

ment) Ordinance, 1990 (No. 6 of 1990). [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1558/90]

Statements showing action taken by the Government on various assurances promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during various sessions of Lok Sabha

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM (SHRI SATYA PAL MALIK): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the following statements (Hindi and English versions) showing action taken by the Government on various assurances promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during various sessions of Lok Sabha—

Eighth Lok Sabha

- (i) Statement No. XXVII—Sixth Session, 1986 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1559/90]
- (ii) Statement No. XXV—Seventh Session, 1986 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1560/90]
- (iii) Statement No. XXV—Eighth Session, 1987 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1561/90]
- (iv) Statement No. XXII—II Part of Eighth Session, 1987 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1562/90]
- (v) Statement No. XXI—Ninth Session, 1987 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1563/90]
- (vi) Statement No. XIX—Tenth Session, 1988 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1564/90]
- (vii) Statement No. XVI—Eleventh Session, 1988 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1565/90]
- (viii) Statement No. XII—Twelfth

Session, 1988 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1566/90]

- (ix) Statement No. XI—Thirteenth Session, 1989 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1567/90]
- (x) Statement No. VIII—Fourteenth Session, 1989 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1568/90]

Ninth Lok Sabha

- (i) Statement No. VI—First Session, 1989 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1569/90]
- (ii) Statement No. V—Second Session, 1990 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1570/90]
- (iii) Statement No. I—Third Session, 1990 [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1571/90]

Statement correcting reply given on 4th Sept. 1990 to USQ No. 4284 regarding Halt at Bihiya of Howrah Express

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI AJAY SINGH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (Hindi and English versions) correcting the reply given on the 4th September 1990 to Unstarred Question No. 4284 by Shri Tej Narayan Singh M.P., regarding Halt at Bihiya of Howrah Express. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—1572/90]

11.11 hrs.

MOTION OF CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

[English]

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

As decided at the meeting held by me with the Leaders of Parties/Groups on 6 November, 1990, the discussion should conclude and the Prime Minister will reply to the debate at 7 p.m. It was also agreed that the House would not rise for the lunch.

The Honourable Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Kumari Mayavati, will you please take your seat?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have a submission relating to protection of the life of a Member of Parliament. They are constantly threatening to kill me. As such I want to bring this to your notice that there was an attempt on my life when I was coming from Azamgarh via Benaras. The local police rescued me. Several times I have been threatened on telephone with the warning that they would kill me if I did not extend my cooperation to Shri Chandra Shekhar. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM DHAN: I would urge upon you to look into the threats being given to the life of political leaders in the prevailing atmosphere. You must make arrangements for the security of Members of Parliament. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You resume your seat.

[English]

The Speaker is on his legs. I have called the Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Prime Minister.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing Shri Chandra Shekhar to speak because Shri Ram Dhan has mentioned his name.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you I would earnestly submit to Shri Ram Dhan that as he is my friend, he should have informed me about these threats at the very first instance. I assure him that he will face no danger from my side. I would like to request the Prime Minister to provide him as much security as he has for himself. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. The Prime Minister is speaking on the confidence motion. You should listen to him attentively.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Why all of you have stood up, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I expect all of you to speak only after seeking permission from the Chair.

(Interruptions)

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Sir, I beg to move:

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

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You speak when your turn comes please take your seat now.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Let the debate take place in a good manner. Please take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not permitting you.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you I would like to submit before all the hon. Members that there have always been diverse opinions on various issues; there has been unanimity as well, but this House is the apex body of the country for expressing our views and understanding the view points of others. Today, the country is faced with many grave problems and we have to take decision on serious issues. He have not to decide the fate of the Government, but it is the principles which are to be decided. (*Interruptions*)

And you have rightly said that as far as the fate of the Government is concerned, I had very clearly visualised the things on that very day when the Rath Yatra was stopped; on that very day I had decided... (*Interruptions*)

M.R. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. Listen to the Prime Minister attentively. your turn will also come.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: And when this had been made clear by the Bhartiya Janata Party that if the Rath Yatra was stopped... (*Interruptions*) I am coming to that also. I will furnish dwell on the developments month-wise. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES AND MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): This is a serious debate on the Confidence Motion...

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Dinesh ji, you must have seen that Mr. Advani is restarting... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: This is a serious debate on the Confidence Motion. May I except from the Members to allow the Prime Minister and other Speakers to put their views. If necessary, I will request the leaders to keep their Members in order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have full faith in my Members that they will keep order. Our Members know how to keep order. They will keep order.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lodha, you are an experienced member.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): It is the responsibility of everyone, including my party and all its Members to allow every one to express his views during the course of discussion. However, I would like to remind every one that the purpose of Confidence Motion is to decide whether the Government still enjoys the majority or not. The purpose of a no confidence motion is to ascertain as

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

to why there is lack of confidence. But I distinctly remember that when the confidence motion was brought in December, the ruling party, my party and communist parties said that they were in favour of voting without discussion. At that time, the Congress Party did not agree to it and thus a discussion took place on the confidence motion. Today also, if the Congress Party and the ruling party agree...

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: We do not agree.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Then a discussion will take place.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): There should be a discussion.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The discussion will take place. But I wish to tell you that...
(Interruptions)

[English]

SRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: There should be a debate.

(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have no objection to the debate. I was ready for a debate yesterday also. I am not objecting to it.
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

But the people and the Prime Minister should try to understand as to why there is interruption from this side. The tension that has been built up in the recent past between different parties and within a single party should be understood. However, I am of the opinion and I want that all the members should participate in the entire debate in a disciplined manner. Everybody should be provided an opportunity to express his views and everybody should respect the Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

I would like to thank Shri Advani for the point which he has made. In today's discussion all groups should please listen to each other, the final decision is in your hands. My appeal is that even if one feels hurt by something said during the course of today's discussion, one should exercise restraint and place his views before the House on the basis of one's comprehension, duly supported by arguments.

I would like to submit that so far as Government is concerned we had decided about it consciously. I know that the issue is not to be decided today. The Government had already taken a decision on that very day when Bharatiya Janata Party had presented a resolution before the public clearly that if Rath-Yatra or Kar Seva was stopped, it would withdraw its support to the Government. Keeping in view the mathematics of the composition of the house, a challenge was thrown to the Government to take a decision in the matter as the state of its existence. Why was this issue raised at that time? The reason was that there were some related issues. By bringing these issues before this House and by having a discussion on them, the ideas will be clearly put before the people of the country. That is why this issue has been brought before this House. Not only this, it is also a fact that we i.e. Bharatiya Janata Party, leftist Parties and Janata Dal have all worked unitedly to run the National Front Government during the last ten-eleven months. But what new developments took place which compelled the Government to take a different decision. It was not just the question of Rath Yatra or Kar-Seva, but it involved certain basic issues. It has started a fundamental debate. The four basic points in this debate are:—

1. Is one's religious faith above the Constitution or above the set up established under the constitution;
2. Should there be a religious polarisation in this country?

