

There are some policies in the country, on which there is a broad consensus. The former Government also sought consensus. It has been from the days of Nehru. When I spoke for the first time on foreign policy, I told Panditji that the non-aligned policy was not his personal policy. Even if you had not been here, the country would have followed the path of non-alignment. The country cannot make the mistake of aligning with any particular group. We are a very strong and vast country and can not be cowed down. We fought for our independence and for the freedom of other nations. How can we align with any group? Non-alignment was the right policy which the nation has pursued.

13.00 hrs.

But due to the end of the cold war, new problems are emerging. Security situation has deteriorated all around us. In such a transitional phase, pressures are expected to rise - economic pressure as well as security pressure. As far as our Government is concerned, we will not succumb to any pressure. This assurance I want to give you. And I am sure that the entire nation and the House will extend its cooperation to me in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would conclude my speech after lunch.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Prime Minister, I should inform you that the total time available for the BJP is one hour and fifty-six minutes out of which one hour and seventeen minutes have already been consumed.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am just informing. The Prime Minister can take any amount of time.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What about the interruptions?

13.01½ hrs.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT RE: PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Members, I have to inform that under Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure, I have nominated the following Members as Members of the Panel of Chairmen :

1. Shri Chitta Basu
2. Shri Nitish Kumar
3. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee

4. Shri P.M. Sayeed
5. Shrimati Vijaya Raje Scindia
6. Prof. Rita Verma

13.02 hrs.

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

14.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled After Lunch at One Minute past Fourteen of the Clock*

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

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

[Translation]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, while concluding my speech, I want to raise one issue.

There is unanimity in the House and in the country that due to historical reasons and due to the shortcomings in our social set up, justice has not been meted out to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Equal opportunity was not available to them and therefore they kept on lagging behind. They could not keep pace with the other groups of the society. The framers of our Constitution had reflected on this and provided for reservations, for the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other Backward Classes, who are socially and educationally backward. All decisions on reservations were taken unanimously. There has been a consensus on this. After the verdict of the Supreme Court on this issue, it has been decided that regarding reservations for the Backward Classes, status quo would be maintained, i.e., in those states where reservation is more than 50 percent, it would continue. But in other States, reservations for the Backward Classes should not exceed 50 percent. Dr. Ambedkar also, in the Constituent Assembly supported the view that the reservation limit should be 50 percent. The remaining 50 percent should be left for competition. In this, the Supreme Court also discussed the issue of creamy layer. It was of the view that a Committee should be set up to identify the creamy layer. The backwards among the Backwards should be benefited first. Late Shri Karpooi Thakur of Bihar was concerned for the poorest among the poor. Those among the Backward Classes who are prosperous, who have lands, have influence in the village, are capable of progressing on their own. They are capable of standing on their

own feet. There is no need for reservation for such people. But several States did not implement the Supreme Court's verdict on this issue honestly. Different reasons have been given and attempts have been made to make that verdict infructuous. In this connection there is a need to formulate a clear and definite policy after consulting all political parties and discussing different groups in the society.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is another aspect to this problem. We are committed to social justice. Justice should be done to those who have been denied it so far, and at a faster pace. Discrimination should end in society. Help of the law has been sought for this. While doing away with disparities it is essential that social ill-will should not be fomented and casteism should not be encouraged. Today, the country seems to be divided on the issue of casteism. This poison of casteism is spreading in all classes of society. So much so that it can not be said with certainty that, services remain unaffected with casteism. This situation is worrisome for all. The nation is already beset with communal problem and if we do not take care of this problem, then a new problem will arise, which will harm the social structure and create problems in the villages i.e. in every corner of the country. We need social equality and social harmony also.

We took steps to institute and develop Panchayati Raj Institutions, ensured participation of all, specially gave the women their right. If best results of this step is to be achieved, then along with that, a change in outlook in this regard is also essential.

I am sure that the House would also pay attention to this question. And a unanimous policy in this regard would be formulated, that would strengthen social justice without disturbing the social harmony. Harmony does not imply that social evils should be tolerated. Nor does it mean that the backwards and oppressed should be maltreated. But harmony means that, we all being the sons and daughters of mother India, we have to solve our problems amicably. We should feel the pains of others and respect their sentiments. Any reform, bereft of inherent mercy or sentiment, can be effective only partially. But cannot bring permanent change in the society. The need is for steps to be taken to usher in permanent change in society.

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : Is the Leader of the Opposition not speaking?...*(Interruptions)* I am on a point of information.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is our choice.

SHRI RAM NAIK : It might be your choice. But I am asking the Speaker as to whether the Leader of the Opposition in speaking or not.

MR. SPEAKER : That is the internal decision of the party.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (Baramati) : Before opposing this no-confidence motion, I offer my tributes to the respected late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of modern India. He was a true democrat and always held Parliamentary democracy in high esteem. For several years he was present in the Parliament to safeguard democracy. I seek his forgiveness that, today a person is Prime Minister who has not majority in the House and democracy has been shamed...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK : Last time, who got the majority.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please take you seat. You have no right to intervene.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I respect the Prime Minister very much. He is a gentleman. He is honourable. Though in the Sangh Parivar, he has maintained his poetie feelings. And has always tried to have balanced views. He has also tried to steer his party towards Gandhian Socialism. When the Babri Masjid was demolished...*(Interruptions)* He said,

[English]

I am misfit in politics.

[Translation]

Even after respecting him so much, I ...*(Interruptions)*... Even after respecting him so much, I consider it my duty to oppose the confidence motion, because far from getting a majority, he has not got even on-third seats. And he has occupied here...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad) : How many seat have you got?

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : After getting support of all colleagues...*(Interruptions)* Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am feeling it very painful. You are sitting at this place without getting even one-third seats. They may have to repent over this act. I can understand your agony. The Bhartiya Janata Party has come into power and crores of people of this country have become more concerned. It seems that they will not be able to get support of more than 190 M.Ps...*(Interruptions)* Even then the hon'ble President invited the BJP to form the Government being the single largest Party. I have no grudge against it. But I am surprised that if they knew...*(Interruptions)* If they did not have full support,

why did they try to form the Government? They have disgraced the democracy in some way. They do not have the majority. The number of votes polled in their support is less in comparison of that of Congress Party. It is claimed that they have got the mandate but they got less votes as against Congress ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali) : Hon. Speaker, Sir, I have got a point of order.

SHRI SURESH KALMADI (Pune) : Under what rules are you raising it?

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA : Sir, the hon. President had invited Mr. Vajpayee to form the Government. It is an aspersion on the hon. President.

[Translation]

They say that they had disgraced...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Point of order can be raised under a specific rule. What is the rule under which you are raising it? You were a Chief Justice of High Court, you should know the rule.

DR. DEBI PROSAD PAL (Calcutta North East) : They were fully aware that they cannot form the Government by any means...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : It has been said that BJP has got mandate. Mr. Speaker, Sir, BJP has got less votes as compared to Congress. BJP has got not a single seat in 19 States of India. At the same time, it has got no support. Except getting one seat in Assam it has got not even a single seat in the entire North-East, West Bengal, Orissa, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Goa and Punjab States. In spite of this, it is said that they have got mandate. Here, it has been said repeatedly...*(Interruptions)* Whatever you are saying, is absolutely right. This time congress has not got good response. I agree with it, but it is a fact that the Congress has got seats in 26 States. In this House the BJP represents only a few parts of the country whereas, I am glad to say that, today the Congress Party represents the most of the biggest parts of the country. This is the situation.

Sir, has the BJP got more seats in comparison with the seats which the Congress Party got in 1989? Then, why they are making false claim that they have got mandate? You may remember that the Congress Party had got more seats earlier, under the leadership of late Rajivji, in comparison with the seats won by the BJP today in this House. But Rajivji never claimed to form the Government without getting

majority. He always saved the dignity of political and democratic set up of this Institution. When Shri Morarji Desai had resigned from the Prime Ministership, the hon'ble President had given a chance to late Yashwant Rao Chavan to form the Government. But since he did not have absolute majority, in the House, he had not formed the Government. This is also a history of Parliament of this country...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE : He had tried ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : Not at all. He did not take oath on knowing that he has not absolute majority...*(Interruptions)* I do not know as to who has given advice...*(Interruptions)* He has broken the vow of celibacy for unknown bride. Those who always talk of morality, are enjoying power today in spite of having no hope for absolute majority in the House. It is good that the people of this country have experienced the Government of BJP during the last 8 to 10 days. It will be written in the history of our country that by staking false claim of getting absolute majority, BJP has blemished the democratic tradition of the country for getting power only for a few days. They can make themselves to forget it but not this House and the country too.

Galib has said :

"Maine Mana ki Kuchh Nahin Galib,  
Muft Me Aaye To Bura Kya Hai."

It was said by the BJP that unless the Party gets 225 seats, it will not make claim for Prime Ministership. They will not, be allowed to indulge in horse trading after forming the Government. Today, hon'ble Prime Minister has also said here that they do not want to indulge in horse trading. I do not want to speak more over this. But on the basis of what has been published in the newspaper, I want to tell about whatever has happened during the last 5-10 days. Many Members who are sitting in this House know it. They know as to why they were contacted. They know about the suggestions, they were given. But I want to know as to why they tried to form the Government in spite of not having majority in the House. I am sure that they wanted to resort to horse trading. It is unfortunate for them and it is our good luck as well that nobody cooperated with them. It has been mentioned by the Prime Minister while replying on the President's Address that he has made efforts to gain majority. It is true that there is mention in the Presidents Address about Article 370 and the issue of Ayodhya Temple.

It is also true that no mention has been made in the President's Address about common civil code. Whatever change we are experiencing, it not true. The point of national consensus which has been raised today is also not a change. The Government of Maharashtra should once again think over Shri

Krishan Commission. It is not a change whatever had been said yesterday. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is a senior leader of the BJP. BJP-Shiv Sena alliance is ruling in Maharashtra for the last one year. They scrapped the Shri Krishan Commission and got the good work stopped there and rendered help to save gundas. So I would like to ask the hon'ble Prime Minister as to why he was keeping mum that time? ...*(Interruptions)* This change and generosity is only for getting power. There is no intention of change behind this generosity.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a couplet in Urdu "Mere Shahar Ki Inayaton Se Bachkar Rahe, Yeh Sir Ka Bohh Nahin Sir Uttaar Leti Hain."...*(Interruptions)* You may think over the developments which have taken place during the last five or six days. When they could not succeed in getting majority, they started saying that the election will be held again in the country and Parliament will be dissolved ...*(Interruptions)* To whom this threat has been given? We are not afraid of this threat. The forces having faith in secularism, are still alive and they will prove majority...*(Interruptions)* Congress Party could not get good response in the Lok Sabha elections. In this context Hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed some views before the House. I agree that our number has decreased...*(Interruptions)* The situation like this generally arise in the life of Political Parties. I remember that I was also elected and had opportunity to sit in this House when out of 80, only two member were elected from your Party...*(Interruptions)* Remember the economic condition of the country was very bad five years back. At that time Congress Party had taken several important steps under the leadership of the Prime Minister Narasimha Raoji to improve the economic condition.

What was the condition of Punjab five years ago? Now I think that there is no need to say that there is peace in Punjab. The election process has been completed in a proper way in Punjab. With the initiative of Congress, democracy has been revoked there. Then election process started in Kashmir. BJP was one of the Parties which were crying for election process. In this way, participating in the elections the people of Kashmir have shown the entire country that the steps taken by the Congress Party to begin election process were right. The people of Kashmir were satisfied with these steps. You had protested the election process in Kashmir ...*(Interruptions)* During these five years we have completed so many good works but we could not approach the people to tell them about these good works...*(Interruptions)* and we had to pay its cost ...*(Interruptions)*. It is not so that Congress Party has never faced defeat after Independence. Congress had faced defeat twice before this. In spite of that they continued their work for upliftment of backward classes and also maintained relation with them. I would like to say

that though we were defeated and our number has decreased but there is no doubt that Congress Party will start its work to strengthen the people of the entire country, particularly backward classes. Observing the condition of the country hon'ble Prime Minister said that our country needs stability. On this point I agree with him. He said that we should pay attention to the progress made by the neighbouring countries. I agree with him but this may be possible only when the forces having faith in social and national unity will be strengthened. You may call that a coalition Government but unless that coalition comes into power our country can not make progress. We oppose the BJP because we do not agree with its ideology.

Today, hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed his views on secularism. The question is that only expression of views is not sufficient but people be assured on the action taken to implement them. RSS and its associate BJP have faith in the antiquated Hindu nationalism. They published the ideology of Hindutva and Hindu nationalism in their election manifesto. They assured to construct the controversial Ram temple. Yesterday, during a meeting in Lucknow the hon'ble Prime Minister had spoken about construction of Ram temple ...*(Interruptions)* BJP says that they are committed to construct Ram temple but Mathura and Kashi are not included in their agenda. The question is not about Ram temple but the RSS is a organisation which has multi-voices...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : What are you doing?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : What are you doing? Please sit down.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : BJP says that it is committed to construct Ram temple but Mathura and Kashi are not at its agenda. But its ally Vishva Hindu Parishad talks of constructing temples in Mathura and Kashi too.. What is your reaction to this fact?...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : What is this, Sir?...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please, look here. You are all responsible Members of this House. The whole country is watching you. Live telecast is going on. Please behave decently. You are all representatives of the people.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : I felt very happy when the hon'ble Prime Minister said here that there



should be no discrimination in the name of religion. Only one muslim representative has been elected in the BJP in the 11th Lok Sabha polls. It has been published in the latest issue of 'Economics' of London that-

[English]

"BJP has a few ornamental Muslims in its ranks."

[Translation]

Sikandr Bakht became happy after hearing this. I though that Shri Sikandr Bakht is not an ostentatious person. He supported BJP even after demolition of Babri Mosque. I know that keeping in view his seniority and whole heartedly service rendered for BJP for so many years, he will get Ministership but even after taking an oath of Ministership he had to wait for 5 to 6 days for a good department. Hon'ble Prime Minister says that there should be no discrimination in the name of religion. I agree with him on this point. Does any action seems? BJP wants to rule the country on the basis of only 23 percent votes it has got in the elections. When we protested it, they started publicising that a conspiracy was being done against the BJP. Threats were given and in Mumbai, Shri Bal Thackeray said that if the BJP Government falls then there will be a civil war in the country. It proves that you have no faith in democracy. Therefore, we oppose to this motion of confidence. The news has been appearing in many newspaper for the last few days that after the Confidence Motion is defeated by a large number of votes, there will be no stability in the country. I would like to say only that today, all secular Parties have united and they have absolute majority in the House. I think that there is some difference between the policies of several Parties and our Congress Party but there is a need to stability in the country. Some time there is political compulsion but at last some Parties having faith in unity and secularism in the country are trying to unite, therefore, Congress has decided to support the United Front from outside. Untill they follow the policy for advancement of the poor people, Congress Party will continue to give its support to such Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose the motion of confidence of the BJP Government in this House. This House fulfills the hopes and aspirations of crores of people of this country. Therefore, it is necessary to say before this House that the country has not faith in this minority Government. Therefore, it is, my moral and national duty to oppose this motion of confidence.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Hajipur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Confidence Motion. I was in favour of bringing No-Confidence Motion. I was listening to the Speech of Shri Vajpayee with apt attention. I, personally have full regard for

Vajpayeeji. But for the first time I found that his speech was neither sharp nor had any specific direction...*(Interruptions)*

14.41 hrs.

