* You were also in that Government. Shri Chandra Shekhar was the President of the Party. I was also one of the Working Committee members in the State unit. Shri Vajpayee and Shri Morarji Desai had both contacted me and asked the support of Shri Devaraj Urs to that Government. Shri Devaraj Urs was branded as a corrupt politician and Shri Devaraj Urs was indicted by a commission of enquiry which was appointed by the Government of India. Sir, with all the sincerity at my command I am making this. I am not going to make any allegation. Is it not a fact? Is it not a fact - that is all what I am going to ask.

For political convenience in this country all political parties have played their own role for a temporary gain including Deve Gowda. Yes. Let us search our hearts instead of arguing one against the other. At least let us start a new chapter. If at all you are really interested to restore the dignity, decency and sanctity attached to this institution, attached to our Indian democracy, let us start a new chapter.

I will just quote one word of Shri Vajpayee. I am not going to take others. There are various other issues. I am not going to touch about corruption or about the M.P. Chief Minister's corruptions etc. I have got all those things here. That is a different matter. 'The B.J.P.'s support to the B.S.P. is tactical. The Congress's support to the United Front is opportunistic. Deve Gowda's Party has hardly 45 Members. The Congress with 136 Members is supporting Deve Gowda'. It is so only to cover up their sins, according to your allegation. How much strength in the U.P. Assembly had Ms. Mayawati got? Sir, for your stature I will tell you that you said one thing yesterday...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KANSHI RAM (Hoshiarpur) : Ms. Mayawati was having 69 M.L.As as against your 44 M.Ps. in this House...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : Kanshi Ram saheb, you have got a great revolutionist. I have got

highest regard. I am only attacking their policy  
...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN : He is only attacking the person for whom he has the highest regard... (Interruptions)

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : What was the mandate of the people? Was the mandate of the people to support BSP? Tell me, Sir. You are a seniormost leader, you can advise me, you can guide me what is right. Day before yesterday, while you were participating in the obituary references, you said one thing - it is still fresh in my memory - that Sh. Sanjiva Reddyji was denied the Presidentship and after ten years he got it. We do not know what is going to happen tomorrow. But for a person of your stature, you should not try to find fault with others when your own party has committed so many mistakes. This is all I want to say... (Interruptions). Every political party has got its own internal problems. Why do you worry about that? ... (Interruptions). When Delhi BJP tickets were distributed, what happened? ... (Interruptions). That is a different matter... (Interruptions). When Delhi BJP tickets were distributed, it was said suitcase politics will not work I do not know Hindi. I cannot speak in Hindi... (Interruptions). In every political party, these issues are there. It is not confined to 'A' political party or 'B' political party. In the present-day politics, in every political party we have got internal problems and we should not try to take mileage out of it. That is my appeal. I do not want to make any further comments on this point.

I would like to make only one or two points more... (Interruptions) Our former Chief Minister and former Governor Barnalaji has said that there is shortage of urea. Do not worry, there is sufficient urea. As a farmer's son, I will take care to provide sufficient urea to all the farmers in this country. I will take care of it... (Interruptions).

Our former Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition has expressed his concern about our foreign policy. We have made it clear that there is a large measure of consensus on foreign policy which is based on our traditional values and on the experience gained during freedom struggle and in the post-independence era. Non-alignment is the cornerstone of our foreign policy. The United Front Government will closely adhere to the consensus. We have made it very clear and so far as the other issues which you raised are concerned, I will tell you very frankly that 28th is the deadline for the Geneva Conference and I will consult senior leaders. I am not going to announce anything right now. It is not a thing to be announced in this House. When I came to your house, you suggested some ideas. I

will consult senior leaders. It is a very serious matter, a very important matter. I will consult all the Opposition leaders and before making any final decision in this regard, I must weigh both the sides what will be the advantage and what will be the disadvantage. On both the sides, I will take the views of senior leaders and then I will make a final decision. As I am there as the Prime Minister, I have to take the final decision. I will try to protect the interest of the nation first, the other issues are secondary for me. Without compromising the interest of the nation, the security of the nation, if anything that could be possible on the advice of your senior leaders, I will take a decision very soon ... (Interruptions). Shri George Fernandes has given about 15 questions on the fertilisers issue. He has written me a letter and he asked me to reply to all those 15 questions... (Interruptions) Shall I read the questions and the answers?... (Interruptions) He has framed 15 questions.

KUMAI MAMATA BANERJEE : He will frame 100 questions everyday.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : I think 10 questions per day were framed by one seniormost jurist in those days. I do not want to comment about it, because he was the former Law Minister. He had framed 10 questions per day during the days of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. If you want to frame 100 questions per day, I have no objection... (Interruptions) I have also taken them seriously.