3. Is the mixing up of religion with politics desirable?
4. Will the emotional integration of the country be preserved or not? These four points are linked with this issue. There was a big question mark and the Government had to take a decision as to in which direction we should go, and we took a decision. When a choice between power and principles came before us, we considered it proper to adhere to principles rather to sticking to power. We could retain power by compromising our principles. If we could have made a compromise on these four points, the Government would have survived, but the question was whether the Government should survive or the country. Everybody is familiar with the background of controversy about Rama Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid. We have nothing new to say about this matter, but the background of the disputed site of Babri Masjid and Ram Janam Bhoomi lies in the order of the Allahabad High Court which says that *status quo* should be maintained there. This means that the Babri Masjid or the existing structure should not be demolished. In no way should it be destroyed or demolished and at the same time there should be no interference with the pooja of the idol of Lord Rama till a final decision is taken in the matter. It is the responsibility of the Government to maintain the *status quo* there. Whatever be the decision of the court it has got to be respected. If court decides that it is a mosque, let there be a mosque. If the court decides that it is Ram Janam Bhoomi, let it be accepted by all. A present *status quo* has been maintained to ensure justice. So

far as the construction of the temple in Ayodhya is concerned, no Muslim has objected to it till date nor has any Muslim said till date that they will object to the construction of Ram Mandir in Ayodhya. If the temple or Lord Rama is not constructed in Ayodhya where else it will be constructed. There is no dispute. *(Interruptions)*

I say even today that minorities are being dragged into the dispute. *(Interruptions)* Nobody has any objection to the construction of a temple in reverence of Lord Rama. Nobody from the minorities has ever said this. So many steps were taken and many attempts were made to solve this problem. And I agree that the people for various parties and those associated with different institutions and the religious leaders from both the communities and other communities also tried their best to solve this issue. It is not so that they did not make efforts. A proposal was put forward on behalf of the Government that a plot of land adjacent to the site, which is quite close to Rama Katha park can be a much better site than the disputed spot Government had offered this land for the construction of the temple. *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYAWANTINAVINCHANDRA MEHTA: Temple will be constructed at Rama's birth place.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: My submission is that whatever be the decision of the court for the solution of the problem, that should be implemented. If it goes in favour of Rama Janam Bhoomi, it could be implemented accordingly. It is said that six crores of rupees have been collected and construction of the temple will also take a long time. On the one hand it was said that special bench may be constituted and there should be regular hearings and whatever judgement is delivered should be accepted.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYAWANTINAVINCHANDRA MEHTA: Nothing had been done for four months. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Madam, one may hold the Government guilty after four months, but what was the fault of the innocent children? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PHOOL CHAND VERMA (Shajapur): How many people were sacrificed for Mandal Commission? (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is on his legs. Please take your seats.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is speaking; Shri Lodhaji, please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: In this way, Sir, many reasonable proposals were put forward and attempts were made at all levels, but the matter reached a deadlock, when it was said that the decision of the court is not acceptable. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Khurana, your turn for speaking will also come. Please be seated.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Be seated, please.

SHRI MOHAMMAD SHAFI (Srinagar): This is Parliament House not Rath Yatra. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Be seated, please.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

Sir, some people put forward a proposal that this issue can be solved if an ordinance is promulgated and if the Government presents it as *fait accompli* the problem may possibly be solved and later on it will be accepted by all. When all measures were exhausted, this too was tried, but this was also not accepted by both the parties. People from Vishwa Hindu Parishad and Babri Masjid both rejected it. Of course, Advaniji called it a very small step in the right direction. Ataiji also endorsed ... (*Interruptions*) ... But the people belonging to Vishwa Hindu Parishad and Babri Masjid rejected it. And Shri Advani also made a statement. The main purpose of issuing the ordinance was to find an early solution by referring the matter to Supreme Court since the dispute has been continuing for several years, which has generated considerable tension. While conceding that it was a step in the right direction it was said that the temple would be constructed only at the spot where Lord Rama was born. The other aspect of the ordinance related to the maintenance of *status quo*. The acceptance of ordinance till the supreme court delivered a judgement, did not mean that *status quo* was being disturbed. Because if it is brought in disputed the dispute will remain there. But intention should also be clear. It was creating another major controversy. Therefore Government withdrew it. Then it was urged that it should be solved through mutual dialogue and the decision of the court should be accepted. But the matter reached a deadlock, when they said that they could not have any talks on it and they could not wait further and they were also not agreeable to accept the courts decision. At that time we had to make a choice and we decided that we would not accept it as many things were linked with it.

So far as this problem is concerned, whole Government has been staked on this issue. I would like to say in this connection that I will continue to make efforts to solve this issue, it will be our collective effort throughout our life to solve it. The question of remaining in power or going out of power does not matter much. What really matters is that the issue should be solved. If this issue

is solved through mutual dialogue, it would be a great example of national integration. Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid issue should be solved through mutual discussion. It is our collective responsibility to solve it through mutual talks. It should be made a point for national integration by finding out a solution of such a major controversy through mutual discussion. Consensus should be evolved for resolving this big controversy.

I would like to ask a question which is very much relevant to this issue. If there is a clash between two faiths or two religious faiths in a country where there are many religions and no body can question other faiths and where all religions enjoy equitable respect, then what is the way out? The religions faith of one section the other can not be violated. Thus it can be solved either through mutual discussion or through a court of law. How can the country be run? If a precedent is created at one place and if it is accepted and people of other religions raise such issues, it will come a very great problem. A good suggestion in this connection is that a legislation should be enacted by Parliament to maintain the *status quo* of all religions places as on a particular date so that dispute may not arise in future. It would be a good decision. We extend our full support for such a move. Initiative should be taken in this direction. I think a consensus could be evolved about it. But a big argument is made when it is said that one's religious faith is above the constitution and the court. It is above the State, then it is possible only in a theocratic State. It is the definition of theocratic State and we would be laying the foundation of a theocratic State. When election symbol and religion are mixed up...

(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi); These are all obsolete ideas. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: These are not obsolete things these are the things which will be arise in future. Had these things been obsolete, there was no need to

say anything. These things will arise in future, that is why we have changed our path. *(Interruptions)* Today there should be a fundamental debate on this issue. Government's coming in power and going out of power do not matter much. Governments come into power and go out. Government is not a thing which is non-available. Now it is very easily available. *(Interruptions)* But we have to see whether religion and politics can be mixed up and whether there would be religious polarisation in this country. If religious polarisation takes place, what will be its effect in Punjab, Kashmir and North India. What will be its effect on our Armed Forces, Police and army. ... *(Interruptions)* I am proud of our army, armed forces and police. These are the symbol of our unity and they are Indians, first irrespective of caste, religion and language. The soldier who wears a military uniform is always ready to face any danger. We are proud of them. All of us have shed our blood on borders of the country. Every inch of our land is sacred. If we put its dust on our forehead as 'tilak', the unity of our country will be maintained *(Interruptions)* Dust of every temple and Masjid is sacred. I do not say that these controversies should continue to occupy our mind because it affects our youths adversely. Its results can be seen in other countries too and it leads to dictatorship and murder of democracy which cannot be checked by other forces. Therefore, main issue of today's debate is continuance of democracy and not the Government. We have to decide about the main issue and it is not the issue as to what sort of Government will be there. What a Government would be there is quite evident. We have to consider as to what shape of community we want. We have to decide if we want the country where all the people live in amity, peace or a country full of hatred. We wanted these things to be debated and it has been alleged that we are sticking to the Chair. Had we been interested in power only, we would have compromised our principles. Something else would have been done. *(Interruptions)* Dagger is there and one should see as to who is using that dagger. *(Interruptions)* It would go on record and this country is witness to those issues which have been attacked. This fact

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

should form part of our history... (*Interruptions*) ... I know that this main issue will be raised in today's discussion... (*Interruptions*) ... There are issues. It is not that the country has no problems. These can be debated. The debate can be held on the achievements and failures of the Government. Good and bad points of the Government can be discussed. There is force on the arguments of both the sides. Debates can be held on Punjab, Kashmir and Assam problems, price rise and the State of the economy of the country and good as well as bad points of the Government may be highlighted. But all these are being raised, because other parties want to evade the real issue which has to be decided today. We want to put the real issue before them. We want them to face the reality. The main issue has been framed in the minds of the people of the country and issue has been framed politically throughout the country. A decision should be taken about the stand taken by Government in not allowing the Rath Yatra any further. The Government does stick to its stand in this regard. The members cannot shirk their moral responsibility by referring to other issues. If other matters are to be discussed, it should be decided today itself. The issue has been framed politically in the entire country and the other House may also be summoned immediately for the purpose and a decision may be taken about the shortcomings and mistakes of the Government. The time has now come when principles for which this Government have stood for and your principles are to be tested, your integrity is to be judged... (*Interruptions*) ... Sir, so far as we know the religion in India, has always been a unifying force. It is a matter of feeling and faith and has never got a place in the politics of power. One may not bow to a king, but an enlightened and religious person is always held in high esteem. There might be other reasons for a clash in the society. There is no clash between religions. Hinduism symbolise unity and it has brought different people closer, it has united animate with inanimate and soul with the omnipresent, the God. Hinduism has not created differences among

the people, it has united them Islam also has been a symbol of equality and brotherhood, Christianity is a symbol of love, Buddhism and Jainism have been the symbol of non-violence. Our religious feelings have been our biggest asset, legacy, heritage and motivating force. This has been the basis of our history and with the help of it, we can mould our new history in future. If we distort our religious spirit, we will distort our history, culture and future. Let it be decided today. It is to be approved today. It would have to be decided as to who is on this side and who is on the other side.