(Shri P.M. Sayeed in the Chair)

It may be that I could not understand but the whole country is listening to him. I was looking at Shri Atalji. He himself was feeling that today his speech was not that sharp and effective ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly do not interrupt. You are a senior Member. You know, when he yields to you then only you can speak. Please do not interrupt.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I have not said anything which requires any comment from him. I would like to make some points.

First of all I would like to submit that this Government has said something about mandate. Just now Sharadji has replied to it. It is correct that public of this country has not given mandate to any political party. This mandate is in favour of coalition Government. It is also clear that this mandate is in favour of secular forces. You got a mandate of 23 percent, United Front has got a mandate of 45 percent and 28 percent mandate is in favour of Congress Party. Except the 23 percent, remaining mandate is in favour of Secular forces and this is the first occasion in the history of India. Leave the point of Secular party...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, no. This is not the way. You are a senior Member. You should know.

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this mandate is in favour of secular forces and regional parties. If you look into this election result, you will find that mandate is against Communal forces and this is the only reason that inspite of support from rich class, allurements and threatening they could not buy a single independent M.P...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please resume your seats.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are a senior Member. You will have an opportunity to speak.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon. Minister is raising a point of order.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. Ram Vilas Paswanji has used a word that 'not a single M.P. could be bought'. He should say that not a single MP joined them. Whether it is a market for saleable people and not a single MP could be bought. This word should be expunged from the proceedings... (Interruptions) He should say 'not a single MP joined them' or he should use some other correct word for it... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please resume your seat.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Right. I accept your amendment, not a single MP joined them. Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say not even one percent... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDAMBI PRASAD YADAV (Gonda) : Janata Dal split and its Members were bought. Can they reply to it?... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please cooperate with the Chair. Kindly be seated.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly be seated.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Hon. Members, may I request all of you? A serious discussion is going on. Please cooperate with the Chair.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : They are all new Members. Let them also understand. When you get the opportunity, you can put forth your points.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I may have to name that Member. Everytime he is getting up. I will name you if you stand up again. Do not do like that.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this party does not have even one percent mandate of the minorities. Just now Sharad Pawarji has said that they did not get the mandate at all in Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Orissa West Bengal,

Tripura, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Assam and North-East... (Interruptions) I do not claim that Janta Dal has got mandate. I have said that we have got the mandate collectively. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, Sir, our colleagues were very much annoyed at that. The hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee ji has just 194 hon. Members in all whereas. We have 321; I have with me... (Interruptions) Now these have become purchased. Now it has become Parliamentary and at that time Sushmaji was giving us sermons. Now it is said that they have been purchased and it has become Parliamentary... (Interruptions)

SHRI RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer) : In which language are you speaking?

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Ram Vilasji, you may please address the Chair. Otherwise, you will be inviting trouble from them.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has said that he does not believe in horse trading but in manipulation. On the basis of that with a strength of 194 M.P.'s this Government wants to win majority... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : If there is anything objectionable, the hon. Prime Minister can deal with it while giving the reply.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Kindly be seated. Please resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : No no, please be seated.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please be seated.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is better if my friend Ram Vilas Paswanji concludes without creating any controversy. I have not said that I believe in manipulation... (Interruptions) and I refute this change... (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when Atalji was speaking then Somnath Babu, myself, Mulyam Singhji and other from our side had requested. Our members not to interrupt him. there were only a few interruptions.

When Sharad Pawarji and Vilasji were speaking. I would like to urge upon Atalji through you that we should condemn such things even if someone from your side or from our side has said otherwise. A very serious discussion is going on here, which is being watched by the entire nation. Therefore, my submission to him is that he should ask his colleagues to maintain decorum. We have done so Somnath Babu along with myself have done so ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Sharad Yadavji, I agree with you...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Atalji has gone thrice to pacify his people...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : If need be then I will do so the fourth time also but, it should be in a limit. I am urging upon my friends to keep restraint ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I request all the leaders to ask these Members to be cautious since a very good discussion is taking place.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : When any allegation is made by the treasury benches against us it is our duty to give its' reply. Likewise, if we level any charge against them, it is their duty to respond accordingly. There is no need at all of any sort of excitement in it. The hon. Prime Minister has levelled charge on us and has remarked that a weird assortment of heterogeneous elements. If it is so, then we would like to know of the Bhartiya Janta Party and its allies like Akali Dal, Samta party and Shiv Sena have the same policies. whether they are not a motley group? Does the hon. Prime Minister support the Anandpur Sahib resolution. Did not the Bhartiya Janta party support the Operation Blue-Star?

Mr. Chairman. Sir. I have said that these days the politics of convenience is going on. If some party gives its' support to the Bhartiya Janta Party then it becomes the 'gangotri' and ideal party and if it does not support then it becomes the worst party. My submission is that such things should not be said and at least this Government does not have the right to speak about morality.

He has just now said that the hon. President has invited him but the then President had also invited Shri Y.B. Chavan who very humbly had told the President that he would make his position clear after two days. Only after his position clear after two days. Only after his denial, the others were invited to form the Government. Likewise when Atal Bihariji was invited, he did not know that he would be invited to form the Government and we also came to know about it from the newspapers. When he was invited, he should have told that he would decide after

consulting his colleagues. I would like to know if they have held discussions with the Akali Dal, Samta Party, Shiv Sena and the Haryana Vikas Party? Why did he go there and accept the invitation? If they had said that they would prove their majority later on, then it would have been understandable but different opinion started coming in, someone said that it is upto God, Sushmaji gave a different opinion and our colleague Mahajanji gave a different opinion - they tried all the measures. The head of Shiv Sena said that if their Government falls then there will be a civil war in the country and it will be divided and the hon. Minister of Home Affairs said that if this Government falls it will lead to disintegration of the country. One Government will come another will go - ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR (Mumbai North West).: Sir, I am on a point of information.

*[Translation]*

Since, he is speaking about Shiv Sena ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you on a point of order? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : I am on a point of information.

*[Translation]*

Such things can not be said here, about which he does not have full information ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : No. I cannot allow any point of information.

*[Translation]*

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : He has said.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : If there is anything, you can reply to it when you speak.

*[Translation]*

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : When he has said something it should be allowed to speak.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : If he yields, I do not mind. Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan, are you yielding?

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : No.

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : Unless he knows fully, he should not make any allegation against somebody.

[Translation]

Nothing wrong should be said... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : I have not mentioned anyone's name.

[English]

SHRI MADHUKAR SIRPOTDAR : Sir, he is not supposed to make any allegation when the person concerned is not present in the House... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman Sir, we want that this Government should fall at the earliest. We have selected only 4-5 speakers from our party to speak so that the uncertainty present in the country come to an end. I know that the ruling party will make all efforts to prolong this discussion but I am sure that at the time of voting on this motion, this Government will fall certainly. Then there will be no civil war in the country and this country is also not going to disintegrate. The parties will continue to divide. Parties will keep on splitting; we all will also keep on breaking, everything will disintegrate but the democracy will go on as usual in the country. I do not believe that the country will be saved if the BJP Government survives or it will disintegrate if the BJP Government falls flat on the ground.

This country is great. It will never disintegrate at any cost. The people of the country are great. Your slogan shouting will not do anything. You had majority Government in four states namely Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan. You could have ruled for five years in Uttar Pradesh but the way you have entangled and thrown the law, the rule of law to the wind intricating the constitutional framework to shreds in the very first year, the people of Uttar Pradesh discarded and deprived you of the majority, when elections were held immediately after that. The people of this country are great. The secularism has marked its victory over here. The country will not at all pay any heed to your threats. I can assure you that if my Government survives, it will falsify all the presumptions cherished by you.

I admit, as stated by him, that fall of the Government is not a new thing but I would like to know what made the fall of our Government in 1977 after emergency, the issues of R.S.S. and dual membership were responsible for it. Again, who engineered the fall of our Government in 1990 which was formed in 1989?... (Interruptions)

Our Government was in power in 1990. Hon. Prime Minister has just shifted his statement from religious fanaticism to casteism. Does his party not consist of backward people or people having faith in Mandal? What was the reason behind mentioning the name of Ram? I had stated earlier that Ram-Ram Vilas Paswan — is sitting here. Is it in Shri Atal 'Bihariji' or Shri Murli Manohar Joshi Ji? Ram is already sitting here... (Interruptions)

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : Ram is in our culture. The name of Lord Ram is being insulted here... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, There is no question of interruption in it, then why are they interrupting... (Interruptions) I am not yielding.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : If there is anything objectionable, I will remove it.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA (Padrauna) : Mr. Chairman, Sir... (Interruptions)\*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will go on record.

15.00 hrs.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was stating that our Government in 1990 was working in the interest of the poor, the dalit, the backward and weaker sections of the society and had our Government not implemented Mandal Commission and not worked for backward classes, this Ram Rath would not have been brought on the road.

Ram Rath was brought to counter the Mandal and usurp the rights of the poor which resulted into fall of our Government. I would also like to add that both the times it was the R.S.S. which was instrumental in the fall of our Government. Therefore whether it was in 1977 or in 1990, our Government fell due to R.S.S. This time we are going to form the Government of secular forces and it will last till five years... (Interruptions).

Just now Hinduism was mentioned. I want to thank the people of this country and I am proud of the fact that the people who are talking of Hindu Nation today, they should not forget that every one had contributed a lot in the freedom of this country. Khudiram Bose and Sardar Bhagat Singh were hanged till death and Isfaquallah, a Muslim, who had

\* Not Recorded

said, "Sarfarsi ki tamanna ab hamare dil mein hai; dekhna hai jor kitna bajuye katil mein hai." was also hanged till death.

Sir, the state has no religion of its own. The state is neither Hindu, nor Muslim nor Sikh. Water has only one quality, one religion. Nobody would like to put his finger in hot water but the cold water is useful for all. In the same way state too has a religion and that is the religion of justice. But if you add Hindu, Islam or Khalistan to it then it will lose the very concept of justice.

I know that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has something else in his mind and expresses something else under pressure and he has demonstrated this time and again.

He talks of Hindu nation. We can very well see that there are Hindu Chief Ministers in all the states, be it Prafull Kumar Mahanta, the Chief Minister of Assam, J.B. Patnaik, the Chief Minister of Orissa, Jyoti Basu the Chief Minister of West Bengal, be it the Chief Minister of Tripura, the Chief Minister of Bihar, Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav, the Chief Minister of Delhi Sahib Singh Verma, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Shri Digvijaya Singh, the Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh, Shri Veer Bhadra Singh, the Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Shri Bhairon Singh Shekhawat, Shri Bansi Lal who has become the Chief Minister of Haryana after Shri Bhajan Lal, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra- Shri Manohar Joshi, or Chandra Babu Naidu in Andhra Pradesh, Karunanidhi in Tamil Nadu, Naynarji in Kerala or Deve Gowda ji in Karnataka. It show that there is no Muslim Chief Minister in any state. Tell me the name of any state where any Muslim has become Chief Minister.

ONE HON. MEMBER : Antule ji had become Chief Minister.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, that microphone should be shut down.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes. I have been seeing him. Please don't repeat it. I have been observing you.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN. : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was stating that there are Hindu Chief Ministers in most of the states. President and Vice-President and Prime Minister of India are Hindus and Hindus are occupying 99 percent of the Government jobs. Only one percent jobs are with the minority people. I do not want to drag army in this matter but why the slogan of 'Hindu Nation is being raised again and again and even if it becomes a 'Hindu Nation,' what will a Hindu get more than this? When the Mandal Commission was implemented by us whether it was not meant for Hindus? Was it not meant for the

backward people? Are Yadava, Kurmi, Kori, Nai, Teli, Tamoli, Luhar, Kumhar, Chaurasia, Barhai, Mallah, Nishad, Bheel, Paswan and Chamar not Hindu?

What does Hindu mean? Whether a handful of people will rule and Muslims will only be abused? Will the people in power rule on the name of Hindu? Who is a Muslim?

It has repeatedly been said that Muslims are the progeny of Babar who came here, in 1526. When he came here, Ibrahim Lodhi was on the throne. Before Ibrahim Lodhi, Khilji dynasty was in power and prior to that Tughlak dynasty was ruling India. Before Tughlak Dynasty, there was Slave dynasty and exactly before Slave dynasty, Mohammad Gori was the ruler of India. All these rulers were not Hindus and as per the annals of History, all of them were Mughals. Historians tell us that only 1200 persons accompanied Babar to India, their number has swollen upto 12 crore. There are around 14 or 16 crore Muslims in Pakistan and Bangladesh. If this number is added to it, the number reaches upto 28 or 30 crore Muslims the progeny of Babar? I shall tell you who is a Muslim and why he embraced Islam. Here Barnala Sahab is a Sikh but by caste he is jat. Tora Sahad and Badal Sahab both are also jat and Buta Singhji is Safai Mazdoor by caste. Are these persons not Hindu? Who are these Dalit Christians or Adiwasi Christians and who are these Buddishts? 10 Lakhs people accepted Buddhism with Baba Sahab Ambedkar. All these were Dalits. Why some members of our family became Muslim? When you stopped them from entering the temple, they went to Masjid and when you did not permit them to dine with you they joined the Dastarkhan or Langar. You are not going to eradicate the evils of the religion and simply resorting to other temporary devices.

Is Uma Bharti not aggrieved? I think, all of us are anguished. Vinay Katiyar ji has been made head of Bajrang Dal just to threaten. Sikandar Bakht ji was made No.2 Minister but when time came to award him portfolio, he was given the portfolio, he held in 1977. He could not even attend the office for 10 days. Shri Suraj Bhan ji and Shri Kariya Mundaji is sitting here. Mr. Chairman, Sir, the people of the country understand everything.

Sir, when we talk of social justice, it does not mean that to provide justice to everyone in the society be it Dalit or Brahmin. India is like a garden full of flowers of each and every variety and species.

[Translation]

There are Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Dalits and also Christians. That gardener is best, in whose garden there are all types of flowers. Remember, the gardener of such a garden is dishonest, in whose garden only the Lotus flower blooms and others, wither away. Such a garden will not last.