Sir, with all sincerity at my command, I would like to make myself clear - whether you will like it or not - that I am a firm believer in God and I will tell you one thing. I am not going to mix matters. I am a firm believer in God and that is why, I said that destiny has brought me here. I never expected that I am going to be the Prime Minister and that was not my life ambition. There is no excitement for me. I was a little hesitant to accept this responsibility.

With all sincerity at my command, I would like to make myself clear that any Congress leader - you may believe it or you may not believe it—up-till now, has never discussed anything about this particular issue with me. I would like it very clear to the nation that nobody has come to me. I can swear that nobody has interfered in this matter up-till now and I have not asked the C.B.I. to cover up anything in the matter. I have come before this House to inform as to what has happened up-till now. I can give only that much of information to the House now. I cannot give anything beyond that, because there are various phases of enquiry. The full enquiry has not been completed and we have to send our people to trace the money, to find out where the end point is. Within a short span of time, within two or three days we will take the decision. Our former Prime Minister and the

Leader of the Opposition had seen that file and he had signed it...*(Interruptions)* Against me also, several photocopies have been taken in 1987. Chandra Shakhari is sitting here. The destiny has brought me here. What can I do?...*(Interruptions)* But they have tried outside. That is another thing. Do not bother about it.

I will read out what actually the report I have received from the Department :

"The National Fertilizers Ltd. (NFL) had entered into a long term contract with M/s. Karsan Ltd., Ankara for supply of 2 lakh metric tonnes of bagged urea at a price of US \$ 190 per metric tonne on cost and freight (c&f) basis. The contract was signed on 9.11.95 for total value of US \$ 38 million. Shri C.K. Ramakrishnan, MD, NFL (under suspension from 24.5.96) approved the signing of the deal at his level, exceeding his delegated powers.

The terms of the contract envisaged 100 per cent advance payment to the seller who was to supply urea within five months of the payment. At the request of M/s. Karsan Limited, NFL credited the amount of US \$ 37.62 million to their account at Pictet Bank, Geneva, Switzerland on 5.12.95. One per cent of the contract value amounting to US \$ 0.38 million was released on 2.11.95 to enable the seller to take a Lloyds Insurance Policy, which was purported to cover the risk against non-performance as well as non-delivery of urea.

In January, 1996, NFL sought the authorisation of Government of India to import 2 LMT of urea to be delivered between February-April, 1996. This authorisation was accorded on 29.1.96. On 13.2.1996 during a review of the performance of the canalising agencies, NFL was unable to provide firm shipping details against the above contract. Thereafter the matter was taken up repeatedly with the then MD, NFL and he was asked on 16.2.96 and 23.2.96 to provide details of the shipping schedules and also indicate the safeguards taken to ensure security of funds advanced in contravention of established guidelines and procedure. Only an interim reply on 6.3.96 was given by MD, NFL stating that he was assessing the situation and would revert within a fortnight. On 20.3.96, MD was reminded again but before any reply could be received, the news about the deal appeared in the Press by Financial Express on 22.3.96, followed by a series of write ups.

It was decided with the approval of the then Minister of Chemicals and Fertilizers to depute teams of officers of NFL and the Department to Ankara, Turkey to make an on the spot assessment of the

party's credentials as well as their inclination to perform. Accordingly, two teams were despatched, the first comprising the new ED (Marketing), NFL and the additional Chief Vigilance Officer, NFL was despatched on 3.4.1996. The team was subsequently joined by the Joint Commissioner (Fertilizers Supply and Distribution). Another team comprising MD, NFL and Director (Vigilance of the Department reached on 17.4.96. They were able to interact with the Chief Executive of M/s. Karsan Ltd. only on 23.4.1996. The Indian Embassy was associated to assist the teams. Based on the assessment of the Director (Vigilance) that the urea would not be forthcoming, approval of the then Minister of Chemicals and Fertilizers was taken for handing over the case to the CBI. It was stated in the reference made to CBI on 25.4.96 that there appeared to be a criminal conspiracy and misconduct on the part of the public servants."

18.00 hrs.

In the intervening period, NFL Board has held an emergency meeting on 27.3.96 and ordered a vigilance enquiry after finding that the deal was executed with undue haste and without due verification of the credentials of the party. The Executive Director (Vigilance), NFL, enquired into the matter and gave his report on 11.4.96. Confirming that the entire deal was ill conceived, he advised that if substantial shipments of urea are not made before 4.5.96, the entire case may be handed over to the CBI.