Guru Nanak Devji had brought every one together. There are doors on all sides of Harmandir Sahib, which are all open for the devotees irrespective of their faith. One can see it in Harmandir Sahib. There is no discrimination or confrontation in various religions. There may be difference in rituals and not in religions and now there is confrontation in politics also. But there is something else behind the curtain. Not only this, the steps that the Government had taken with regard to the down-trodden and backward classes... (*Interruptions*) ... Are you saying something reliable? The steps that were taken for the betterment of backward classes through implementation of Mandal Commission Report, were resented and it has also been the cause behind it, Sir, we know that we are out to fight with the system which is thousands of years old, and there is no doubt that by doing so we would find ourselves in difficulty. Perhaps it is my fate. It happened when I was the Chief Minister, or Union Minister of Finance or Minister of Defence or even now when I am the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Rakeshji, please sit down.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: When I was the Minister of Finance, my views clashed with the economic system and thus I had to go from that post; during my tenure as the Minister of Defence my views clashed with the political system. I had to go again and now when I am the Prime Minister,

my concept differs from the present concept of social system and thus it is being said that I may have to go soon. However, I am not bothered about it. We are not bound to bow down to these systems just to complete our five years' election term. We will prefer to keep ourselves away from the power but we will continue to fight against injustice. We don't mind even if we have to contest hundreds of elections but we will not give up the path of justice. This year has been observed as the year for justice in commemoration of birth centenary of Bharat Ratna Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar and whatever steps we have taken in this regard have been resented by certain classes. Now the question is as to how the poor can become partners in power. The poor will have to involve himself in that struggle for justice, because he is not fighting for his livelihood rather he is fighting for respect and honour in the social life. That is why my submission has been that unless weaker sections participate in the power-structure—whether it is in this House or in the bureaucracy—their problems cannot be solved. Therefore, efforts will have to be made in order to enable them to get their share in the administration of the country. Unless they are involved in administration, mere holding discussions will be futile and those people will continue to remain ignored.

Sir, we reached this stage with hard struggle and the formation of Government was just a halt. We continued the struggle while in Government and will continue it when such of power. We are prepared for a relentless struggle; even a few moments of important occurrences have considerable significance in history. Members may be anxious as to why we have parted company with B.J.P. after an alliance of 10-11 months. My submission in this regard is that it was just an experiment to bring rightists and leftists together. National Front was formed as an alternative to the Congress. Since independence there was no alternative political party to the Congress. After independence, the country had to face a number of problems and in order to solve them an alternative was essential.

12.00 hrs

But the decades after decades passed, no political alternative direction could emerge. National Front was an effort in that direction. On one side there was left spectrum and on the other BJP while Congress was in the centre but no centrist option was there to be chosen by the people in case they wanted to go against the Congress. National Front filled this vacuum in that sense. It was a new attempt to form the Government. In order to fulfil the aspirations of the people for a political alternative to end the Congress monopoly, all the forces came together in the last elections. Though our campaign was not joint but we had an agreement for seat adjustments. Under the agreement for seat adjustments, we got the public mandate to end the Congress political monopoly and under the same public mandate, we had an alliance with the leftist parties as well as the B.J.P. and we had been working in consultation with each other but the public mandate was mainly against the Congress. Whatever we spoke in public meetings was totally against the Congress. Nobody can deny this. Of course, some differences were there. Shri Advani raised the issue of article 370 and suggested its exclusion whereas I favoured. But on the Ram Janam Bhoomi Babri Masjid issue, B.J.P. always asserted that they lend their moral support only to it but would never get political benefit out of it. Whenever this matter came up, they claimed that the movement was started by Vishwa Hindu Parishad and they were just giving moral support to it.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): Don't make wrong statements. It has never been said.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: This will be decided by Vishwa Hindu Parishad only because they are mainly involved in it. Neither during the election campaign nor during consultations it was made evident that they were giving their support to National Front mainly on the basis of Ram Janam Bhoomi Babri Masjid issue as defined by Vishwa Hindu Parishad. This be-

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

came clear only during the 'Rath Yatra'. It was alleged that we did not consult them on some other matters. also. However, in that particular case we did inform them. Another allegation made against me was that I do not follow the judiciary and the Constitution. I do not want to go into this controversy. If I have faith in something, you should also have faith in that and only then some solution may come out. This was the only fundamental difference that broke our relations.

According to the news reports today the situation is that BJP and Congress both are in a mood to topple the Government. But I would like to ask them... (*Interruptions*) ...If they topple the Government they must take responsibility to run the Government also. Political sincerity demands that the people who topple the Government should shun the responsibility of running the Government. Out of 280 members, we were about 140 and we formed the Government but now it is heard that 190 members will be on one side and 25 members will be on the other side and it is very surprising that 190 members cannot run the Government. You should have some courage at least... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shastriji, please sit down, I did not allow you to speak, so please sit down.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It reveals only the opportunist tendencies and the violation of public mandate. It is also being said that on one side there will be an engine of 25 HP and on the other of 190 HP. Will the 25 HP will carry the 190 HP or it will be the other way round? (*Interruptions*) Sir, generally we see a jeep pulling a trailer because the jeep has got the strength of HP, an engine is there in it and the trailer follows it, but today it appears as if the trailer will push the jeep. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVI LAL (Sikar): Today the situation is that public opinion is with us whereas the power is in their hands. It is really a very strange position.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

Sir, just now I gave the example of trailer and jeep, however, the trailer can push the jeep only when the jeep is put in reverse gear. But if Rajivji drives the jeep in the forward gear, the trailer will never move ahead.

Sir, the people have given their verdict in favour of various political parties other than the Congress, so it will be far better if such parties run the Government. It is related to the previous election. We will accept what you decide, we will sit on the opposition benches if you wish. So far as differences inside the family are concerned even today if anyone wants to return to his family he is welcome, there is time till this evening. But, Sir, that would be a wrong convention because the Government can be formed only as per the political authority of the country.

[*English*]

political authority must reflect the political will.

[*Translation*]

It would not be the sanctity or legitimacy of political will if any of the splinter group is given the responsibility to form the Government, it would set a wrong precedent. Therefore, such precedents should not be started.

The topic has shifted to a national Government. It has been pointed out that the country is facing a number of problems—Punjab problem, Jammu-Kashmir problem, Assam problem, then there is problem of price-rise and the gulf, and a national Government should be formed to meet all these challenges. This matter can be taken into consideration, but I would like to make it clear that my party would join hands with none except the left parties. We would not join hands even with BJP which considers itself to be above even the Constitution and the law. Therefore, Sir, I would appeal to you and all the hon. Members of the House that they should rise above their political interests and take decisions according to their conscience to promote unity of the country,

secularism, dignity of the Constitution and for the upliftment of suppressed, exploited and neglected sections of the people. With these words, I conclude.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

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

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI PIYUSH TRIKAY (Alipurduar): To which party he belongs?