Mr. Chairman, Sir, just now Hon'ble Prime Minister was speaking and he directly made an allegation. We know that your speech is very persuasive and you hit in different ways. You say people misappropriate fodder. I deny this. It has happened in every Government to withdraw the funds in excess of the budget provisions. Excess withdrawal of funds is not a crime. What is to ensure is that where the money is spent...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I repeat myself... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : If you look towards that side, while speaking, they would stand up.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was saying that every Government makes a budget estimate and in every department money is withdrawn in excess of the provision. The moot point to see is how the money is spent and whether it is being spent properly or not. For this, 41 officers have been suspended there. They are in jail. The Government took action. Initially judicial inquiry was demanded. Judicial commission was set up. Then CBI inquiry was demanded. The matter is sub judice. I have heard that the Chief Justice of the High Court is looking into it. The truth will come before us. Who can make allegation against your Governments. This Shiv Sena...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, can we not level charges? The Enron case took place. During the election campaign, I remember, Shiv Sena and Bharatiya Janata Party used to say that their Government would do two things. These two things are to throw Dawood Ibrahim and Enron into the Ocean. Have you thrown Enron into the Ocean? Has Enron not been allowed to act again? What charge can we level against you?...*(Interruptions)*. Just now I was witnessing that you speak of discipline. In today's edition of Navbharat Times, it has appeared. Hon'ble Prime Minister, Sir, a member of your Council of Minister, a member of your Party, Mr. Atma Ram Patel, 75 years old was beaten up in front of you and then was paraded naked...*(Interruptions)* but you could not protect him. Then how can you defend the nation. Your office is locked up. The word expressed by the Navbharat Times, relating to Bajrang Dal and RSS, is unparliamentary word. Therefore, I do not want to express it. Because if I do so, they would start shouting.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to say that to whom are you going to teach about discipline and morality...*(Interruptions)*. It is true that their office has been locked. We have received this information. The Government comes and goes. Day before yesterday we learnt how this Government is functioning. This Government is like a photostat Government. Their only work is to get the photostat. This is our Hon'ble Home Minister. Did he not ask the Home Minister

day before yesterday for the Babri Masjid file. What is Babri Masjid? Did the Home Minister's name not figure in it?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is totally wrong, absolutely false and baseless...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we know because...*(Interruptions)*. Attempt is being made from the Government's side to blackmail all the Chief Ministers. Why was the army not sent to Assam? Whereas it was so demanded by the Assam Chief Minister. Why the 15 battalions of BMP had to be sent there from Bihar? Why did not the Government of India paid due attention on this? I would like to submit that the matters of unity and integrity of the nation and corruption are there. To whom are you blaming? You are not overlooking yourself. You have not mentioned about corruptions in the President's Address. You are issuing sermons to us. Where is your national President. Why his face is not appearing here? And what about the Former Chief Minister of Delhi? In Madhya Pradesh everyone from top to bottom is involved in the hawala case. And, you talk to us on corruption.

You want to clean the Gangotri? But Gangotri is clean because the place from where it originates is full of herbs. But if its place of origin is polluted, then it can never be cleaned. Therefore, Vajpayeeji, the atmosphere around you is sullied. It is so much dirty that, if you will pour a bucket of clean water, it would be sullied. I want to request you that you did not have the mandate earlier to form the Government and you have not the same still now. Does our conscience act in the Parliamentary democracy? ...*(Interruptions)* Tomorrow when we will form our Government and appeal to the members to vote according to their conscience, then will you not issue a whip to your Members? Will you not convince your party Members? This never happens in Parliamentary democracy. Therefore, you should think over your short-comings, where ever it is. There are people from weaker sections and minority classes and you talk about secularism. But they look only communalism.

Respected Barnalaji is here. He is a very good friend. We want to work a lot together. His party is a federal Party. But their ideology is that the Centre should be strong and all the states should work under it as a peon...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA (Patiala) : Have you asked the Congress if they are ready for federal system?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Sir, through you I want to urge that we did not expect this from the Government, at least not from Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. When the President invited him being the

BJP as single largest party, then he should have said that he did not have the majority, or he should have said that he would consult all his allies and then let him know the position. But you went and took the oath. Thereafter you made immense efforts and tried every tricks to get the majority. But we want to thank each and every member of our Party and the other political parties, who saved to dignity of the Parliament by frustrating any attempt for horse trading. There are no industrialist or big capitalists of the country who did not come forward to support. Share prices started increase. Why? Do we not know? I do not know much about the economy but I do have some knowledge. Big capitalists started blindly to support the political party and such things happened. There can be no friendship between horse and grass. Horse will always eat the grass. You are celebrating the 'Janadesh Samman Divas'. I would like to request you to resign. Go from here and pave the way for secular forces. Atalji, you need not worry. We would run the secular Government smoothly for five years. We will not disappoint you.

With these words I strongly oppose this Confidence Motion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Nalanda) : Hon. Chairman, Sir, I want to speak in support of the Motion brought before the House by the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. I would like to request the House through you, that a debate has to take place in this House. I have to express my views and those who want to oppose my views may say so later on. But I have noticed that from the very beginning there is less of debate and more of uproarious scenes are being created in the House. So, I request you to tell the every Member of the House that this House is meant for debate and accordingly debate must go on. Prime Minister has truly said that if need, one must resort to interruptions but interruptions do not mean creating uproarious scenes, hence this must not be resorted to.

First and foremost, I would like to say that no political party is responsible for the present situation which is before the House or truly before the country. Neither the political party invited by the President has created this present situation nor those parties who have decided not to allow them to form the Government at any cost. This situation has been created by the voters of this country and did not give majority to any party in this House.

I do not want to repeat to remind it here but during the course of debate I found it necessary that we are forgetting to the voters who are responsible for the creation of this situation and now we are here to decide the fate of the country.

Mainly three political parties, namely : Bhartiya Janta party, National Front- Left Front now United

Front and Congress Party, went to people for mandate. One of these i.e. Congress Party had told the people forcefully that it will have the majority. National Front and Left-Front had also gone one step ahead and said that they would get the thumping majority and form the Government. Many of its leaders had said publicly that they would get three hundred seats. Some leaders of the BJP had also said that they would get the majority. But perhaps Shri Sharad Pawar has just now said about the Prime Minister that he had said that "they will refrain from forming the Government if they get less than 225 seats." It was an assessment that perhaps we will not achieve that target and may get less seats but later on it came to the light from two parties of the country that we are going to form the Government with the help of other parties. People opined that both of these parties are unable to form the Government ...*(Interruptions)*

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : We will form unitedly.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : We will reach there when you form the Government unitedly.

We will unite you both.

Please wait for that. You should wait for some time, we will unite both of you...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt.

*[Translation]*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman, Sir, whenever they interrupt, we will retort them.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Fernandes, only six minutes are allotted to your Party, so kindly address the Chair and do not look at them.

*[Translation]*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : All right. We will ask you for some more time. Ultimately you are going to decide that who will form the Government in the country and what should be the programmes of the Government. Who will run the Government for the next five years, while doing so please do us a favour for not reminding me about the time.

The President had invited. Our Party had requested the President to invite Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to form the Government. My friend Shri Ram Vilas Paswan has said here that I told something about the Samata Party. In view of the present situation the country we went to the President with a proposal duly passed that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee should be invited to form the Government.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : We had said that the policy of both the parties are different.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : It's not a matter of policy but you have said something else. Perhaps you have forgotten in the flow of your speech. You have said that we were not asked for. We should have asked for first.

[Translation]

We were asked to call them, because we have seen the condition in the country and on that basis we have expressed this point...*(Interruptions)* I am happy that the President has taken the step in a right way and we also felicitate the President and thank him that he has acted according to the democratic traditions which have been established in our country during the last several years. This situation has come up only after 1977. From 1952 to 1977, a single party had been getting majority in India for the last 25 years. In 1977, this situation changed and after 1977, this situation again came up in 1989. Again in 1991 the position was same but at that time the whole opposition Parties were divided in such a way that they were unable to stop the constitution of a minority Government. That Government was not constituted on the basis of the majority of Congress party. Actually it was constituted due to the grace of the opposition Parties. But this situation has been prevailing in the country since 1977, that how a party failed to get majority or a party having majority splitted and in this situation the President had to take a decision. A tradition has been established in our country and the President has acted according to that tradition. I was surprised to hear that our hon. Member Shri Sharad Pawar has said here that something wrong has been done.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR : I did not utter something wrong. I had said that whosoever has been invited, is the right step...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : To say slurred, will be a personal allegation. Shri Ram Vilas Paswan has said again and again that "how we went and why?" The President had invited us and as such we went. In such a way it was an attack on the decision of the President. They have said that the Government have not such courage. It is correct. But the attack was directly on the decision of the President. It could not be negated.

The second point, I want to say is, that if inviting of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was wrong and he should not go there and if he should not have constituted the Government, then who should be invited, this something wrong has been done is not enough. When you were not in the race then who should have gone? Till today, 13 parties could not prepared a common programme. You, yourself are saying that your programme has not been clalked out.

The Present Leader of Opposition, former Prime Minister and Congress President is unable to decide

that on what basis they will be repeated that something wrong has been done, how they went, it is not a way of discussion. If you do not like the established traditions of parliamentary system of this country, then amend the constitution, which is the only way out. To waste time on such a debate is not in the fitness of things.

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI (Darbhanga) : You were given only seven Minutes time and now why are you wasting the time of the House?

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will manage that. It is not your job.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : It is being said that the Government will not be allowed to be constituted or to work at any cost. We have lot of experience in this regard. Shri Nitish Kumar ji is also sitting here. It was claimed about both of us in Bihar that George Fernandes and Nitish Kumar would not be allowed to win Lok Sabha Seats from Bihar at any cost. So we have experience about this. The thinking of these leaders and that of Voters were different. The Voters of Bihar are now much matured. It has been proved by the fact that I and Nitish Kumar are in a position to be present here...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are a new Member. You should behave well. You please be seated.

Mr Rajesh Ranjan, you kindly be seated.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJESH RANJAN (Purnia) : Mr. Chairman, please listen to me. Hon. Member is uttering objectionable words against a Member of Parliament. Is it a matter of dignity for a Member of Parliament?  
*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Any such words uttered would be expunged

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI RAJESH RANJAN : They are calling a persons 'goonda'...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You kindly be seated

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ANAND MOHAN (Shivhar) : Who is Goonda in Bihar?...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Anand Mohan, please resume your seat.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman Sir, I was saying that...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura) : Mr. Chairman, please take care of the time fixed for it. I want to submit that it would be better if the time is spent on the item fixed for.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN) : Your statement has created a doubt. I have already requested the Chief whip that any time taken by George Fernandes may be deducted from my party's account.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Samta Party is allotted six minutes. The chief whip of BJP has already informed me that any time taken by Shri George Fernandes would be deducted from his account. They have got one hour and fifty minutes, apart from the time taken by the PM.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I request that time should not be wasted in this manner by creating interruptions...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : You will continue.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I will continue.

[Translation]

But my submission is that time wasted due to such interruptions should not be included in the time allotted to our party...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have no such mechanism to measure the time of interruptions. I request that interruptions may be minimised.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : We are speaking on your behalf. Whenever there is interruption, we see as to who interrupts...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please carry on.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Persons who arrogantly say that they will not allow the Government to continue, would not be allowed to do so at any cost. It would amount to disrespect to the voters. Now a new political philosophy is coming up on the basis of 20,30, or 25 percent. It means that if a party succeeds in getting one M.P. elected in getting from each state then leader of that party in the House will become Prime Minister, but if one hundred Members of another party are elected from four States, they will have to sit in opposition. They are talking of evolving new principles also. I was surprised to know from such a person who has been Defence Minister of the country and Chief Minister of a big State several times. But they should realise that it amounts to disrespect to the voters. Today, the total strength of BJP and its allies comes to 190. They say that the hon. President has committed a mistake by inviting BJP on this basis to form the Government. If they want that BJP should not be allowed to form the Government at any cost, then in case, BJP musters majority tomorrow or had BJP mustered absolute majority, then what would have been the form of democracy in this country? This question arises - because I am anticipating such threat from the manner in which debate is going on...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJESH RANJAN : These imaginary things.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : It will be like the rise of Hitler. Hitler also came that way. I need not remind you.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : If they want to discuss Hitler, we are ready for that but today we will not waste our time for that. We are ready for that discussion and would like to have discussion particularly with you on this matter. I am feeling a foul smell in this debate and line of thinking as was felt 10-5-7 years back when the Government of only one party used to rule the country and that is use of Article 356. Members of DMK party and Telugu Desam are sitting here who know how many times Article 356 has been used and for what purposes and how it affected our democracy. We have such experiences. I doubt that those people who talk today in this manner, can move towards that direction as and when they get a chance. This House will decide the fate of this Motion. We have been informed that the United Front comprising of 13 Parties, with our friend Shri Deve Gowda as its leader, will formulate a joint programme containing all the common points included in their manifestoes. I would like to know as to what common points or views are there in their manifestoes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore) : It will be decided later on... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Why later on? I have manifestoes of Janta Dal, C.P.I. CPI (M) and Telugu Desam with me. Telugu Desam Party has released its manifesto in Telugu. Translated version of manifesto of Telugu Desam Party in English has been gone through. After having gone through all these manifestoes. I think, there are two main common points in these manifestoes. First is - to curb the corruption. On this Janata Dal says -

*[English]*

"The Congress, fossilised by the family rule and poffligacy of power, has not had ever dynamic leadership or a sense of direction to retrieve its lost ground. In fact, its endless equivocation on such incandescent issues as social justice and secular order compounded by its elitist craze for economic liberalisation has only led to further erosion of its base. Since 1989,...

Sir, you must protect me. I cannot possibly speak in this kind of a situation. You must protect me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please carry on.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES :

"The Congress is now historically heading towards final disintegration. The splits and revolts, which have recently afflicted in continual instalments are unmistakable indications of this process. Even while the congress has kept contraction rapidly in terms of political and social ground, its governance during the last five years has been pockmarked by numerous scams such as the securities scandal, fraudulent disinvestment of the PSUs' shares, sugar import muddle, deals in railways, power, oil, mines and telecom sectors."

The manner in which the havala racket was suppressed and sidetracked by the Government for over four years is a scandal in itself. It is now known that the stable Government which the Congress proudly claims to have given to the country, was literally purchased, as is evident from the bulging bank accounts of some M.Ps."

*[Translation]*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is the manifesto of the Communist Party. It has been written in it-

*[English]*

"Under the Rao regime, heavy blows were struck at the secular foundations of our Republic. A sense of alienation and

insecurity overtook the minorities who do not look upon this Government as a protector of their life and property.

Corruption has reached new qualitative dimension under the Rao Government, with every passing day exposing a new scam, each bigger and more scandalous than the one earlier. Security scam, sugar scam, disinvestment scam, Bailadila deal, telecom scam, railway gauge scam, Purulia arms drop scandal, the Defence scam and now the havala racket, have polluted our democratic system and life. Even the country's security has been at stake in some of these scams."

It further says:

"The country is no longer safe in Congress hands. Its chances of gaining a majority on its own are non-existent. The Congress is clearly unable and unfit to rule the country any longer."

*[Translation]*

But it does not include one thing and that is-

*[English]*

"But now it is fit to support the National Front. It is not fit to rule any more but it is certainly fit to support them." ...*(Interruptions)*

I want to make a distinction just now to help you out. Here is the CPI (M) manifesto. It says:

"These five years have seen totally unprecedented levels of institutionalised corruption. The hallmark of the Narasimha Rao regime has been the exponential growth of both the number of scams and the amount looted through them. No area was left untouched, no stone unturned to loot public assets by the criminal ruling-party-politician-businessman-bureaucrat nexus. The Congress party is now a political party with no internal democracy and is plagued by internecine quarrels. It has turned itself into an organisation whose leadership is abandoning all commitment to the national cause" ...*(Interruptions)*

I am not yielding, Sir... *(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI BHAGWAN SHANKAR RAWAT : Have you left the Congress Party forever... *(Interruptions)* or you have joined National Front?... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the last manifesto. After this I will read out some of the documents.