The then Managing Director, NFL, kept assuring even upto the first week of May 1996 that the goods would be delivered. In fact, on the basis of assurance and messages from the seller, he informed on 29.4.96 that three ships containing 25,000 tonnes of urea each would arrive in May 1996. However, no shipments came in the month of May. This proved beyond doubt the dishonest intentions of the party. Another significant revelation was made on 15.5.96 that the Lloyds Insurance policy was only a marine insurance and did not cover the risk of non-performance by the seller. This established the fraudulent nature of the deal. On 19.5.96, Executive Director (Vigilance), NFL, lodged a criminal complaint with CBI against two Turkish nationals, Tuncay Alankus and Cihan Kranci, the Chief Executive and Vice-President of M/s. Karsan Limited, respectively, their Indian agent, Shri M. Sambhasiva Rao and Shri D.S. Kanwar, former Executive Director (Marketing), NFL.

After consulting the Cabinet Secretary and the Chief Vigilance Commissioner, it was decided on 24-5-96 with the approval of the then Prime Minister, who also held the charge of the Department of



Fertilizers, to place Shri C.K. Ramakrishnan under suspension and entrust the additional charge of Managing Director, NFL to Shri A.V. Singh, Chairman and Managing Director, Hindustan Fertilizers Corporation.

On 27.5.96, the CBI sought concurrence for registering a regular case against Shri C.K. Ramakrishnan as he was a Board level functionary. Necessary concurrence was given on 28-5-96. The CBI arrested Shri C.K. Ramakrishnan and Shri D.S. Kanwar, former Executive Director (Marketing) on 1.6.96. This was followed by the arrest of M. Sambhasiva Rao.

For recovery of the advance payment, NFL is filing an Arbitration case in the International Chamber of Commerce against M/s. Karsan Limited. They have also alerted Interpol through CBI for keeping a watch on the above-mentioned executives of M/s. Karsan Limited.

Sir, this is the report which I have received.

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad) : Sir, it is 6 o'clock now. The time has to be extended.

MR. SPEAKER : You are very right. Since it is 6 o'clock, with the approval of the House, we shall continue with the discussion on the Confidence Motion till it is completed.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA : The enquiry by the CBI is still going on and, after completion of the enquiry, I am going to place all necessary materials before the House. As the enquiry is still on, apart from this, I cannot give any more information to the House. In respect of those queries which Shri George Fernandes had raised, I have got ready replies. There is no need for any suppression of the facts. The Director, CBI, is completely in-charge, who is monitoring the entire enquiry. Several people have been summoned and the enquiry is going on. So, at this stage, I cannot reveal any further information till the enquiry is completed.

Yesterday, a mention was made about the killings in Doda District in Kashmir. It is a history which is known to everyone, to all the senior leaders. In fact, the BJP manifesto also mentions that it should be declared as a disturbed area.

I do not want to take an extreme step now as we are going to hold the election in the near future. There is no need of taking such an extreme step of declaring it as a distress area. I would like to assure this House that as early as possible the elections are going to be held to the Assembly and then the elected Government will take care of the area.

So far as taking action to prevent such heinous crimes is concerned, the Government of India will

take all necessary steps to put out the crime with heavy hands. I do not want to take much of your time. With these words, I would like to request with all humbleness and with all humility, all Members of this House to give their approval for us, to extend their support and to vote the Motion of Confidence.

MR. SPEAKER : 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."

*The motion was adopted*

18.07 hrs.

## VALEDICTORY REFERENCES

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : May I take this opportunity of thanking the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, all the Leaders of the political parties and all hon. Members for this lively Session and for your co-operation though sometimes it came to me very reluctantly? I put on record my sincere thanks to all of you.

On behalf of Lok Sabha, I would also like to thank the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Doordarshan and All India Radio who had enabled the entire proceedings of the House to be seen by millions of people because of the live coverage. I thank them on your behalf.

(SHRI H.D. DEVE GOWDA) : Before your good self adjourns the House, I would like to express my thanks to the entire House for having passed this Confidence Motion unanimously. ... (Interruptions)

Sir, our senior-most leader, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has said that there is no need for division and we do not want division. Therefore, I thought it was unanimous. Anyway, I would like to make one or two announcements.

There is no question of mixing any politics so far as developmental works is concerned.

I want to assure the House that for any hon. Member of this House, any time before 9 to 9.30 in the night and in the morning at 8 o'clock, I am available when I am at headquarters. There is no question of any hesitation to any member. This is one thing I would like to make myself clear.

There is no mixing of politics so far as development works is concerned. I want to make it very clear.