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I have called Shri Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, most regretfully I am participating in this discussion. I am not rising to criticise any individual, I have stood up to look within our hearts and to assess as to what we did during the last eleven months. What we have done so far to emulate these principles in our actual lives, which we have been talking about. I would like to submit in very clear words that we may have difference of opinion on such issues so far on secularism in concerned, use have difference of opinion with Bharatiya, Janta Party, but what I have learnt from democracy is that inspite of our differences we should work together to take the country forward. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen to what Shri Chandra Shekhar says.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Even if they don't listen, I will try to make them listen. I understand that inspite of difference of opinion we should carry on through mutual discussions and we formed this Government on this basis only. It does not matter whether the Members belong to the Left Parties or to the Janata Dal, we should not forget that we made a pact with the B.J.P., because the

country was in danger. We should work together to save the country from that danger. Our friends are very angry, but this anger cannot solve the problems the country in facing. The situation of the country today is worse than what it was during the last eleven months. Is it not a fact that there has been increase in terrorism, inequality unemployment and in prices in the country? Is it not true that there has been increase in social tension and Punjab, Kashmir and Assam are reeling under terrorism? In the villages people are becoming thirsty of each other's blood in the name of religion and caste Whether any introspection to find out who is responsible for bringing the country to such a situation and why? I request the hon. Prime Minister that it is not any drama to run the Parliament. It is not the question whether a jeep will run or a trolley. The hon. Prime Minister is in the habit of seeing the lifeless objects only. But a jeep or a trolley does not run on its own, it is the driver who make them run. If the driver is inexperienced neither the jeep will run nor the trolley. The question is not of the jeep or the trolley, it is of driver. I regret to say that when the driver is incapable of driving a jeep or a trolley, how can he drive properly. Therefore, I would like to submit if you want to raise the question of principles, you should first raise the question of secularism. Secularism is the first test of human sensitivity. A nonperson who is not sensitive cannot be secular. In spite of our divergent views, if we cannot respect each other, it would be meaningless to discuss secularism. I would like to know from Shri Advani whether this is the way to carry out the discussions? I wanted to ask this question eleven months back when this discussion took place between the Prime Minister and Shri Advani, when I was not there. A Committee was constituted to suggest solutions on the Babri Masjid issue. The hon. Home Minister and the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh were also there in that Committee and who were later removed from the Committee only because some of the leaders of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad did not want that they should be there. Is this the way to govern the country? Are we going to govern like this only? Why Shri Mulayam

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

Singh Yadav and Shri Mufti Mohammad Sayeed were removed from the Committee, who had compromised then? Whether a compromise was made with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad or that with any Imam over the issue of Babri Masjid, such compromises only are responsible for worsening the situation in the country to such an extent. An Ordinance was issued at the instance of the hon. Prime Minister. We thought that some way might be found out through this. We can fail and your party may go out of power, but hon. Prime Minister has no right to insult these institutions. Involving the office of the President also in the can not be called to be a right tradition. Such a thing, has never happened in the history of the world I am closely observing this Parliament for the last 23 years, such thing has never happened that an ordinance is promulgated and then withdrawn within 24 hours... (*Interruptions*) ...I would like to submit that this Tuglak like behaviour is responsible for taking the country to such a worse situation I am against such type of behaviour and consider it my national duty to oppose such behaviour to save the country. The Members are being asked to discuss about the principles. We also know that Rama does not belong to one place only. Here I would like Shri Advani to refer to the poem read by Shri Maithilisharan Gupta once in the other House which means as follows...

"Mana Ram tum manav ho, ishwar nahin ho kya,

vishwa me rame hue sabhi kahin nan-inho kya,

tab mai nirishwar hun, ishwar kshama kare,

tum na ramo to, man tum me rama kare,"

This is the definition of Rama, which was given by our Rashtrakavi. Some solution can be found, if we discuss the issue keeping in view the above definition. We

should opt for negotiations. I have no hesitation in saying that Shri Advani and Shrimati Scindia also love the country as much as I do. Even if our views are different can't we find a solution through mutual discussions. I have as much respect for Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri Indrajit Gupta as I have for others. But I would like to tell those who talk of the principles that principles are not something which can be discussed in the corridors of powers it is strange that a person who entered politics through government posts should discuss principles ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Please note it that principles are not discussed in the corridors of the Government posts.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yes, I know that. Principles are nurtured through struggles but those who have no history of struggle, when talk about principles... (*Interruptions*) I am not one of those, who do not accept their mistakes. May be I have also committed mistakes. May be I have made a lot of mistakes and have taken a lot of wrong steps in politics, but Mr. Prime Minister have also struggled for the principles. When you were making all sorts of sordid compromises to remain in the chair, I was fighting all the problems by following the path of struggle. Please don't talk of your principles to me. As I have already said I might have also made mistakes.

"Chaman ko sinchne me pattyan to jhar gayi hong,

yahi ilzam mujh per lag raha hai bewafai ka,

magar kaliyon ko jisne noch dala apne hathon se,

wahidava karen is chaman me rahnumai ka."

The hon. Prime Minister who is responsible for taking away smile from the faces of crores of people of this country, would have

saved the dignity of this country, this House and of his own, if he had resigned, from his post rather than discussing the principles in the House today, but he has no respect for dignity, principles or rules. I also know all those talks of bravery. I didn't mention it before, because it is known to everyone that in Parliamentary democracy the cabinet has collective responsibility. This is for the first time that it has been said in our country that the Prime Minister is corrupt while the Finance Minister, who has signed on the file, is honest. If this had happened in any other country of the world, such person would never have been allowed to rise in politics.

Mr. Prime Minister, I know that it is difficult for a splinter group to run a Government but Prof. Dandavate, Mr. Ajit Singh, Mr. Sharad Yadav, Mr. Devi Lal and Mr. George Fernandes, you entrusting the reins of power to a despondent and frustrated individual and the results thereof are before you. Where were your principles, when you were elected as the leader of the Janata Dal Parliamentary Party? Was that election based on principles? Then, on what basis are you challenging us today? On what basis are you giving us lessons on principles? The question of secularism is a perpetual one. People should not kill or harm each other in the name of religion, we should not create fear in the minds of the minorities. If attempts are made to terrorize them, we will stand and fight against those forces indulging in such activities. If Mr. Advani's 'Rath' was to be stopped, why did you wait till the day a threat to the Mulayam Singh Yadav Government became imminent? Why was the rath' not stopped at Delhi or before that? Mr. Advani has said that nobody talked to him on this issue even once, during those four months.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a committee of the National Integration Council of which I am also a member and a very eminent person is the convent, held its meeting to find out ways and means to solve this vexed issue through negotiations. Many people present in the House may be surprised to hear that Shri L.K. Advani and Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee extended their whole-hearted co-operation in this regard and I have no hesitation in admitting this fact, but, the Prime Minister's

office sabotaged the whole process, the very next day. Is this the way to run the country? Is this the way to solve its manifold problems. We are ashamed of it. I have never been a Minister, but Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am aware of the limits, of the propriety of conducts within which one propriety has to function in politics, in a Parliamentary democracy. Here, we hold talks with political stalwarts like Shri Advani and Shri Vajpayee and assure them that the contents of the talk won't be disclosed to the press, but the very next day we find all those things splashed in the front pages of newspapers. Talks are held with religious leaders like the Shankaracharya and Ali Mian, but after four days, you back out. No one has been spared, whether it be Mr. Advani, who takes dinner with you every night or people like Ali Mian, who sing songs in your praise or even revered people like the Shankaracharya. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the gravest problem that the country is facing today is that the people are losing faith, they are losing confidence in the leadership of this country, in this Government they are not losing faith in the system and we shall leave no stone unturned to regain that confidence, and we will seek the co-operation of one and all in this regard.

I know today the country is passing through a critical phase and is moving in the wrong direction. I am aware of the ground realities and I will not claim that we are capable of bringing the country back on the right track, but certainly, we will try to save it and serve it to the best of our abilities. We are not a demoralised lot. We shall endeavour to bring the country out of the critical phase it is passing through, the crisis it is facing today Crocodile tears are being shed, for the poor for the downtrodden.