[English]

"The Congress Party which was in power, has not only failed to increase the standard of living of the common man but also has failed to provide the basic needs of the masses. Corruption has become a way of life for the Congress leaders. People have lost their faith in the Congress. Unending manipulations have become a habit of the ruling party. The Congress has destroyed the country's economy by following improper policies. Communal tensions, regional insurgencies and the atrocities against the lowest of the lower rung of the people, namely, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, have been incited by the Government and are being used for their benefit. This the state of our country today..." (Interruptions).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What is your manifesto?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : My manifesto you are most welcome to read and study... (Interruptions)

SHRI UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU (Bapatla): Sir, at the same time, Telugu Desam categorically said that coalition Government is the only solution... (Interruptions). You can look at the manifesto. We have categorically said that it is the coalition Government which is the only solution. You cannot go through the sentences which are convenient to you. Take out the BJP manifesto... (Interruptions)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Why should I read what you want me to read? I am just now concerned with you... (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Sir, we would like to know what the Samata Party wrote about the BJP in its manifesto. Kindly ask him to read it out

MR. CHAIRMAN : I cannot compel him to state what he has said about the BJP.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman, Sir, such a senior hon. Member is telling me what to read out. How can it be possible that I ask him what to speak? Whatever I want to say, I am saying... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : He is speaking on a No-confidence Motion against the Opposition. Let him continue.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not saying so with a view to create any problem for these people.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Speak about the confidence motion also.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I would like to know whether Shri Narasimha Raoji has read it. This charge sheet against Shri P.V. Narasimha Raoji has been published in the New-Age of C.P.I. on 23rd, 22nd, 21st and 26th of April. It is hardly one month old. It appeared after the election campaign had started.

[English]

It says that it is a charge-sheet against Narasimha Rao Government, Narasimha Rao must go. Not only Narasimha Rao Government is a corrupt one, but its policies have been anti-people in all spheres.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : It contains a number of allegations. Which I would not lie to read out... (Interruptions)

[English]

Narasimha Rao - epitome of corruption... (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : What did you say? Did Mr. Vajpayee go to him?

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : They go to meet the former Prime Minister. Did not he go to meet Atalji.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I had gone to offer him sweets

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I was felling that he was in trouble. He thinks that I was going to read it to make him laugh. I am reading it out just to make it clear, how they are claiming to form the Government... (Interruptions) For what purpose all these things were said. It was to inform the countrymen that they were against him.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Please speak on the motion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : This is the motion... (Interruptions) This is the motion as to why this Government should continue. This is the motion that the Government is not to be handed over to our people. Mr. Chairman, Sir, now comes the issue of secularism. A word English has been misused in our country. I fail to understand why it is so. I would like to make it clear who is secular and who is communal and what is its criteria. I am not advocating the Bhartiya Janta Party and any other organisation also... (Interruptions) Who issues the certificates and who can be issued the certificates. This is the document of your party, please read it also.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : What difference your comments make?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : What is the meaning of secularism? It is the document of C.P.I.M. It has the meaning of secularism. It says :

[English]

"While the BJP was trying to shed its Jan Sangh past, the Congress-I under Indira Gandhi has started floating with the Hindu vote which first became evident in Jammu elections in 1983. She was also accommodating the *Ekatmakta Yagna* launched by Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the organisation's first attempt at mass mobilization to promote the *Hindutva*. The tentative moves made by Indira Gandhi became the central motives of Rajiv Gandhi's election campaign. When he won an unprecedented mandate by raising the spectre of national disintegration at the hands of minority secessionism, the focus was on Sikh extremism in Punjab and the assassination of his mother by her Sikh bodyguards, the killing of thousands of Sikhs in Delhi and other North Indian cities in November that year from the grotesque background to the Congress-I's election campaign and father, in the recent years, the Nehruvian ideals have been jettisoned by the Congress completely. The danger of this has increased. For instance at every stage of the Ram Janam Bhoomi agitation, the Government of India compromised and helped it along."

"It was behind the opening of the locks, it allowed Shilanyas, it allowed the periodic 'Kar Seva', it stood aside to allow the demolition and finally allowed the rebuilding of a make shift temple at the site, thus legitimising the entire movement, including the demolition. Barring the farcical arrests of a handful of leaders and an equally farcical ban on the VHP, the Government failed to take any action against those who demolished the mosque or those who went on a killing spree."

[Translation]

I am reading out this statement as there is one sided hue and cry. Charges are levelled against Congress by these people. That they are communal. They have stated in their manifesto that the Congress is communal. They have given up secularism and every document speaks about it. What sort of discussion, they want to hold on secularism.

Since 1947, two non-Congress Governments were set up till date in our country. Once Morarji Bhai's Cabinet was formed and at that time there was Janta Party. All the parties united after emergency and later on in 1989 the other Government was formed, whose Prime Minister was Shri V.P. Singh. In the first Government, Jasangh was present in the form of Janta Party. In the second Government the Bhartiya Janta Party and the Left parties gave support, from outside. Leaving aside these two Governments, if we deduct 4 years out of the last 50 years then there had been the Congress Government in the Centre for 46 years. They can not deny this fact. If there had been their Government for 46 years out of 50 years then why the people belonging to the minorities feel insecure in our country? Who is responsible for it? If there is some fear among the minorities after Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has become the Prime Minister and if the question is raised as to what will be their future then I would like to know whose Government had been there for 46 years out of 50 years?

Mr Chairman Sir, I represent Nalanda constituency. There is a town Bihar Sharif in my constituency. The Muslims live there. They have around 50 thousands votes in that constituency. The half of the weavers and the Bidis workers have been starving for the last 3-4 years. There is nobody to enquire about them. There is neither any arrangement of employment for them nor there is any arrangement of selling their product. All those people have voted for me. They did not ask me, for which I am being interrupted here. The Muslims of my Constituency raised the issue of livelihood. The Bidis workers and the craftsmen asked me how we will be able to provide them employment. Who can deny today that the Muslims of our country did not get employment. They have not been given employment in Government and private sectors. It has been going on since independence. All of us and this House know in what condition the Muslims of this country are living. Who is responsible for it? Who thought about providing employment them in 46 years. They were pushed towards handicrafts and on account of the new economic policy this handicraft is also being abolished. Then they give the slogan of secularism to win votes and to run the politics of this country? Mr. Chairman, Sir, I oppose it. I have been opposing it and will continue to do so?

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to submit two or three more points. First of all, there is the issue of Hawala, which has been discussed much in the newspapers. All the parties have mentioned it in their manifestoes. When how and what has happened in Hawala, it is a separate thing but the facts become selective. The facts are to be viewed selectively. Shri Advaniji, is trapped in Hawala. It became a big issue but many other people and many other things

became part of the document. Who can deny it that those who took much money in Hawala, are from Janata Dal... *(Interruptions)* It is your publication and not mine. The then Minister of Janta Dal, Shri Arun Nehru Rs. 35 lakh, Moh. Arif Khan 7 crores 49 lakhs 46 thousands, the Chief Minister of Janta Dal Shri Chiman Bhai Patel Rs. 2 lakh and the president of Janata Dal Shri S.R. Bomai...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI B.K. GADHAVI (Banaskantha) : Sir, I am on point order. How can he name the people who are not Members of the House?...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is it you are quoting?  
*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let me find out, what is it?

*[Translation]*

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHARAF FATMI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order...

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Fatmi, he has raised a point of order. You please be seated. Let me deal with it. Whether he is from your party or not, I have to deal with it. What is it you are referring to?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I am reading 'Havala case punish all the guilty', a CPI (M) publication. This is a printed document...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI MUKHTAR ANIS : You were also a Minister in that Government. How did you join the council of such Ministers on the basis of morality?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : You should speak only after knowing the fact. Neither you nor any of you has knowledge of the history.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Are you prepared to authenticate it?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Yes, Sir, I will authenticate it.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, George Fernandesji is a very responsible Member with total knowledge of the rules, business and procedure of the House. I am not in favour or against any of the names which he is mentioning from a literature or a leaflet. I am only reminding you the procedure. Some Members are already present in the House who are supposed to be involved in the havala case. But the matter is in the court for trial. We have to find an answer whether the names of persons - who cannot defend themselves - could be repeatedly uttered here. They can defend themselves in the court of law only and not in Parliament. Is it proper on the part of George Fernandesji, who is a seasoned Parliamentarian to attribute motives on their names?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I am not attributing any motives to anybody.

*[Translation]*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did not state that I considered them culprit. I only stated that when one speaks, he utters everybody's name but one name has not been spoken out. That is what I am saying.

16.00 hrs.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, It seems, he is authenticating it. He can quote from that. The name of anybody who is not here should not be referred to as he cannot defend himself.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Please do not give such ruling. The names of those who are not present in the House cannot be referred to here. This ruling will have far reaching effect on the whole proceedings.

AN HON. MEMBER : Rule is rule.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : It is not a rule.

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : As per our established rules here, we will deal with whatever is objectionable.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh) : Any matter which is hanging in the court should not be referred to in the House.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Objectionable matter is something different but many persons who are not present here are there in the public life. They affect our policies and participate in making the policies of the country. What is objectionable in mentioning their names? I have not stopped.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I am neither attributing any motives to anybody nor blaming anyone to be Criminal...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

I am not making any allegation against anybody...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, Let me conclude my speech. I do not intend to speak more...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. CHAIRMAN : If it is pending before the court, normally the convention is that any name which is pending before the court is not referred to.

[Translation]

SHRI SATYA PAL JAIN (Chandigarh) : Paswanji has mentioned the names of Shri Sahib Singh Verma and Khuranaji. Their names should also not go on record...*(Interruptions)* Paswanji has also quoted the case of Advaniji which is subjudice...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Quoting from an authenticated document is permitted in the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have already given a ruling on that. Whatever is authenticated is permitted. Whatever is pending in the court is not referred to here.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Ram Vilas ji mentioned a case in the House which was perhaps mentioned by hon. Prime Minister in his speech. He said that whatever happened in Bihar was proper and there was nothing to wonder about that. I have a judgement of the High Court in my hand and I would like to quote some points from it ...*(Interruptions)*

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

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is on a point of order. Please hear him.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Let me see. You please leave it to my judgement, not your judgement.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sharad Yadavji, whatever is *sub judice* and is pending before the court will not form part of the proceedings.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : You have referred to the question of *sub judice*. In Kaul and Shakhder, the rules are very clear about the matter of *sub judice*. In criminal cases, a matter is not *sub judice* as far as Parliament is concerned until the charges are framed.

In civil cases, the matter is not *sub judice* until the issues are framed. In this matter, in which my friend Shri George Fernandes and what Shri Sharad ji have said, the question that simply because it is in a court of law, the Parliament be debarred from discussing it on the ground that it is *sub judice*, with respect, Sir, I submit that it is not tenable. Kaul and Shakhder is very clear on this. Our rules are very clear on this. The matter is not *sub judice*. Criminal matter is not *sub judice* unless charges are framed. Civil matters are not *sub judice* until the issues are framed. Therefore, in this blanket manner, for you to say that simply because it is in a court of law, there

shall be no reference to it, is not appreciable. I submit this with due respect. He cannot say it is *sub judice*.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : It is not in the court of law.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The second thing that he was saying was that simply because it is a legal case, therefore, no reference shall be made to it. Sir, please reflect on it because what you pronounce from the Chair will have very deep ramifications. Please refer to page 473 of Kaul and Shakhder ...*(Interruptions)*

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

16.06 hrs.

(Mr. Speaker - in the Chair)

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order?

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE : I am referring to Rule 353...*(Interruptions)* I am not wasting the time. Rule 353 clearly states that Members are not liable to any proceedings in any court in respect of anything said by them in the House; allegation should not be made by them against a fellow Member, Minister or any individual or a public body unless the allegation is supported and certified by strong evidence and adequate proof to substantiate that in the event of a Member...*(Interruptions)* I am making a point or order to the Speaker and not to you. If a matter is referred to the court and the Member is not present here to defend himself, that matter cannot be raised here without strong document, that means, the strong evidence.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Sir, the rule 353 which has been quoted by Kumari Mamta Banerjee is meant for Members. It is for the Members of the House. She has quoted irrelevant rule.

[English]

Rule 353 is about allegation made against any person, any Member of the House...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I am not making any allegation against anybody who is either in the House or outside. I do not know what these points or orders are all about...*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : He is quoting from the judgement. She is quoting an irrelevant rule.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I am only reading a judgement of the High Court.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : It is a public document. Kindly look at the rule.

MR. SPEAKER : Madam, I think you have made your point and Shri George Fernandes has made his point.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri) : Sir, I would draw your attention to rule 352 which says :

A Member while speaking shall not—

- (i) refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending."

What the hon. Minister Shri Jaswant Singh has mentioned here, I do not think it is applicable here because it is clearly stated that any matter pending a judicial decision shall not be referred to here.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : This matter is not pending in a court of law. This is not in a court of law.

SHRI E. AHAMED : I do not have the book here. Kaul and Shakdher has already mentioned it. If any Member refers to something pending in the court of law, then he is going into the merits of the case. He is not only referring to the case but he is going into the merits of the case.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I am not making any allegation against any member, against any outsider or any matter pending before a court of law. I am only reading from a judgement of the High Court. It is something that has been decided by the High Court.

MR. SPEAKER : I think the matter is very clear. The hon. Member is not quoting from a judgement where the case is pending before the court. It is an established, a published document which the hon. Member is quoting. I think the Member had the right to quote.

SHRI KINJARAPU YERRANNAIDU (Srikakulam): What is the necessity of quoting it now?

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was not my intention to raise this issue here but the Prime Minister himself has raised it ... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : But Mr. George, you have far far exceeded the time.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I have hardly spoken. I am finishing.

MR. SPEAKER : Please wind up.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I am winding up.

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

[Translation]

I have already told this.

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I am making only one point... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, As Shri Ram Vilas Ji has raised this issue here, I would like to read out some lines of this judgement. I would like to read out some lines of the judgement given by Justices S.N. Shah and Justice S.K. Mukhopadhyaya on 11th March, 1996 and then I will conclude my speech. The judgement which has been written by Justice Shah and which has the concurrence of Justice Mukhopadhyaya reads as follows :

[English]

"What I have not been able to understand is how excess expenditures/drawals could be possible without the tacit support of high-ups at the Secretariat/Government level. It is usual to find the Treasury raising objections in passing bills - whether it is salary bill of the staff, fee bill of lawyers or contractor's bill. How then without the financial sanction and availability of funds could money be drawn, to the tune of crores of rupees every year? Who permitted this excess expenditure? The Constitution envisages a definite procedure to cover the excess. The Constitution envisages a definite procedure to cover the excess. The procedure has undisputedly not been followed."

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Are we discussing? ... (Interruptions)... This is highly objectionable ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. George, please confine to the Motion. It is not a No-Confidence Motion against the previous Government. It is a Confidence Motion of the present Government. Kindly stick to that.

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Shri Ram Vilas Paswan raised this point... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. George Fernandes, please conclude.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Since Shri Ram Vilas Ji has raised this issue in the House, it is not fair to say that nothing took place there rather I wanted to read out some more things... (Interruptions) But while concluding my speech I would like to narrate the final observation/factual position of the case in the High Court.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Sir, you have given your ruling... (Interruptions)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, Justice Jha further says :

"The factual position of the case may be summed up as follows :

- (i) Huge sums of money, far in excess of the legislative sanction for the services, have



been spent in the Animal Husbandry Department over the last so many years. These expenditures, systematically effected by making drawals from the concerned Treasuries, were fraudulent in nature.

- (ii) No legislative sanction in the shape of additional or supplementary grants/appropriations has been accorded to these excess drawals till date.
- (iii) The State Government was admittedly in know of the excess drawals. Yet, no remedial action whatsoever, was taken. The Government has failed to show its *bona fide* in not stopping the ongoing drawals and expenditures.
- (iv) The stand of the State Government that excess drawals are usual phenomena, in the circumstances of these cases, cannot be accepted. Its plea that it was not aware of the fraudulent nature of the drawals/ expenditure until January 1996 is also not belief-worthy."

MR. SPEAKER : I think it is enough.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, Shri Ram Vilasji has misled the House. I will serve a notice. Kindly provide us an opportunity to raise a discussion on this matter separately. We will serve you a notice alongwith the document stating that Shri Ram Vilasji has misled the House. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am going to conclude my speech. Opposition leader... (Interruptions).

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please conclude.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Sir, I want to conclude. I am concluding, Sir.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : I am on a point of order.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down, there is a point of order.

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV : Mr. Speaker, the House is being misled. Hon'ble Mr. George Fernandes is misleading the House. After the decision of the High Court, which has been read out here, the State Government has approached the Supreme Court. He has misled the House by not making a reference of the Supreme Court's

Judgement. A motion of breach of privilege should be moved against him.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Yadavji, A point of order is not a point of order unless it is quoted under any rule.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, this point of order which is being raised is a matter of some importance which will arise probably again and again in this House. Kindly hear us for a few minutes and then you can make up your mind. I think it is necessary that you should read with us Rule 353.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : You have already given your ruling Sir. It cannot be reopened.

MR. SPEAKER : I have already given my ruling on that, Mr. Law Minister. Let the hon. Member conclude his speech. The hon. Member may kindly conclude his speech.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : I conclude with the words that an appeal was filed in the Supreme Court in this matter. A number of renowned Advocates were present in the court. This was the judgement of 11th March and it came to Supreme Court on 19th March. The Supreme Court not only upheld the judgment in toto but the whole matter was handed over to the C.B.I... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. Why do you not allow him to speak? I have given my ruling. Please sit down. I am on my legs. Please allow him to conclude his speech. Mr. George, one more minute. Please.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : One and a half minute, Sir.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place the manifesto of the Congress Party before you.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to request the Leader of Opposition to have a glance over the point mentioned in the preamble of their manifesto :

[English]

"An election presents a choice to the people. The choice to vote a party into Government. The choice to vote a candidate to office.

What is the choice today?

The Congress presents an India with a bright future. The Opposition presents an India that will be thrown back to the past

The Congress presents an India which is growing, creating wealth, generating jobs

and providing more incomes. The Opposition presents an India which will be stagnant, inward-looking, poor and likely to become bankrupt.

The Congress presents an India which rejoices in its unity and celebrates its diversity. The Opposition presents an India that will be inflamed by caste and religious passions.

The Congress presents an India that has earned new respect among the Countries of the world. The Opposition presents an India that will be ignored, ridiculed and forgotten.

The Congress presents an India with a stable Government and a vibrant economy. The Opposition presents an India with a tottering Government and a collapsing economy."

[Translation]

Please do not pay heed to such thoughts  
...(Interruptions)

With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not going to deliver a speech. With your permission, I would like to speak for a minute.

Our friend, George Fernandes has delivered an impressive speech. I would only like to say that the Samta Party had made electoral alliance with the BJP in Bihar. We had not made electoral alliance with them in the entire country. Samta Party is not committed to implement in any way the manifesto of the BJP. We have been saying this right from the beginning, which has also been said by hon. Prime Minister that in the existing situation the country need a system based on co-existence. He should have pondered over this thing on the day the President had invited him to form the Government.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in order to avoid the wrong tradition I am saying this. I am not one of those people who want that the BJP in any case, should not form the Government. In the democracy, if the BJP gets majority, they will form the Government. This is the tradition in the country. Just now an hon. Member has said that the President is being criticised. I say that no such criticism has taken place. In the past too, if a party did not get the majority and the President invited them to form the Government and also asked them on whose support they are going to form the Government. Vajpayeeji should have mobilised the support, which he could not. It is not in accordance with the Parliamentary conventions. I did not expect this thing from a personality like him. I am saying this because I have great respect for him. The speech, he delivered today, is not in accordance with his personality as the leader of BJP.

Perhaps, he had formed the Government under some compulsions, although he knew that he will not get the requisite majority.

I believe...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU (Madras North) : With only 55 MPs, you had formed a Government. What did you do then? You are speaking against this now  
...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, to make them understand my point, I now will speak in English.

[English]

I formed the Government only after the letter of Rajiv Gandhi was sent to the Rashtrapati saying that he will be supporting my Government. I did not form the Government till Rajiv Gandhi sent the letter on behalf of the Congress Party to the Rashtrapati saying that he will be supporting that Government. I am saying this for the benefit of some friends who are angry for obvious reasons. They understand me at least, if they do not understand Hindi.

And I can understand their anger...(Interruptions)

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU : Sir, we are listening to the translation.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to indulge in any conflict. I would like to express my views about the Bhartiya Janata Party, which I have already expressed time and again. I respect Atal jee very much, but in the present circumstances this discussion is going to be meaningless. The consensus about which he was talking is not a consensus but is creating bitterness and conflict. In my opinion to reach at top is one thing but to relinquish that post is even greater. I hope a personality like the hon. Prime Minister should quit the office without any further discussion on this matter.

SHRI SANAT MEHTA (Surendranagar) : Sir, I rise to oppose the Confidence Motion moved by the Prime Minister. I will only limit myself to the observations which are only concerned with and related to the Confidence Motion...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Order in the House please.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SANAT MEHTA : The people have elected us for maintaining the democracy and for maintaining the national unity. Sir, I will limit my observations to these main aspects. Sir, a lot of propaganda has been done in this House. Sir, when almost all the political parties and the political analysts and the

columnists in the country have accepted that the working of the election of the Eleventh Lok Sabha has not given very clear verdict in favour of any political party, it is only the BJP, in this context, has converted the minority vote into *janadesh*. Sir, I want to bring out the another aspect. My friend Shri Sharad Pawar has given details as to how the BJP has failed in different States. But along with the political mandate of the integrity and unity of this country which is a world example of the unity in diversity, a social mandate for remaining in power is also required. Sir, as far as the 1996 elections are concerned, BJP has not received the social mandate. The BJP has received only three percent of the Muslim votes. The same is the case with the Christians. The BJP got just 11 percent of the dalit votes. Also, it has got very negligible percentage of the tribal votes. While in the case of OBCs the Exit poll says that both NF and LF and the Congress got higher share than the BJP. This clearly means that the Muslims, the Tribals, the Dalits and the Christians have largely rejected the BJP.

How can a party which received only 23 percent of votes proclaim that it has the *janadesh* to rule? How can a party which has a very narrow social base and having lack of social mandate be allowed to rule the country? How can a party, rejected by the poor of India, be supported?

In the final analysis, one can conclude that the Indian soil could not be contaminated even after the BJP's manured with the Babri Masjid and the Bombay blasts. The elections have proved that the religious fundamentalism and religious-based politics could not be there in the mainstream. The poor of this country has not voted for the BJP; the poor of this country has given a mandate in this election saying that alleviation of poverty is the main task in the country. That is one of the reasons why I oppose that BJP should not be allowed to rule this country. With that view in mind, I oppose the Confidence Motion moved by the Prime Minister.

Here it is claimed - the Prime Minister has very ably claimed - that they are not going to do anything like buying, purchasing or horse-trading. I welcome it. But after getting a minority vote and getting an invitation from the President, why should they evolve a game plan? It has appeared almost in all the newspapers and the magazines that BJP has evolved a game plan to remain in power. What was the game plan? The game plan consisted of wooing; it consisted of threatening and it consisted of dividing the Opposition parties. The game plan was published in the newspapers and the magazines. As a part of the game plan, they decided that issue like abrogation of Article 370 of the Constitution which accords special status to Jammu and Kashmir, common civil code, construction of Ram temple at the site of the demolished structure at Ayodhya and campaigning in Kashi and Mathura were avoided in the President's Address. If they have a clean hand

and if they wanted to test whether they have a majority or not they should have stuck to the principle. But this was a part of the game plan. So, the first step they took was, all those issues which were very important issues in the manifesto, all those issues for which the BJP fought the elections in the streets of India and all those issues which they have said in every meeting that these are the aims for which we are going to the Lok Sabha were set aside. After coming to this House or after getting an invitation from the President, they started the game, setting aside those main issues and started appeasing the Opposition. There was no response from them and that did not fructify. There were regional parties, and the Prime Minister wanted to appease them, to win over them; knowingly he assured that Article 356 of the Constitution will not be misused and all sorts of guarantees were given. Why were these guarantees necessary if their hands were clean and if they were sure that they will have a majority? This was also an idea to appease the regional parties so that Shri Chandra Babu Naidu and the leader from Assom Gana Parishad will get an assurance that they would be safe under the BJP rule. This was also a plan in their game plan. Horse-trading is not always the type of horse-trading which is popularly known. To my mind, this is also a horse-trading because they set aside the principles and did the things which they had not accepted in their manifesto. Things did not stop here.

People of India could not be misled by such gimmicks because people of India and the political parties have known the true colour of the BJP. Then what happened? They sent feelers; even indirect threats were given. One of the top BJP leaders thundered; these are the words and I quote :

"The country will be balkanised if the people's mandate is subverted."

It was further mentioned that the confirmation of the BJP-led coalition in power was essential to save the country from disintegration. Why such a threat was necessary from a person like the Home Minister, when the Prime Minister in this country says that the issue was only related to one aspect that we want to keep the country united?

Then, why did I fail? One threat was not enough. On the same day, a news comes in the newspapers — a threat comes from Bombay and the exact words were that there will be a civil war in the absence of BJP Government in the country, the Congress and other parties will be responsible for such a situation. Sir, if confidence was there if the hands were clean, if no horse hands trading was to be done, if no underhand dealing was to be done, why should there be such a threat in a democratic set up? To my mind, are we to understand that balkanisation and civil war are the ultimate goals of the BJP and its allies? Otherwise, how can such threats and thoughts come uppermost in their minds while facing the democratic

process in the form of vote of confidence? My friend, Mr Chandra Shekhar rightly said that if Prime Minister was very clear in his mind, if his hands were clean, no such thing was required. And I have still not come across a single rejoinder from the Prime Minister rejecting the story of balkanisation or that of the story of civil war should not be circulated when he is trying to create consciousness in this country for the unity and democratic process of the country. I think no rejoinder was given. It means that it was also a part of the game plan and that is the reason that I say that the BJP has no mandate as far as the electorate is concerned. The BJP has no social mandate because the poor people have, by and large, rejected the BJP all over the country for whom this House is meant for. The main task of this House is to alleviate poverty of the dalits, the tribals, etc. The Prime Minister expressed some good feelings about the tribals. But why did the tribals not vote for the BJP? It is because secularism is so dear to the dalits and the Christians. Whatever type of secularism is so dear to the dalits and the Christians. Whatever type of secularism the Prime Minister wanted, them to accept is not acceptable to these people and that is the reason I oppose the Confidence Motion.

As far as economic policy is concerned, till this day, I have not heard the word *Swadeshi* for which the *Swadeshi Jagran Manch* was created. Full support was given. Even BJP president gave a lot of support but everybody has forgotten *Swadeshi*. Why? It is because I feel that all over the world the communal parties have no economic policy whatsoever. In any part of the world because they live on religion-based politics, they live on the policy of hatred. So, Sir, I feel that that might be the reason. And after the Enron, the Prime Minister or the BJP would not have liked to displease America. That must be the reason that even in the President's Address *Swadeshi* was totally avoided. *Swadeshi* was not such a controversial issue. *Swadeshi* was not rejected by everybody. There are parties on this side also who are wedded to it but the only idea was to create a climate so that they can move the parties, they can divide the parties, they can keep the Members absent and somehow remain in power. If this is the game plan, then I do not think it is right for the Prime Minister to say that they are not interested in horse trading, etc.

Another point is about *Swaraj*. *Swaraj* was the main plan in the manifesto of the BJP. That was the very reason that Advaniji had taken our *Swaraj Yatra* and started it from the South. This time he did not start from Somnath. It is fortunate for us in Gujarat. He started from the South but the results have shown that it did not click in the South. The BJP did not get any support except a small support from Karnataka and as far as *Swaraj* is concerned, the result or the reaction was that it failed to make any reaction in the South but at least, it has made a different impact in Gujarat. A day after the Prime Minister's national

broadcast, the Prime Minister visited Gandhinagar, one of his two constituencies.

There he addressed a *janasabha*. After *janadesh* came the *janadesh*. We are usually attending public meetings; we are usually attending public meetings; we are usually attending rallies. But the Prime Minister wanted to go to Gandhinagar, his own constituency in Ahmedabad. He addressed a *janasabha* to celebrate his coronation. What happened in this *janasabha*? On this historic occasion the country witnessed the first glimpse of the *su-raj*. What was that first glimpse. This too in the land of the Gandhi, the hon. Prime Minister went to the meeting after visiting the Gandhi *ashram* and after paying homage to Gandhiji - everybody knows. Within minutes of the Prime Minister leaving the *janasabha*, the BJP activists stripped naked one of the seniormost Minister and gave him severe beating. Not only that, a few other Ministers were also the target of their attack; their cars were destroyed by the angry saffron mob.

I am not saying anything but in the words, of the prominent Daily, under the editorial title 'An ugly episode' - these are not my words - it is written in one of the prominent Dailies of Delhi and I quote:

"Even political squabbles are understandable, but if rival groups attempt to settle scores between them through barbaric acts..."

These are also not my words.

"We will only be destroying the very fundamental..."

[Translation]

SHRI BANWARILAL PUROHIT (Nagpur) : The people involved in Tandoor Case talk like this ... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SANAT MEHTA : Kindly listen. This is the glimpse of *su-raj*. BJP is shouting slogans in the streets as :

[Translation]

"Yeh to jhanki hai, baki to sab baki hai"  
(this is only a glimpse, rest is yet to come)

[English]

So, the *jhanki* was given at the time of their Prime Minister's *Janasabha*. Their own Ministers were beaten; they were made naked and their cars were broken. One of the Chairman, his bones were broken. And they are still in the hospital. Is this the way of the *su-raj*? If this *su-raj* is going to come to India, then this is the reason we oppose that this Government cannot be allowed to stay in the throne of this country for a minute because.

[Translation]

You have given this jhanki, tomorrow you will give us more.

[English]

Why could the Prime Minister not restrain them even till this day? This whole game in Gujarat has started from October. What type of things are happening?