The Prime Minister has reminded the House, of his tenure as the Chief Minister. I don't want to discuss it, or do I want to remind him of the responsibilities of a Chief Minister. but Mr. Speaker, Sir, if one goes through the proceedings of the State Legislative Assembly, during the tenure of his Chief Ministership, one will find that his hands are soaked in the blood of thousand of innocent people Please don't remind us of those

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

things, we don't want this debate to stand at that level but it hurts us when you people give us lessons on principles, when you talk about people gaining power through the backdoor. Throughout your political career, you have held ministerial positions, but you will learn the intricacies of politics, only if you come out of the cocoon of the administration. The Corridors of power are definitely not the classrooms for giving sermons on political principles. Certainly, even a 'Raja' can give sermons but real principle can be taught only by persons like Gautama Buddha and Mahavir Jain, who have done years of penance, have made sacrifices and suffered the bangs of poverty and hunger, but a power hungry Raja, who is ready to stick to his chair, by hook or crook is certainly not the person to teach lessons of political principles and morality.

I would like to say that, it is our responsibility to work for the upliftment of the poor and downtrodden. Unfortunately, in our country, we have distorted caste system, due to which the poor and downtrodden among our backward classes...
(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI MUFTI MOHAMMAD SAYEED): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask Mr. Chandra Shekhar, one question, (*Interruptions*)... I want to put a question to him. (*Interruptions*) I would like to ask him a question. He has levelled so many allegations against the Prime Minister, on his role as the U.P. Chief Minister, as the Union Finance Minister and the Union Defence Minister but I would like to ask him, whether at the all party. Conclave held at Bangalore, didn't he accept the presidency of Mr. Singh? On what basis, did you allow him to lead the party, to lead the movement? Today, you accuse him of being a Member of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's cabinet, (*Interruptions*) I want to ask you, during the last few years... (*Interruptions*)... he was the President, the leader of the party... (*Interruptions*)... Decisions were taken, the Manifesto was prepared, all of you accepted collective responsibility...

(*Interruptions*)...

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I don't want to get entangled in these things. However, when the Hon. Minister of Home Affairs is asking such questions, I would like to remind two persons, Shri Dandavate and Hon'ble Shri Devi Lal. They may recollecting that when the senior leaders of the Party met at Bangalore, I was asked to propose Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh for the post of Party President. Mr. Ajit Singh, you may be remembering that at that time, I had said that I won't simply oppose Mr. Singh's nomination, but I would neither propose his name or second. I know many things. Now, if you are going to ask me about them, it won't be in your interest. I want to say only one thing. I don't want to drag this discussion to a personal level. You may be aware that people feel delighted, when they see an actor stage a sudden entry into the arena, but the audience gets disenchanted and disillusioned with the same actor, when he tries to dominate the whole play. It loses its charm as a drama and turns into a steer jugglery. I don't want to talk about that particular character. However, friends, I would like to submit before you that the major problems being faced by the country today, are that of poverty, of hunger, of thirst. There is reservation for the backward classes, but where are the jobs? What resources are there at your disposal to provide them with means of livelihood? Have you ever thought about it? Have you ever shown any concern for those affected by the price-rise? Did you ever think of the need to provide the basic necessities of life to the poor, innocent and helpless masses of this country? The party Manifesto did not mention only about bringing about reservation for the backward classes, it focussed on many other equally important issues. I would like to say that by bringing reservations, we can keep the poor and downtrodden in a fool's paradise for a few months, but unless we have resources at our disposal, or we are

prepared to bring about major changes in our economy, how will it be possible to provide them with jobs? What resources do we have? Our greatest arrests are our manpower but Mr. Speaker, Sir, the ruling elite doesn't have faith in them. It has faith in the Multinational corporations and it wants to build this country with their assistance... *(Interruptions)* ... Friends, I would like to remind you that when the country's industrial policy was formulated, I expressed my reservations about it. At that time, it was stated that they would make the necessary changes soon. Eight months have passed since then, the Government has collapsed, yet the people of the country are not aware of the industrial policy. No one is aware about the country's economic policy. I would like to make a submission to Shri Somnath Chatterjee that. These are fundamental questions, for which we have fought and struggled for years. I don't want to respond to the harangues of political novices, but I know that I too have been in the political area for a long time now and I won't lose my nerve ... *(Interruptions)* ...

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must have wide-ranging discussions on these fundamental questions, but I would like to say that in this Parliament itself, about a month back, with the support of the Congress Party, we had unanimously or with majority votes passed a Constitution Amendment Bill to postpone elections in Punjab. Similarly, today, people like me believe that if general elections are held now, it would lead to bloodshed and disintegration of the country. Therefore, if we want to postpone the elections till peace and normalcy is restored, if we want but government to function for some time more... *(Interruptions)* ...

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform my friends that letters were being sent to me from time to time by the Government over the past few days, but I did not receive them *(Interrup-*

tions) Ministerial positions are tempting for those, who have never got the opportunity, they crave for it. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that if this country is to be saved and built in a new way, if it is to be rescued from its affliction, its pain, its distress and helplessness then, we will have to get rid of our Prime Minister. I would like him to quit gracefully or else in order to perform its patriotic duties, in order to protest the nation and its age old civilization, this House will have on other option, but to remove him.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say one thing more especially to my friends in the Bharatiya Janata Party. We know that we all should join hands to create an atmosphere of goodwill. We want your Co-operation, yet we would say that in order to run the country and to establish the rule of the law, sometimes the Government is forced to take some unpleasant and stern steps, although they are taken with hesitation and distress... *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Why don't you give up your efforts to become the Prime Minister?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): By your action, you have brought elections nearer.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I would like to tell my friend Shri Madan Lal Khurana that he should not take offence to it, but there is no use in unnecessarily blaming the Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav. We would like to assure you that he doesn't believe in a confrontationist approach, he doesn't want to aggravate the dispute. I would like all the parties to sit together and find out ways and means to solve this vexed

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

issue, but if the Government is forced to take some stern steps, Advaniji, it will be a compulsion and not as a willing at. (*Interruptions*) Similarly, the hon. Prime Minister should not take my words to heart. My opinion about him is the same as the one I had about him earlier and I don't want to express it here. We would not have wanted it even today, had the Prime Minister not started considering so high of himself that he started giving us lessons about principles.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): I want to ask only one question please. Please for Haven's sake, let me ask only one question. I am also old in politics and, therefore, I would like to know why, when one the Left Parties. Conducting movement against price rise, Shri Chandra Shekhar did not him us at that time and have a joint movement. It is the answer to this question that I want to know. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra, I would request the hon. Members to be patient. Some leaders are speaking. Everybody is a leader. The country is looking towards you. We are at cross-roads of our history. I would beseech all the hon. Members that when I am calling upon Members to speak, all the other Members should patiently listen to the Member who is speaking. I would request you all to give a patient hearing to the leaders, to the hon. Members whom I am calling. I am now calling upon Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Baramulla): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Under which rule?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Please hear me. My point of order is that before the National Conference walks out, before anybody speaks from the BJP....

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Please hear me. This is the Party which had taken oath that it would abide by the provisions of the Constitution of India. They took the oath.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Kindly hear me. They should abide by the provisions of the Constitution of India. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra is an hon. Member of this House. Please hear him.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: They should accept the verdict of the Supreme Court of India. We are not prepared to hear them. They are taking India to Fascism.

(*Interruptions*)

They are not accepting the Constitution of India. They are not accepting the verdict of the Supreme Court. I have respect for the persons but not for the party. We will walk out now.

12.43 hrs.

At this stage, Prof. Saif -ud-din Soz and some other hon. Member left the House

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had moved a no-confidence motion against the Government of Shri V.P. Singh and for this purpose I had written to you. I move the same.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as a matter of fact a debate should have been held over the no-confidence motion, but you have permitted the Prime Minister to obtain a vote of

confidence initiating a debate on The no confidence Motion brought in by me, I want to say that I was surprised to hear from the Prime Minister not to raise issues other than stopping of Ram Rath, secularism and Mandal Commission. It is not a question of issues. he initiated his speech by making a mention of stopping of Ram Rath. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people of this country had not made V.P. Singh the Prime Minister to stop Ram Rath, to shed blood of Hindus and to prevent construction of a temple on Ram Janmabhoomi. He was made Prime Minister to implement the manifesto of National Front. Has he put into practice even a single issue contained in the election manifesto of National Front then he would have come out with it here. It requires to be highlighted.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri V.P. Singh has mentioned that he has done all this to protect the constitution and he is going to make sacrifice today for this cause. I want to ask whether the constitution was protected in Kashmir? Whether the two lakh Sikhs and Hindus, who were living in Kashmir has not to quit Kashmir and settle elsewhere in the country under forced circumstances? Whether he could protect them? Shri V.P. Singh deployed the entire Government Machinery to protect the structure of Babri Masjid, he has not made a mention of numerous temples that have been demolished in Kashmir today there is no one left in Kashmir to offer prayers in these temples. Today no one is allowed to Hoist the National Flag in Kashmir. Hoisting Flag at any place in Kashmir means inviting death and falling prey to bullets. No one can raise the slogan "Bharat Mata ki Jai" in Kashmir. If the Prime Minister is incapable of providing protection to the people who hoist the National Flag in their own country and who raise patriotic slogans and if the Prime Minister is not capable to protect the people from bullets, then he has no right to continue as the Prime Minister of this country. I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to whether he has made any attempt to go to Jammu & Kashmir, He went to Bhagalpur and toured almost every part of the country but he did not go never to Kashmir. What to talk of

providing any relief to the victims there, he did not feel it proper even to go to Kashmir to wipe the tears of people suffering there.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what is happening in Punjab? Congress Party had put Punjab on fire and had turned it to a slaughter house. In the course of last one year 2500 people have been murdered there. In Punjab people are being butchered mercilessly in buses and trains but you have not taken any preventive steps in this regard. Neither you have taken any political, social, Administrative initiative nor you have tried to check terrorism by taking some concrete steps. You have not tried to organise people of that state against terrorism and to hold elections. What happened to your Padyatra? Hon. Prime Minister I request you to tell the countrymen about it. Army was deployed in Ayodhya, in all the cities of Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh but you did not deploy army in Punjab because you had on eye on the coming mid-term elections and on the Chair and the votes. The people went on counting the dead bodies and on the contrary you kept on counting your votes. You have driven Punjab on the verge of disaster.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the regime of this Government, the prices have been soaring very high. I have got the statistics relating to rise in prices but I do not want to get involved into those statistics. Today potato is being sold for Rs. 10/- a kilogram. and onions at Rs. 8/- a.k.a. but the Prime Minister who makes tall claims in this regard is not in a position not take any step to check price rise. Dispute this it is an erring of fact that he is saying all these things in praise of his tenure as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, Sir the Government betrayed the youth A this country the most. They had assured the youth that they would make right to work a fundamental right would provide job to every person under this right. On this assurance the youth of this country united and toiled hard to make him the Prime Minister. But what did you give to them there after. Did you provide them employment? You gave them Mandal Commission

[Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra]

we too are in favour of improving the economic condition of backward classes. We too have said that they should be given reservation in jobs and in other fields. There were 31/2 crore unemployed youth in India whose names were registered in Employment Exchanges. Thereafter 65 lakh more people have come to the Employment Exchanges this year to get as to how many their names registered hon. Prime Minister should tell us out of them could get employment. Only two lakh got it. The fan on Government jobs which is in operation since 1984 from the time of congress Government has yet not been lifted by you. Lakhs of youth crossed the age limit and thereafter they have been forced to starve. You have not taken any corrective measure. You have tried to immortalise yourself merely by calling this session and posing certain problems. You said that you have implemented Mandal Commission recommendations and have tried to uplift the backwards. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to ask the Prime Minister as to whether he has provided job to a single person under this reservation despite the fact that so many months have lapsed. You were aware that this matter would be taken to Supreme Court, you knew that no one would get a job. You implemented it without caring to go through it. You did no without talking to anyone and without taking into confidence the parties that are extending their support to the Government and without reaching a national consensus.

On its implementation hundreds of youths in schools and colleges restored to self immolation. The delicate flowers of the country kept on burning and you had no sympathy for them and made no attempt to save them, you did not try to stop them to do to by holding concrete discussion with them. On one hand people immolated themselves and on the other hand you did not provide jobs to people belonging to backward classes. On the contrary you indulged in self publicity and drifted the country into a caste war. The Prime Minister has said that today's debate should be co to secularism. The Prime Min-

ister claims that if any party or group keeps its interests above the constitution then Government will have to take necessary steps to protect the constitution. I want to tell. The Prime Minister that in our constitution common civil code forms a part of the Directive principles. Our constitution lays stress on Common civil code for all citizens of the country. But you have stated that you will not allow it's implementation. Does it not amount to giving priority to religious sentiments over the constitution. You have referred to protection of law. No one thinks of the religious sentiments and beliefs of Hindus. As regards Ram Janambhoomi, our leader Shri Lal Krishna Advani will speak at length.

But what is meant by secularism. In the entire, world secularism means that every one is equal in the eyes of law. Everybody has equal rights. We accept the fact that Hindus, Sikhs, Muslims and Christians have the right to equality try party do accept it but it is an issue of faith. But in India, the Hindus have been treated as second or third class citizens for more than a thousand years and this cannot be allowed to continue now. If becomes a sin to be a Hindu in a country, 86 per cent of whose population happens to be Hindus, then we refuse to accept such type left of secularism. If the Imam of a Masjid runs this Government and all ordinances are passed or withdrawn at his will and if all theadams in religious matters are taken as per his desire, then is it secularism? We are asked to forget the history and the atrocities that had been committed. The foreign invaders had demolished the temples and damaged the idols. We are asked to forget that lakhs of people were slaughtered and the men and women of this country were taken to foreign countries as slaves and were auctioned we are prepared to forget everything but Muslims shall also have to forget that now Babar cannot rule this country. Hindus shall not tolerate any kind of torture any more.

As regards Ram Janambhoomi, the Prime Minister has himself said that it was not a mosque, it is merely a structure. Everybody knows that no namaz has been of-

ferred there since 1936. No Muslim can visit that place. Idol of Lord Rama are placed there. How can a place be a mosque where idols are placed? It is only a memorial of Babar. There cannot be any objection in shifting it from there. The statue of George I has been removed from India Gate. The statues of Queen Victoria and King Edward have also been removed. The names Harding Library and Harding Bridge and the name of institution associated with Irwin have been changed. All the foreign memorials have been removed on the plea that are symbols of foreign aggression. At that time nobody protested against it and raised the question of identity of christianity.

[English]

SHRI ABDUL SAMAD (Vellore): Is there any statu inside the Babri Masjid? I want to know this.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: The idols of Rama are place at that very place. (*Interruptions*)

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Ratilalji, please sit down.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Whenever there were invasions on India, the people of this country come forward to sacrifice their lives. Lakhs of people laid down their lives for the cause of Ram Janmabhoomi, Lakhs of people were beheaded and their bodies were cut into pieces by the aggressors. At that time they had firm belief that one day India would be a free country and and Ram Janmabhoomi would once again be liberated. They had never anticipated that after 43 years of independence, the unarmed people chanting songs in praise of Lord Rama and proceeding towards sacred Ram Janmabhoomi would fall prey to the bullets under the order of the Prime Minister

and a Chief Minister of this country... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down as your party leader is speaking.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: I would like to say that it is neither an issue of ideals nor of principles. All these people are murderers and they are dreaming their bright future at the cost of bloodshed of Hindus. They are like vultures who are nibbling the dead bodies. They are trying to create their vote banks and serving their political ends.

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR (Bikaner): They also want to make a Hindu Vote Bank. They are responsible for the killings of innocent people.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Makkasar, please sit down. That is not the way, you have to give patient hearing to whatever is being said.... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: I am repeatedly asking you not to interrupt the Member whom I have permitted to speak.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: It is tragic that thousands of people have been killed but it is a matter of shame that such people are also there in this country who congratulated Mulayam Singh Yadav and rejoiced over this bloodshed.