Sir, the Prime Minister was talking about water. I am coming from a constituency where water is given for half an hour every four days...*(Interruptions)* They have no time to attend to the water problems...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : Your Government had been in Centre for a number of years and what kind of action you have initiated in this regard.

SHRI SANAT MEHTA : For how many months you will talk about Congress 18 months have already passed.

[English]

If you could not provide a tanker to the people, do not rule over this country. This is the glimpse of the *su-raj*. Nothing can hide your barbaric acts; no shouting can hide your barbaric acts... *(Interruptions)* This is enough proof as to what kind of democratic values are they going to uphold - to plead with their own people; to have barbaric acts, to lock their office? If this is the scene, what would happen all over the country...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

Those who talk like this, I would like to tell them that no leader of National stature belonging to their party has neither tried to check these incidents taking place there since October nor condemned them. This shows that these type of things will recur here and in the country in future also.

[English]

Sir, I can never support a Party which has no social mandate of the poor; a Party which has no economic policy; a party which leaves the fundamental values for the sake of remaining in power and then talk of high values. This is a country where we have unity in diversity. If the Dalits are not with you, if the Christians are not with you, if the Muslims are not with you, what kind of a unity are you going to achieve? You have to accept it and you will have to do something. That is why I say that this Government can never be supported. I feel that at the earliest if the Prime Minister heeds to the advice by Shri Chandrasekhar, I think, it would do good to their Party as well as for the country.

With these words, I strongly oppose the vote of confidence moved by the Prime Minister.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : For five hours now we are discussing this motion and not for once, neither the Prime Minister nor his present supporter Mr. Fernandes has claimed that this Government has the majority support of the House. Then, what is this exercise going on! That is why we had made a request to put this motion to vote without any discussion. We felt that this Constitutional aberration called Vajpayee Government should be ended immediately without any ritual. I am very sorry to say that a person of the eminence of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has spoken in this debate not as a Prime Minister really but more as a devout Shiv Sainik and RSS functionary. The manner in which he has spoken clearly shows that he has no heart as he has not bothered to refer to the relevant issue, namely trying to prove his majority support in the House. We can understand his agony. He will go down in the history as a Prime Minister of this great country for the briefest period. But we cannot help him. It is not our obligation to keep him in power. Mr. George Fernandes was arguing as if it was our duty to keep BJP in power. He said that we have said so many things about the Congress and the Janata Dal, that we have got so many things to be complained about. But whether United Front comes to power or not does not mean that BJP should remain in power without any mandate either of the country or of the majority support of this House.

Today we have heard a unique speech in this House. I had an apprehension, which I expressed in the meeting also, that this debate will be utilized for something else, that is to make election propaganda and not for the purpose of adverting on the real subject because it is a question of numbers, the question of head counting.

SHRI RAM NAIK : Are elections coming?

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Despite your threat, no.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : How long they could have taken? Hon. Rashtrapati's mandate was to prove the majority and not to indulge in gimmicks or propaganda. Sir, even now I would like to know, as Shri Chandra Shekhar pointed out, do they claim majority support in the House. If not, then why should the debate continue? That is why I felt that this opportunity will be misutilised for purposes which they think will suit them. I was listening to the Prime Minister very closely. He was not really addressing the Members of the House to persuade them to vote in his favour but he was addressing the people outside this House hoping that he will somehow convince them. Towards the end of his speech he tried to spread the germs of mistrust and a feeling of separation. He tried to divide people on the basis of religion and, Sir, we cannot but protest and protest till the last and we shall not rest until this Government which has no mandate goes out of power from this country.



Mr. Speaker, Sir, an attitude of injured innocence has been taken as if we are doing great injustice today. Why does Shri Vajpayee not think as to why nobody is coming to his support? Today I find that even a fractured Samata Party is supporting him. They have no alliance with the Akali Dal.

SHRI SURJEET SINGH BARNALA (Sangrur) : They have.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I stand corrected. They have no alliance with Samata in Punjab or Haryana. They fought against each other. That is also a post-election alliance.

Well, this United Front is formed after the election. They have been talking about it as if we have committed a crime. The Prime Minister was saying that theirs has become the largest Party in Parliament. I did not expect that Mr. Vajpayee will stake his claim only because of an electoral fortuity. Does their getting 194 seats with their allies with 20-25 percent votes mean that they have the majority support in the House? It is very clear. Of course, I personally have great respect for Shri Vajpayee. I have the great opportunity of being in this House together with him for so many years. I have personal respect for him. But when things like this come from a person of his eminence, one cannot but question, "Is he a free man or a prisoner of his Party, the Saffron Brigade?"

Sir, the invitation of the President obviously meant that the acceptor would have the minimum basis of support for running the Government. If Shri Vajpayee knew that he had no majority in the House, on what basis could he accept the invitation of hon. Rashtrapatiiji? Sir, I am not going into the decision of the President. Mr. Fernandes has tried to provoke us to go into it but I am not doing so. Sir, the only basis for this could be that they wanted to get into power by hook or crook, to remain there even for a few days - and I will try to humbly show how they have misused these few days that have elapsed when they have remained in power without any authority. Sir, they talk of Constitutional propriety and they talk of political morality, but what sort of political morality can we see when they have no support in Parliament. Shri Sharad Pawar has rightly reminded of what Shri Vajpayee has said in his election campaign. The leader who had been projected as the future Prime Minister said, "I give my word that I shall not stake my claim unless I get at least 225 seats." He said that. But there is a deficit of 75 seats. he knows that he is in splendid isolation in this House. Nobody is with them. That is why, Sir, we have been waiting for so many days to know how this minority could be transformed into a majority. What was the magic, what was the game-plan, if the intention was not to manoeuvre, if the intention was not to win some Members with lollipops, or if the intention was not to make crude attempts at what is known as horse-trading? Could there be any other method of getting a majority in this situation without indulging in

manoeuvres or secret deals? Obviously that was being done for all these days that have elapsed.

Sir, many of the hon. Members have rightly said here, that once they got into power, threats started coming. The so-called responsible leaders are hurling threats, threats of civil war, threats of balkanisation, threat of disintegration, threat of collapse of internal security, threat of dissolution etc. Is it not blackmailing the country and backmailing the Members of Parliament? What are the real objects of saying all these things? I heard the other day on television one of the big functionaries of BJP saying, "We cannot win over anybody from Left, therefore, we are trying others. Left are too principled. Therefore, we are trying with the regional Parties." By that what was meant? The regional parties had all fought against BJP; they had fought against the communal parties; and they had fought on secular plank. On what basis are they being asked for their support? I was waiting to hear from Mr. Fernandes as to why he decided to give his support.

He is not here at the moment. Why he decided to support the BJP?

MR. SPEAKER : He is here.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Oh! Is he here? Good. Sir, his concern was that why should U.F. be formed? Why should U.F. be called to form a Government when you have criticized each other? I would like to know did Mr. Fernandes support the demolition of Babri Mosque. Do you support what has been said in the BJP's manifesto. May I read, Sir, with your permission? Page 15, last paragraph: On coming to power the BJP Government will facilitate the construction of a magnificent Sri Ram Mandir at *Janmasthan* in Ayodhya which will be a tribute to *Bharat Mata*. This moved some of the people in our land. The concept of Ram lies at the core of their conscience. Then, I shall take it that Mr. Fernandes now supports; Mr. Fernandes now supports economic policy of the BJP; Mr. Fernandes now supports their pledge to disband the Minorities Commission; their pledge to repeal Article 370 of the Constitution. Does Mr. Fernandes support all these? Then, if he is not supporting that - is he on a principled alliance with BJP? While he did not answer this, he did not refer to this, he only gave us - if I may not be misunderstood - lecture as to how we should behave; as to how we shall look after ourselves. We have also come with the mandate of the people. I do not know what is Samata Party's mandate. Today we find that there is also a fracture in the Samata Party. Even with eight Members they cannot remain together.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said not only have they utilized this period to hold our threats, take up sort of a blackmailing attitude but how have they misused it for the sake of their party, not for the governance of the country. Within one day or two days we saw television shows going on where every Minister was

making promises without even having the right to continue; without being aware whether they could be able to be on this side of the House on the first of June. Everybody was making promises everybody was announcing policies. Which Minister was not doing it? Of course, our very very good friend Mr. Sikander Bakht lost five to six days. He at least did not go on making pronouncements either on urban affairs or on employment or on external affairs. Except your picture with the Haj pilgrims, we did not see any activity? So what did you propose to do? What did you really think so as to propose all this? Was it not your political morality which demanded that you should first get the mandate of this House which the President wanted you to get. If the President had come to a decision that you had the majority, you had the mandate, you would not have put this condition that you should get the support of the House by 31st of May. Therefore, when the President was himself in doubt and you have not proved your majority in the House - of course, you have no majority in the country - you had gone on a spree of making promises, policy announcements and what not.

My very good friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh - I do not know whether he originally getting into the North Block because Finance Ministry was earlier decided to be given to somebody else or I do not know whether somebody wanted it and did not get it, he also made announcements for the next three or four or five years. First of all please see whether you will remain Minister for seven days. What else is this than misleading the people and the country? Sir, I believe that political propriety demanded that such announcements should have been made only after they proved the majority on the floor of this House.

17.00 hrs.

Sir, even for ten days they cannot show a united Cabinet. A very distinguished Member was absent even from the first Cabinet meeting, the second Cabinet meeting and what do you know further, they cannot even put up a united stand on very important issues.

Sir, there is one very important matter. They came to be sworn in on 16th and today is 27th. I do not know whether my information is correct or not and I shall stand corrected, if I am wrong. I am told that there was a special Cabinet Meeting today at 1.15 p.m. to approve the revised Counter Guarantees of the Enron Power Project. Was it politically proper? Was it administratively just? If my information is incorrect, please tell us! You are on the threshold of losing your position today. In the absence of any claim of majority even now — obviously you have not majority; the hon. Prime Minister said, "You may be greater in number...", he said that at one time of his speech, during his speech — such an important decision is being taken on the day this Confidence Motion is being discussed. The Cabinet of this country which is on trial, yet to prove its mandate is taking a very

important decision of approving this counter guarantee. There is no objection! Then I take it that it has been done.

Sir, I do not think, there can be anything more politically and administratively incorrect. This is nothing but an affront to this House and also an affront to Rashtrapatiiji because he has desired that the majority must be proved, it means, he obviously meant before any serious or important decisions are taken.

Sir, the people of this country have decisively voted for secularism and against communalism. We feel, it is our solemn obligation as Members of this hon. House not only to accept the verdict of the people but to see that the politics of this country is not polluted by communal and fundamentalist forces which are out to destroy the unity and integrity of this country. I feel that the continuation of this Government in power for every second means not only showing disrespect to the people's mandate but also amounts to weakening of the secular fabric of this country.

Sir, we are very sorry that our respected Rashtrapatiiji because of some Constitutional obligation had to indulge a few days back in an irrelevant exercise of addressing both the Houses assembled together because the Government which is yet to prove its right to govern could have nothing to tell the people until its right was established. But Sir, I must take very serious exception, to the very conscious attempt that was made to create a simulated situation. Consciously they omitted any reference to the abrogation of article 370, adoption of a uniform civil code, of Hindutva, of the construction of Ram Mandir at Ayodhya, of disbandment of Minorities Commission and they consciously did not mention even anything about what was going to happen after the demolition of the Babri Masjid. During the campaign they had relied on this and that very evening, one of the distinguished Members of this House in the BJP benches, who has just now claimed, rightly though, that he has won by the highest majority in Maharashtra, went on television claiming, "This is only our first year's quota of work, we have not given up any of our demands." The President did not say, "this is the first year's quota of work."

Therefore, it was openly said: "Yes, we shall continue to do this. We shall support the repeal of Article 370." They were not giving up their plan to construct a temple at Ayodhya. They have mentioned other things in their agenda, which were given so much prominence. They deliberately omitted that to project, what I call, a simulated secular credential for it. Sir, say that this attitude is nothing but insincere and ephemeral.

You have deliberately tried to give an impression to the people of this country that you have changed your priorities and that you have changes your

policies and programmes. The President did not mention anything in his Address, which shows that those parts of their election manifesto have no longer been insisted upon by this party. Sir, that was not so. Therefore, I am very sorry to say that even the office of the President was misutilised to mislead the nation.

Sir, the Prime Minister gave a broadcast to the nation on the Television. He did not, rightly according to him in keeping with the President's Address, make any references either to the demolition of the Babri Mosque or the construction of the Temple but he made one observation and I quote :

He has said :

"If the problems related with religion are not resolved for a long period of time. Then the result is what happened in Ayodhya"

What is the significance of this statement expect to give threats? Sir, I cannot think of a more shocking approbation of one of the most heinous happenings in the history of our country.

Sir, our Prime Minister has given another interview in one of the newspapers, which is close to them. He said:

"If the minorities continue to think in the language of minorityism, then the majority will start thinking in the language of majoritism and this will increase the gulf between the two communities."

His speech today was, of course, different. Only a few days back, this was stated by him when he was probably expecting that there would be deserters from this side or he would be able to procure some defection. Sir, he made it very clear because he has own constituency serve Sir, lest it was thought that he was softened in his stance on the temple issue. I quote what he said on the temple issue:

"Our goals are the same. It is a part of our strategy, as to which party adopt at which point of time, strategy has to always be flexible."

Sir, what else is it but double speak? You project something in the President's Address. You say something in your Address to the nation and then outside you go on reiterating what your election manifesto is in all its width and amplitude. The leading personalities of the BJP say: "Yes, this is our first year's programme of action. We are not giving up any of these things." They are not having the political courage to mention it in the President's Address

Sir, one thing is very clear. Yesterday I found that in another moment of agony our Prime Minister has given an advice to the Maharashtra Government to revive the Srikrishna Commission. Sir, he has referred to that. But nowhere it has been mentioned earlier, no protest was made and the BJP had accepted the abolition of the Srikrishna Commission and also of

the Minorities Commission in Maharashtra. Neither their election manifesto nor the President's Address had advocated for its reconstitution until yesterday's contrived message to the Maharashtra Government.

Sir, I cannot but notice, without being personal, there are people in today's Treasury Benches who have been found guilty or allegedly participant. - I am not sure - allegedly to be involved in the Bombay riots. There has been a detenu under the National Security Act or TADA - I do not know. Illegal arms were seized from him. Had any action taken by the BJP Government or that the Government in Maharashtra against that person or any such person, wherever he may be? This Government owes an answer. The Party owes an answer to the people. Therefore, why has this sudden instruction been given to the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, except today for public consumption if it can impress some Members of this House?

Sir, I am sure, not a tear will be shed in the country as this Government is being voted out of power. Sir, this country deserves deliverance from communal operators. Sir, as I said, the accidental emergence of BJP as a single largest Party is nothing but an electoral arithmetic. It does not give right to anybody, to any Party either to claim the right to governance or right to shape the future of this country. Sir, no doubt, we have many problems to solve. But hardly religious obscurantists can say that or can hardly perform to solve those problems. We have our secular commitments to keep. The people of this country deserve a Government which will fight against communal divide of the people and the country. We cannot play with our unity and integrity. The secular parties have formed the United Front - however, Mr. George Fernandes may try to ridicule it - to provide a secular humane and pro people Government and that should take charge soon.

Sir, I repeat Mr. Chandra Shekhar's suggestion. I say to the Government that enough is enough. For sake of the country and the people, I request the usurpers of the powers, to please go. You have no right to remain a minute longer. The people of this country, at least, are entitled to be governed by those who command majority inside the House. So, those who got 20 percent vote cannot have any claim to be majority, any right to majority. Sir, as such I oppose this Motion and I am sure this nation opposes this Motion.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion and I will be very brief. Sir, in the last 15 days or 13 days to be exact, we have been subject to a number of new constitutional precepts and principles, a number of political lectures, a number of threats, blandishments, inducements. Yet, the hard reality is that the Government of the day has not been able to win a single Member belonging to other Parties to its side.

Their strength remains frozen at 194. The Prime Minister quite candidly admitted that he does not have a majority.

If he did not have a majority, if he knew that he did not have a majority, then why did he move this Motion? Is it because he thought that by his oratorical skills he could win over anyone today? Is it because he thought that by his poetry and his passion he could win support today?

The mandate of the electorate in the 1996 election is very clear. No party—and I said this when I felicitated you — no single party, nobody has the mandate to form a Government today, of a single party. The mandate is only for a coalition. The mandate is for a secular, liberal and democratic coalition. That mandate ought to be fulfilled by all of us sitting here. In other countries, political parties and members have taken two months, three months to put together a Government. There is nothing wrong about that. There is a churning in this nation. As a result of that churning it will be difficult to put together a Government but we must have made that effort. What the United Front is doing is to put together a Government. There is nothing wrong with that if it will. There reflect the will of the majority. What the BJP did was a hasty, greedy usurpation of power when they were invited only for consultation. This is the difference between what the BJP did and what the United Front is trying to do. We may succeed, we may not succeed, that is not the point. At least we are making an effort to find out where lies the majority.

Sir, in parliamentary democracy there is only one rule. In Parliament, in this highest body the Prime Minister must command the majority. Prime Minister Vajpayee, for whom I have great respect and affection — and this will be the last occasion I will call him Prime Minister Vajpayee — did not have a majority and did not have the ability to command the majority. He should never have accepted that office.

Sir, a very senior correspondent today described Shri Vajpayee and compared him to Micamber; he said when he accepted his office it was with Micamberish hope. Another correspondent described him as he descended the steps of Rashtrapati Bhavan, with that letter in his pocket, that his expression was like a child with amazement. Thanks to cellular telephone, by the time he descended the last step the message had been flashed to his office that he had been appointed Prime Minister. At that point I think, the thoughtful Vajpayeejee was overtaken by a greedy party. They went into firecrackers and *laddoos* without reflecting on whether they had the capacity to command a majority.

What did they take us for? They took us for purchasable commodities. The CPI cannot be touched, the CPM cannot be touched. At least Somnath Babu and Indrajit Babu must be grateful for small merities.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : They said that openly.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Does that mean that the TDP can be touched? Does that mean that DMK or TMC can be touched? Does it mean that the AGP can be purchased? Does it mean that the Janata Dal can be broken? May be in 1977, may be in 1989, may be in 1970...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

PROF RASA SINGH RAWAT : You were in power at that time. Then what happened. *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Please hear me.

Sir, today every voter in every constituency exercises the utmost vigilance.

What happened in Tamil Nadu in the last month? There was a ruling party. It had a brute majority. Its Ministers and its Members could not enter their constituencies. Boards were put there saying: "Do not enter our constituency". Today, every Member of this House and every member of every elected body is put on notice. The people are no longer sleeping or silent. If we betray their faith, they will rise in and protest and throw us out...*(Interruptions)* None of us who has been elected on a TMC ticket or a TDP ticket or a DMK ticket or the ticket of any other party, is available for being purchased by the BJP. That they should have known...*(Interruptions)*. A former Chief Minister belonging to their party said "Wait and see. We shall conjure a majority." Was he a magician? A Minister sitting in the first row said: "There are ways and means for getting a majority." "My dear friend, Shri Pramod Mahajan said: "If someone goes from my party, he is a defector but if someone comes to my party he is a convert." He said that. It is reported in the *Times of India*. Let us make it very clear that there is not one who is willing to support the BJP, except their 194 Members. And if that is clear to every one here, then why continue this debate? The time has come to vote. There is no purpose in continuing this debate? The time has come to vote. There is no purpose in continuing this debate. Does Mr. Vajpayee say that he still hopes to win support in the House? If he does not, then why continue this debate?

My learned friend, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee mentioned a number of announcements made by Ministers. My distinguished friend Mrs. Swaraj tried to impose her personal code of morality upon Doordarshan and All India Radio. They will become free tomorrow. The Defence Minister said that he would increase the Defence budget. I do not know if he consulted the Finance Minister before he said that. The only one who observed great restraint after the mandatory, customary first press conference, was my friend Mr. Jaswant Singh and even I compliment him for that. There is one thing which he said, which

leaves me in complete amazement. He said that BJP party's plank is one thing, the BJP Government's plank is another. This is a new rule of parliamentary democracy. Every party is voted to power to implement its plank. Are you saying that you have given up your plank? If you have, then you must honestly say that...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHU DAYAL KATHERIA (Ferozabad) : Hon'ble Minister you please first read your manifesto.

*[English]*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I am not a 'Mantri mahodaya', Mantri mahodayas are there.

Sir, I am trying to understand this. A party is voted to Government to implement its manifesto. That is the basis of parliamentary democracy. If you have given up your plank, say that you have given up your plank. Say that you have given up your demand to repeal Article 370. Say that you have given up your principle to impose a uniform civil code. Say that you have given up *Hindutva*. Say that you have given up your demand to build the temple in Ram Janmasthan or where the Babri Masjid stood. But if you do not do that and yet say, we will form the Government but we will not given up the plank, then I call you wolf in sheep's clothing. Why do you want us to come and support you? The Prime Minister accused all of us as practising politics without principles. We are unprincipled politicians, leave us alone, please do not woo us, please do not ask us for support.

There is another statement to which I must take exception. The Prime Minister said that there are only two ways to resolve dispute like Ayodhya - one is dialogue and the other is legislation. I am sure the Prime Minister is a scholarly man, a thoughtful man and chooses his words carefully. He ruled out adjudication. What does that mean? It sends a very sinister message throughout the country. He said there are only two methods - dialogue and legislation. Does he rule out adjudication? Does he respect the the authority of the High Court where the cases are pending? Does he not respect the authority of Supreme Court? Then I ask another question. I ask this with great sadness. Assuming that dialogue and legislation are the only two methods, how did the Sangh parivar discover the third method of demolition?...*(Interruptions)* How does it justify the third method of demolition?

Sir, it is unfortunate today that millions of Indians see the BJP as an illiberal party, millions of Indians see the BJP as a non-secular party, millions of Indians see the BJP as an exclusionary party. The BJP may get win a mandate on a different day. If they do, they are certainly entitled to rule. No one can challenge, no one can complain. But if you are seen as illiberal, if you are seen as non-secular, if you are seen as exclusionary, and you have been

given only 20 percent of the votes and 30 percent of the seats in this House, you do not have a mandate today. Therefore, morality requires, constitutional principles require and your love and affection for this country require that you should go at the earliest. Sir, I have no doubt that Mr. Vajpayee loves my country as much as I do. I have no doubt in his private moments, he reflects upon the error that was committed on 16th of May. But that error can be undone only by gracefully leaving office.

Sir, my submission is that this Motion is a futile Motion of a Government which knew it is not in the majority and does not have the ability to command a majority. The Instruments of the Instructions, the Governor's Committee, the Sarkaria Commission, all have said that only he who can command the majority can become Prime Minister. I wish Mr. Vajpayee had that support. He does not have it today. He cannot win that support. I urge upon him most humbly let this country get a Government. Since the middle of March we have not had an effective Government. Let this country get a Government, let Mr. Vajpayee gracefully leave office so that a new Government can be sworn in and we can get on with the job of governing this country.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Kendrapada) : I just draw your attention to Rule 115. I have already given a notice. While the hon. Member Mr. George Fernandes was making a speech on the Motion, he misled the House by quoting incorrect observations of the Patna High Court. I just draw your attention to the High Court's judgement and the conclusion. Therefore, I may kindly be permitted for that. The judgement says like this :

"Before this, 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 nor they shall be construed as reflection on any individual. The directions as given herein above should also not be understood as indictment of any individual or individuals."

Therefore, Sir, my submission is that the hon. Member Shri George Fernandes had misled the House.

AN HON. MEMBER : You can move a Privilege Motion against him.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I will certainly do that. I am just making a submission now...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Let there be a Motion of Privilege moved against him ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Sir, I would request you to kindly remove it from the proceedings and I am bringing a Privilege Motion against the hon. Member who had misled this august House.



MR. SPEAKER : I will go through the records.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I said that I would go through the records and see that.

*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM (SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member Shri George Fernandes had said that he would authenticate and lay the papers on the Table of the House.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome the Privilege Motion to be moved so that the entire judgement can be discussed in this House and the people allowed to know what exactly the High Court had said about the Government of Bihar.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV : Sir, I accept that  
*... (Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Sir, what is the verdict of the Supreme Court?  
*... (Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall request the hon. Members not to be led by emotions. If the matter goes to the Privileges Committee, the Privileges Committee will call for the files of Bihar Government and this is not a healthy practice.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : I will press for it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : You may press for it. I am not saying anything about it. But the thing is, he quoted one portion of the judgement and you have quoted another portion of the judgement. The proceedings should be corrected accordingly and the matter should be over here. Please do not refer it to the Privileges Commission. This is my opinion.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the problem is Mr. George being carried away by his own emotions is nothing new in this House. He supported the Janata Party Government ferociously in this House one day and then backed out the next day. It is not new for Mr. George Fernandes  
*... (Interruptions)* The fact of the matter is, he is barking up the wrong tree. He is aiming at the Chief Minister of Bihar, who, himself on the contrary, has seen to the arrest and punishment of more than 43 people. He wanted to complete this and that is why he went up to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court gave it to the C.B.I. There is nothing new about it. All I want to say is that Mr. George Fernandes, in his speech, was only barking up the wrong tree. It does not touch the Chief Minister at all. That is all I want to say now.  
*... (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Jena, Under the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, you have brought to the notice of the Speaker certain inaccuracies in the statement of the Member. He had given it in writing. The next step is that the Speaker would ascertain from the Member. Directions 115 (3) says :

"The Speaker may, if he things fit, bring the matter to the notice of the Minister or

the Member concerned for the purpose of ascertaining the factual position in regard to the allegation made."

That is precisely that I will do.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : Thank you, Sir.

*[Translation]*

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR (Mumbai North West) : The Leader of this House, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, has put up the vote of Confidence Motion here. I have been hearing a lot of things about this Motion since morning. After hearing all this, whatsoever I viewed about it. I want to put forth here in a few words.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Vajpayee was called by the President to form the Government and being the leader of the largest party he was called. He constituted the Government. Prior to that, no party had staked its claim to form the Government. But when they came to know that here B.J.P., Shiv Sena and other parties alliance is forming the Government, then this fear stalked in the heart of the opposition that if their Government remained in the country, it would be very difficult on their part to work. Having thought so, they formed a front against us naming as National Front. In this national front all those who never gathered altogether by this day, they all gathered; such as Communist. When there was Indira Gandhi's Government, they had been instrumental in the fall of the Kerala Government at that time by misusing article 356. You might be knowing about it. Not even so, Congress and all these people never sat together by this day. As and when the opportunity came to form the Government, particularly coalition Government in this country, Congress has always played such a role. You form the Government today, we support you and when the Government is formed, Congress plays its trick. It has been my experience by till date and due to this support, they are farming the National Front Government. We have certainly formed the Government and within ten days after the constitution of the Government, these people want us to execute the work of ten years. But it can not be so. All the Members made their statements here. Wherein our Maharashtra leader Shri Sharad Pawar also participated in this debate. A bit of aspersions were cast on our party. I want to ask Mr. Sharad Pawar and Mr. Banatwalla why did they come to our dias when our party was very bad as claimed by them. They might have with some purpose, and when that purpose was served, they started criticising my party.

You people should make an assessment of yourselves as well while discussing in this House  
*... (Interruptions)* I would humbly request all of you that you have expressed yourselves so amiably.

*[English]*

You have tried to express that you are the only honest person in this House.

[Translation]

Do you think that all the rest are committing errors? Shri Chidambaram has cited a good example. He could not maintain good relations with Shri Narasimha Rao, so he quit the Congress party. The same is the position of National Front. This is a combination of such parties who had quit Congress and joined other parties. Later on, they took all the people in their fold to form a Government, as was the case in Morarji's Government. I would like to ask one question in the House, that who was Shri Morarji? I mean which party did he belong to? We had the Government led by Shri Chandra Shekhar. Who was he? Let you ask him. We had the Government headed by Shri V.P. Singh, who resigned...*(Interruptions)* We believed that this would really do something, so he was given a chance of becoming Prime Minister. Now, look at the leader of the National Front. Who is he? Just think about his past. He had quit Congress and joined the other group and formed a group there, subsequently emerged as the leader of that group and became the Prime Minister or a leader. All this gimmick is going on in this country at the behest of the Congress. The people of this country are not so simple now that they can be taken for a ride, they know that to whom they should elect and which party should come to power and form the Government.

I would like to ask one another question in the House. I have listened the Debates for a long while. Some one told that day in and day out, at least one hundred innocent people are killed daily in our country - in Kashmir and in Delhi...*(Interruptions)* That day, there was a bomb blast at Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi. How many people from their party went to look for the people behind the bombblast? *(Interruptions)* Who is behind all these bomb blasts?

The President's Address was going on, Mamtaji, whose parents gave her a beautiful name. It is good that Mamtaji's heart bluds for minorities. But I would like Mamtaji one question that when her heart is so full of affection, did she go to enquire about the people who were killed in the blasts? Did she bother about their welfare?...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : You people Geraoed my house four times because I was fighting for the cause of the minorities. After demolition of Babri Masjid, when everybody was afraid to come to the road, I personally went to those areas and rescued the people. I also helped all the families who were affected in the agitation.

[Translation]

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : They don't look at themselves...*(Interruptions)* Mr. Speaker, Sir, they may speak anything or ask any question after my speech...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : If the hon. Member has made any allegation, I will go through the record and if it is necessary, I will call you.

KUMARI MAMTA BANERJEE : No, Sir. You allow me for personal explanation under Rule 357.

MR. SPEAKER : I will go through the record and I will see what it is. The hon. Member has not made any allegation against anybody.

*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Please come to the point. Only two minutes are left for you now.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : I should be compensated for the time which is being wasted like this...*(Interruptions)* One M.P. has spoken here...*(Interruptions)* Mr. Speaker, Sir, so many people are killed, nobody said about them...*(Interruptions)* illegal arms were recovered from them and they don't have any information...*(Interruptions)* Shri Sharad Pawarji is present here. He became the Chief Minister of his State after leaving Parliament. I possess arms even today, but these are licensed arms. You are making a hue and cry over it.