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR: You had celebrated Dipawali and distributed sweets.

MR. SPEAKER: You will also be given an opportunity to speak.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Today, the communist Party and the Muslim league have become the greatest supporter of this Government. History bears testimony that the Communist Party have always stood by the traitors. It is the Communist Party which had once clapped in praise of Hitler... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: Somnath Babu is to speak.

[*English*]

Shri Somnath Chatterjee will reply to it; you please take your seat. You should have patience to hear other Member's speech... (*Interruptions*) ...

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: It was the same Communist Party which supported Hitler and again, during our freedom struggle in 1942, they supported the cruel and repressive British Government.

13.00 hrs

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during Indo-China war in 1962, the Communist Party supported China and at Tiananmen Square in Beijing when tanks were used to crush the pro-democratic movement in which lakhs of youth were killed, the Communist Party supported the Chinese Government. Sir, it is the same Communist Party which is supporting them today. They have congratulated Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav. They have celebrated over this bloodshed. They have no right to talk of patriotism and secularism.... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: Jai Prakashji, please take your seat.

PROF. VIJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, no definition of secularism has been given there in the Constitution. I would like to say one thing that Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh claimed that he stopped the Ram-Rath and put his Government at stake. How he could stop the Ram-Rath? How much efforts Kansa had made to prevent the birth of Lord Krishna and how Ravana had tried his best to defeat Lord Rama but none of them could succeed in his attempts. So how Mulayam Singh and V.P. Singh would succeed? Temple will definitely be constructed at the site of Ram Janmabhoomi and no power on earth can prevent its con-

struction. However we want that it should be constructed in an atmosphere of peace and cordiality. Janata Dal, Congress Party, Communist Party and Muslim League, all are raising the issue of secularism. If it is so why are they concentrating on such things as to which of the parties is going to quit or which of them is going to form the Government. Why don't they go to the people to have their mandate. We throw a challenge to all the parties to go to the people on the issue of Ram-Janmabhoomi, Punjab and Kashmir problem and seek a fresh mandate. Then they would come to know as to who or which of the parties gets the public support.

With these words, I oppose the motion.

[*English*]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I support the Motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister because we feel that a vote against this Motion in a vote against secularism of this country and a vote against this Motion is for the disintegration of this country on the basis of communal and partisan consideration. Sir, so far as the composition of this House is concerned, the majority here have come on the basis of the support of the people who deliberately defeated the Rajiv Gandhi's Congress Government and ushered in a Government with a mandate to rule the country on the basis of a manifesto which other parties have supported, namely, the National Front manifesto. Sir, so far as we are concerned and my party is concerned, there are many differences between us and the Janata Dal manifesto also. There are many more differences between us and the Bharatiya Janata Party manifesto, their policies and programmes. But when the people of this country gave their definite choice in favour of an anti Congress Government and when the Janata Dal, the National Front was in a position to form the Government, both ourselves and the BJP expressed our support in favour of the Government on the basis that their election manifesto should be implemented. And it was understood that the differences that we have and the differences

of the BJP with the Janata Dal will not be brought into a position of confrontation. That is why, Advaniji said repeatedly on the Floor of this House that their commitment is for the repeal of Article 370 of the Constitution but that will never be a matter on which they will withdraw the support to the Government. They also raised other issues but they were never taken to the point of confrontation or withdrawal of support from the Government. Today why this situation has arisen then. Why does the Prime Minister have to take a vote of confidence from the House? It is because the Bhartiya Janta Party has withdrawn its support from the Government only on one ground—let us be very clear—that the —*Rath Yatra* had been halted and Advaniji was arrested. Apart from anythings else in this country, so many problems are there in this country that we are facing, problem of Punjab, problem of Kashmir, problem of Assam, problem of price rise, problem of unemployment and so many other problems are there. Our economic situation is there; there is accentuation of the problem because of the Gulf situation. All these are forgotten. I could have understood this stand on a question which would affect the life of the people of this country, the future of this country; and which had been considered and was being discussed and when there was no meeting point, they would formulate their own policies and programmes. But only on the ground that the *Rath Yatra* had been halted, only on the ground that the temple is not allowed to be constructed on a disputed plot of land, which is a subject matter of legal proceedings, for which there is a definite order of the court for maintenance of the *status quo*, and as the Government is not permitting construction of temple on that plot of land alone, the Bhartiya Janta Party has withdrawn its support.

Today, we are hearing reminiscences of a leader of a break-away group from the Janta Dal speaking about the country's future. Now, he has decided consciously to take the support of the Congress (I), whom the people of this country had unceremoniously rejected, for the purpose of coming into power, only on the basis of a personal ani-

mosity with the present Prime Minister of the country. Is this the way the future of this country will be decided? I would like to know from Shri Chandra Shekhar whether he would allow Advaniji to go ahead with his *Rath* and allow construction of the temple on that plot. What does he want to do? I would also like to know whether the Congress (I) will permit it or not. The vote against this motion is that they have made their choice, the Congress (I), have made their choice that they would allow the temple to be constructed on this disputed plot of land, otherwise how can they oppose the Government which is today facing this situation because of the question of construction of the temple.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Chandra Shekhar has now appealed for the support from others. He says the driver is incompetent; it is not a question of the jeep, trolley or the trawler. The question is if he forms the next Government, who will be the driver? He may have the steering in his hand, but who will control the clutch and the gear... (*Interruptions*)... He seems to be not very sure of Shri Rajiv Gandhi's support, therefore, he is also trying to placate Advaniji. But at the same time, he is afraid of what would be the reaction of the people of this country. That is why he is giving a friendly warning to Khuranaji and Advaniji that 'I may have to take some strong action against you.'

I would like to ask Advaniji he has decided in his own wisdom—the Ram Rath of epic Ramayana had gone to Lanka for the purpose of annihilating Ravana and his demons who were the incarnates of evils but Advaniji's Rath Yatra whom is he annihilating or he is today reviving the Ravana that is the communalism and the demons that is the Congress (I).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to us the question of secularism is a question of article of faith. This is a country where people belonging to every community, every religion, are entitled not only to stay, reside but to enjoy all the rights. Shall we allow the unity and integrity of the country to be given a go by, to be demolished because some persons want to

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

take away the rights of minorities in this country, because they only want to construct the temple? Will this lone issue today decide the fate of the country? Sir, the choice is very simple. Why we are supporting the Prime Minister today is because he has taken a principled stand, he has sacrificed his Government; he has even agreed to the extent of sacrificing the Government and not to stick to the power of the Chair for the purpose of bartering away the very basis of our Constitutional position.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Wardha): In fact you want him to sacrifice. He has not yet sacrificed. You are suggesting that he should sacrifice.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): He has already become the Prime Minister. You have heard him.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The question is very basic and the question is whether this country will remain one and united and whether we will be able to maintain our secular character or whether this country should be decided on the basis of religion which will put the unity and integrity of the country at stake.

Sir, it appears, on the basis of the composition of this House and the known views of the different political parties, that this motion is not likely to be adopted. But what do we find today. BJP, Congress (I) and a group of deserters are opposing this motion on the issue of secularism. Then what is the difference between BJP and Congress (I)? We don't find any difference.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): You have forgotten those 11 months. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we find very interesting unity, unity of objectives and action between BJP and Congress (I). There is no difference.