[English]

There is much ado about nothing

[Translation]

I was possessing arms and warrant which were provided to me by the police for self defence. Agitations take place. Do you expect from me that I should keep the arms at home and go to the agitating people to preach and teach them...*(Interruptions)* The police has recovered my weapon. A case the police have given back that arm to me. That is the case pending against me. A conspiracy to tarnish my image by false allegations is going on, and to put an end to that conspiracy is the most important task of people's representatives. It doesn't look nice on the part of anybody to argue on wrong points...*(Interruptions)* You form the Government but you are not able to elect your leader or furnish a programme, but do you not fail to stand here to make some one the subject of your criticism. That is all. I want to tell you that if at all our Government falls, we are least worried. We are prepared to face the election afresh. But what about you, you people will not be able to win even half of the seats, you have won this time. I want to bring home this fact to you...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HINDURAO NIMBALKAR (Satara) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Our leader is speaking. Please ask them to keep quiet.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please bear with him. This not the behaviour of the hon. Members of Parliament. I am sorry to say this. Please behave like hon. Members of Parliament. That is not the way. You must have self-respect. If not anything else, self-respect is very important.

[Translation]

SHRI HINDURAO NIMBALKER : Please ask them to behave properly.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : Hon. Speaker, Sir, I will take only two minutes. Reference has been made here about Shri Krishna Commission.

HON. SPEAKER : Only one minute. I have already allowed you for extra two minutes.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : I have seen here that some leaders have spoken upto forty minutes. Reference has been made about Shri Krishna Commission. I, myself had given my evidence before this Commission for four days. On a specific date, I was asked to be present before the court as the advocates of Communists and Muslim League had to cross-examine me, but both of them were not present in the court. Therefore... (Interruptions) The evidence remained incomplete. Nobody can be blamed for this act. If someone is guilty.

[English]

Those who were not present in the court despite giving them summons, that was their mistake.

[Translation]

Therefore, Sir, let Shri Krishna Commission be there, I with my weapons will be there and let other riots take place there, and if you want to discuss on any subject then I am ready to face any Member of their Party that too, not for a day but for two days. I am ready to speak out, frankly, before you. But if there is any effort made intentionally to malign any party, we will not tolerate it. I also want to submit one another point.

[English]

SHRI QAMARUL ISLAM : Sir, I am on a point of order. I just want a clarification... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : He has got only one more minute. Why are you spoiling him?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Sit down, please. Do Not waste your time.

SHRI QAMRUL ISLAM : I just wanted a clarification from the hon. Member.

[Translation]

One clarification. Whether you can tell the position with regard to the allegation levelled against you that you had threatened the advocates? I want to ask that whether this allegation against you is true?

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : It is totally baseless. It is a false allegation being levelled against me. You can put a number of false allegations. One last point. Somebody has ever said that there will be a civil war, if BJP Government falls. These types of rumours are prevailing in Mumbai city. Today, the name of Shri Bala Sahib has not been mentioned. I want to tell you that Shri Bala Sahib had certainly said that... (Interruptions) therefore, the way elections are being held in the country, the way election results are coming and if such situation remains in the country, then, no single party will be so strong enough to rule the country and a day will come when people... (Interruptions)

[English]

Out of frustration, people may go for civil war. That is his contention. It is not a threat. Please understand what he wants to say. Unnecessarily do not make capital out of nothing and do not unnecessarily attack the party which is hundred per cent a national-minded party. We are with the nation. We are for the nation and we will sacrifice our lives if need be for the nation, for the upliftment of the downtrodden. Please do not forget that very important matter.

[Translation]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : He had said it twice.

SHRI MADHUKAR SARPOTDAR : We like muslims if they love this country, we like Hindus, Sikhs, Christians if they are part of this country. We do not like that citizens of Bangladesh should come here and settle. People from Pakistan comes here and they indulge in Bomb-blasts. We will not spare such people. We want to say these things through you in the House. They will have to leave the Country.

[English]

This matter is very clear. There is no compromise on this issue. We are all Indians. We are national-minded people. All our people should go together and fight all those anti-national activities. Each and every Member of this House should keep this in mind. That is my humble submission... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mamtaji, I have told you that I am going through the records. If there is anything else, I will myself ask you to explain. Why are you worried? I will myself request you to explain if there is anything on the record.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member was just making a reference... (Interruptions)

Does the Prime Minister know? I am sure, he knows that in Orissa the Vice President of the Bhartiya Janata Party, just on the eve of the election went and joined the congress...*(Interruptions)*... he won the election...*(Interruptions)*... Does the hon. Prime Minister know about that?...*(Interruptions)*... Or you say, you are not as clean as you want to prove...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Now, Shri Murasoli Maran please.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please, time is precious.

[Translation]

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE RAI (Sitamarhi) : Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : Before raising the question of point of order you will have to tell me under what rule you are raising it.

*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : No, that is not the case.

Yes, Shri Maran.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Madras Central) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very sorry that I have to speak against the Motion moved by the Prime Minister Thiru Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Not that I love Thiru Vajpayee less but I love my people, my language, my culture and the brothers and sisters of the minority community more.

Sir, if the President instead of appointing Thiru Vajpayee as Prime Minister, had asked him to find out and explore the possibilities of getting the majority. I think the things would have been different now. Unfortunately, it did not happen.

Sir, we know we have special regard and respect for Thiru Vajpayeeji. As the President of the Party Thiru Karunanidhi has said : "He is a great person but he is in the wrong Party." He is a towering parliamentarian. There is no doubt, he is an excellent Prime Minister material but the policies which are pushing him forward are such that we have to be careful, that we have to put our foot down and oppose the Motion.

Sir, it is true that the BJP is the biggest party inside the Lok Sabha. But how did they get it? Where did they get the vote? According to the newspapers, the BJP has won most of its seats in the Hindi heartland and in Gujarat and Maharashtra.

AN HON. MEMBER : What about Karnataka?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : Sir, I am quoting from the newspaper.

The Congress also is confined to a few States like Orissa, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh...*(Interruptions)*. I am quoting from the newspaper. It may be wrong. If I am wrong, please correct me.

Sir, the Janata Dal and its allies are present in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka.

The Left Front remained confined to West Bengal, Kerala and Tripura. But they call us regional parties. I think that now all are regional parties; some may be bigger regional parties and some are smaller regional parties. The Congress Party has got about 30 per cent of votes; the BJP has got about 23 to 26 per cent of votes; the National Front and Left Front have got 20 per cent and the so called regional parties like the DMK, the TDP and the TMC have got 25 per cent. That means, the United Front now has got 45 per cent of the votes. If you add the Congress votes also, now it comes to mean that 75 per cent of the people are supporting a secular Government and not this Government.

I am sorry to say this. We have worked with this party, we know BJP very well. We fought the emergency; we were in jail together. When the National Front Government was formed they supported that Government from outside. Many of us were Ministers in them. But it lasted only eleven months. We know for obvious reasons they withdrew their support and the Government collapsed. In politics there are certain things with which one cannot compromise.

In history the Christian era is referred to as two different periods - before the birth of the Christ and after the Christ; BC and AD. Likewise, in the modern India there is a watershed. The destruction of Babri Masjid is the watershed. So, we have to consider things that happened before the destruction of Babri Masjid and after the destruction of Babri Masjid. Their true colours have come out after the destruction of Babri Masjid. The wounds created by the destruction of Babri Masjid have not been healed. The apprehensions it has created have not been addressed.

I have heard the broadcast of the Prime Minister the other day. He was right, he was very nice. He said India never was and never will be a theocratic state. Sir, I appreciate his statement. He promised some constraints to the use of Article 356. He assured that immediate steps will be taken to restore the balance of resources in favour of the State. I agree with him and I appreciate him. But he asserted that the events of December 1992 were not the result of any pre-planned conspiracy. I beg to differ with him; people will not believe that. He may be against Rath Yatra; he may be a moderate. But it was a conspiracy. I know that the Government of the day also kept quiet at the time of the destruction of Babri Masjid. That is why minorities did not vote for those parties.

Apart from this, whatever he has said in the broadcast is something for the public consumption after he became the Prime Minister. But what about his manifesto where it has been repeatedly said that they shall be guided by their manifesto? Page 6 of the manifesto says that the manifesto shall be the covenant of their Government. But what disturbs us most is its faith in what is called Hindutva. I cannot understand the word cultural nationalism - why they used it and how they used it. It is said in page 15 that the BJP is committed to the concept of one nation, one people and one culture. This is a dangerous concept. We accept the one nation concept. But how can there be one people? I am different, you are different, you look at us. We represent different cultures, we represent different States, we represent different languages. That is why Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said unity in diversity. You want to impose uniformity in India. I warn you, it is not possible. If anybody indulges in uniformity another dismemberment like the Soviet Union will take place. That is, towards that end you are treading with this policy of one people and one culture.

18.00 hrs.

Sir, I belong to a Dravidian group; you belong to a different group. There are several kinds of families of language I speak a Dravidian language; my Telugu Desam friends speak another branch of Dravidian language; the people in the North speak, what they call, 'Indo-Aryan' language. They think, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh is India; they forget about South India. Another tiking goes like this. They want to establish Bharatiya Sanskrit Kendra in each district. Why? How many people speak Sanskrit?  
...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Just a moment.

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AHAMED : Sir, our people also have to speak. The time-frame has not been followed.

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. He is entitled to twelve minutes. I think, more or less, the hon. Member has spoken for about six minutes. Shall I give you another six minutes and then adjourn the House?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN : Sir, they want to encourage the study of Sanskrit and strictly enforce the three language formula in schools. Why should they do it? The three language formula has become a failure. It is a fraud perpetrated on the people of India. They want to promote Bharatiya classical music and performing arts. What is Bharatiya classical music? Our music in Tamil Nadu is called 'carnatic music'. If we go to Kerala, their dance is 'kathakali'; in Tamil Nadu, it is called 'bharathanatyam'; in Andhra, it is called 'kutchupudi'; if we go to Orissa, it is 'odissi'. They do not know about India. They want to hold India in one iniformity. It is a dangerous concept. I would say, It is fascism in another form. It is very dangerous.

Sir, about 'Hindutva', I want to quote what an eminent lawyer has said :

"It is a pernicious doctrine evolved against Mahatma Gandhi's advice by the Hindu Mahasabha in 1924."

Who said this? It is Nani A. Palkhivala who said this. you are following that very pernicious and dangerous formula to divide the country, to drive out the minorities, to create fear among them. Therefore, I am appealing to you to give up the policy.

Sir, 'Hindutva' means *manu dharma*, which keeps millions of our people in caste compartments and as untouchables. We will never look at 'Hindutva'. We will put our foot down on 'Hindutva'. It is anathema to whatever we stand for. We belong to a party which has been started by 'Thanthai Periyar' and 'Arignar' Anna. We follow the principles of Dr. Ambedker. We are a party of the backward classes. This 'Hindutva' will oppress us, will suppress us.

Once again, regarding 'one people, one culture' - plurality is a fact of life. It is a permanent feature, which cannot be wished away. If 'Hindutva' means nationalism, I ask you, why do you not drop 'Hindutva'? 'Hindutva' means nationalism, I ask you, Sir, why do you not drop 'Hindutva'? Why do you not call it 'nationalism'? Therefore, 'Hindutva' has come to acquire a connotation of a 'Hindu Raj'. Sir, it is a rejection of India's composite culture and its religious diversity.

Your manifesto speaks about Bharatiya identity, Bharatiya society, Bharatiyata. I cannot understand anything at all. Therefore, I appeal to you in the name of the unity of the country. 'Do not go in for uniformity, that will mean dismemberment of this nation'. Therefore, I have to conclude, having accepted this mandate from the President, I am sorry how a person of eminence like Thiru Vajpayee continued and formed this Ministry. He knows very well. But one thing I appreciate. He did not indulge in horse-trading and suit case or brief case culture. For that, I appreciate him and I congratulate him. I would say this was a wasteful exercise over the last ten or fifteen days. Therefore, I join hands with Mr. Chidambaram and with Mr. Chandra Shekher. Let us stop this melodrama today itself. It is better to resign than to be voted out.

MR. SPEAKER : Thank you, very much. I know there are many hon. Members, particularly from the smaller groups, who are desirous of participating in the debate. We will certainly give opportunity to as many hon. Members as possible. We have already consumed about five hours and 19 minutes. We still have time with us. Tomorrow we will try to accommodate as many Members as possible.

(Interruptions)



MR. SPEAKER : Please listen, Okay, if you want to know that, then I would say tentatively 12.15 or 12.30 for the Prime Minister's reply.

*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit you that kindly call all those members who want to speak today itself and the Prime Minister can reply tomorrow. After that we may have voting...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

Do not believe in tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER : You sit down please. Allow your Minister to reply.

*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit you to kindly call all the members who want to speak or to whom you want to give chance to speak today itself. Tomorrow we may have reply of the hon. Prime Minister. Then voting can take place after that...*(Interruptions)*. If you leave it for discussions tomorrow, it would be a lengthy process...*(Interruptions)*. If you leave it for discussions tomorrow, it would be a lengthy process...*(Interruptions)*. The day after tomorrow will be a holiday on account of Muharrum...*(Interruptions)*. I have already said in the beginning that the intention of this government is not clear and they want to extend the time for discussion.

*[English]*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN : We are not in favour of extending time just now. The Prime Minister will not be available in the House. Today is the death anniversary of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. There is programme at 7 o'clock in Teen Murti Bhawan to be attended by President, Vice-President etc. So, we are not in favour of extending any time. Tomorrow you can decide any time you want...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : But, can we go up to 6.45 P.M. today?

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : You may extend the time upto tomorrow. But the voting time must be fixed irrespective of the number of speakers speaking. The voting time may kindly be fixed. UP to that time whoever has spoken has spoken. Then, the Prime Minister has to reply. He will reply. But kindly fix up time for voting...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Can we skip lunch tomorrow?

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : It can be at 1.30 P.M. After that we can go for lunch as there is no business after that. So, 1.30 P.M. should be the time...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : No no, voting is a complicated process, Therefore, the voting should start earlier than at 1.30 P.M....*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Will you allow the Minister to speak? Please allow your Minister to speak, Your Minister is the right person to speak.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN : We have got still two hours' time. Naturally, it will be from 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. and at 2 o'clock the Prime Minister will reply. Immediately it can be followed by voting...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have allowed seven hours time...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Tomorrow United Front and the Congress Members will not speak. We will not put up any speaker. Let them put speakers, if they want...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, you have allotted seven hours for the debate. Still a time of one hour and fifteen minutes is left for the debate to conclude...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN : Two hours' time is left...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : No. A time of one hour and forty-five minutes is left.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It takes upto 12.15 p.m. tomorrow; and the voting should start at 12.30 p.m. tomorrow...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, a time of one hour and forty-five minutes is left, roughly.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : It comes up to 12.45 p.m. tomorrow. So, the debate, according to the time allotted should be concluded by 12.45 p.m. tomorrow.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Since we want to accommodate a few more hon. Members, I will keep the tentative time for voting as 1.30 p.m. tomorrow.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow, the 28th May, 1996 at 11 a.m.

18.10 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, May 28, 1996/Jyaistha 7, 1918 (Saka).*