Sir, we have had many differences with the Government. We had opposed this Government's economic policy. We have expressed great reservations about the industrial policy of this Government. Sir, we have opposed even taking recourse to ESMA and NSA. I certainly oppose that and even I oppose the arrest of Advaniji under NSA because that is a draconian law which should never be taken recourse to. The question today is much more fundamental and basic. Those are issues which can be sorted out and will have to be sorted out. We also have differences with regard to the way Punjab question has been dealt with, the Kashmir question has been dealt with. These are matters which are vital for this country which have to be decided and would have been decided. The question which has now assumed primacy is not the future of Punjab or the future of Kashmir or the future of Assam or the economic situation but the question which has assumed primacy is not the future of Punjab or the future of Kashmir or the future of Assam or the economic situation but the question which has assumed primacy and which is of biggest concern to us is the future of secularism in this country and whether communalism will win over secularism in this country.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: You forgotten about this for the last eleven months.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We did not forget. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: The Congress Party never associated with the Bharatiya Janata Party. You were with the Bharatiya Janata Party for eleven months. Now, you are coming forward before this House and giving sermons. (*Interruptions*)

SHRISOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I have had the opportunity of knowing Advaniji for nearly two decades. I am sure he is aware of my personal regards for him. But the question which he has to answer to the people of this country and on which I am sure the Government cannot make any compromise is this: "Shall we permit this country to be

destabilised? Can we afford this country to be destabilised on the basis of religion? Can we afford to have a theocratic State? Can we convert this State into a theocratic State? On issues, although we have been supporting; but between us and the Bharatiya Janata Party, everybody is aware in this country that there are ocean of differences and we had agreed to disagree. But we made it clear that as long as the Janata Dal would seek to implement its Election Manifesto, we shall support them. That is not a support to the Bharatiya Janata Party's policy on Ram Mandir. That is not a support to the Bharatiya Janata Party's policy on Article 370 of the Constitution of India. We never supported that. Those issues never assumed importance until Bharatiya Janata Party made it a matter of prestige without considering its serious impact on the future of this country and its unity and integrity. Once we accept that the Government will ignore the rule of law, will ignore the Court order, will ignore the Constitutional provision and will ignore the sentiments and the feelings of the minority in this country for the purpose of allowing VHP or the Bharatiya Janata Party to construct the temple there, in that case, their demand was this: "If you do destroy the Mosque, then re-locate the Mosque." How would they react?

The question is, once we concede this, what will be your answer in case of demand for Khalistan; what will be your answer in case of a demand for theocratic State in North-Eastern areas of this country? What will you say? What will be their answer?

As I said, so many important issues and problems are facing this country. Is this the time to raise an issue which will destabilise the Government? What is the effect of it?

We know, in 1989, the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court by its order asked for maintenance of the *status quo*. That was very clear. It was clarified by the Court. "The Court intended that no party should be permitted to disturb the *status quo*. *Status quo* is understood as meaning that the parties will leave the things as they

are. The direction was with regard to the properties regarding which the rights were under investigation, examination, debate, or a matter being enquired into...

"...The status quo, in the circumstances of the present case, injected both the parties not to alter or modify the status or condition of the properties in question. We clarify that the order dated 14th August 1989 was in respect of the entire property mentioned in the suit, including plot No. 586 by the letters FIGH in the site plan."

VHP entered into an agreement with the U.P. Government on 27th September 1989, which is very important; we should remember it. I quote:

"The VHP undertakes to abide by the directive of the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court given on 14.8.1989 to the effect that the Parties to the Suits shall maintain the status quo and shall not change the nature of the property in question and ensure that the peace and communal harmony are maintained."

In spite of this solemn agreement, in spite of the unambiguous order of the court, BJP and VHP have been insisting, and are insisting—and BJP has withdrawn its support from the Government, because they have taken a position which goes contrary to this agreement, and contrary to the court orders.

(Interruptions)

I would have liked that Chandra Shekhar Ji was here; I would have asked him what is his attitude towards the decision of the Congress Government to permit *shilanyas* in that area. (Interruptions) The Congress will have to reply, no doubt, about it. They are talking of secularism. How did they permit *shilanyas* (Interruptions) They permitted the foundation stone to be laid.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We allowed it only in the undisputed area; not in the disputed area. You must know that much. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: They permitted *shilanyas*. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe, you may explain the things to the House when you speak in detail.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, the Home Minister in this House, in a written reply, has said that *shilanyas* was conducted in the undisputed area—in this very House, the Home Minister in a written reply has said it. (*Interruptions*) Can you challenge it? I will bring it. The Home Minister, Mufti Mohammad has said that *shilanyas* was done in the undisputed area. Mr. Arif Mohammad Khan again repeated it. (*Interruptions*) Sir, don't allow him to distort the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: You have stated what you wanted to say. Now please take your seat. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Congress (I), with a view to create an electorate for themselves among the Hindus, supported the Hindu card. They deliberately permitted the foundation stone ceremony to be performed on the disputed area. If the foundation stone was allowed to be laid, according to them in the undisputed area, where, did they think, would the Mandir be constructed? Their demand has always been to construct, in the *sanctum sanatorium*, which they wanted to demolish. The Congress permitted that. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: No; what are you talking?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Oth-

erwise, what was the purpose of the *shilanyas*? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: A senior leader should not speak like this. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Mr. Rajiv Gandhi had been demanding from the Government that Rath Yatra should be stopped. When it was stopped, he started criticising the Government... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI VASANT SATHE: When?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: When it was stopped, he started criticising the Government for not being able to handle the situation properly. (*Interruptions*) Now he wants to take advantage of this situation. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What did you do about it? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Rath Yatra having been stopped, now the Congress (I) is taking advantage of that; now they are supporting a group of deserters from the Janata Dal for the purpose of their own political interests. Today, the irony is that the petty personal and political interests are allowed to queer the situation; they are trying to take advantage of that situation. The National Interrogation Council passed a resolution appealing for communal amity and communal harmony. The Congress (I) Party did not attend the all-party conference which follow the National Interrogation Council; that was on the 17th of October, 1990. The BJP and the Congress (I) Party did to participate. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Benjamin, without my permission you cannot speak. I am not permitting you to speak. Will you please take your seat?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The communal situation in the country has become volatile since Advaniji started on his Rath Yatra. There had been incidents, ghastly

incidents, communal flare-ups. In so many parts of the country innocent people had been killed for no fault of theirs.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why did you not advise him to stop it in the beginning? What advice did you give him? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe, he is not yielding. What has happened to you?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We cannot forget that almost a mob frenzy had been created in this country.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: They allowed thousands of people to be killed. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe, please don't disturb him.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The unity and integrity of the country is under a serious pressure because of the communal flare-ups that had followed Advaniji's Rath Yatra. Do we want that the people of this country should fight among themselves on the basis of religion? Do they want that we should dissipate our energy in not solving major political/economic issues which are facing this country because innocent citizens belonging to a particular religion will be killed? Is this the way we can maintain unity and integrity of this country? Can we not stop fissiparous tendencies overtaking us? We cannot ignore that this is not a mere question of religion which is involved. Otherwise, we would not have seen the BJP's election symbol so much prominently displayed on the Rath. (*Interruptions*) Shrimati Vijayaraje Scindia has said openly that Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue will be the main plank of the BJP's election campaign at the next election. But is it for political reasons that the Rath was taken and the Rath Yatra was started?

Now a very significant happening is that

the Kar Sevaks have been threatening to continue with the Kar Seva even after the 30th of October, 1990. It is very serious. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURLI DEORA (Bombay South): The Communists had closed their eyes for eleven months.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It is the left parties which have been consistently fighting against this. (*Interruptions*) It is the left parties which have been holding meetings and demonstrations to save the communal amity and harmony and we are happy that the U.P. Chief Minister took a positive role in this case. But what did we find on the 30th October, 1990? That was one of the saddest days in this country.

MR. SPEAKER: You please conclude in a minute or two.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: For eleven months he has taken lunch and dinner with Advaniji and now he is saying this.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: In the last election also you said this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Kar Sevaks threatened to continue with the Kar Seva. Disinformation was spread that Kar Seva had started and had been performed on the 30th October, only with a view to rouse the feelings of the majority section of one community and Kar Sevaks threatened to continue the Kar Seva. When suddenly the Janata Dal has been divided the Kar Sevaks have withdrawn their threat to continue with the Kar Seva.

Therefore, for whose benefit have they been acting? With whom did they have any understanding? Why is that Kar Seva was withdrawn by them? Why are they going away very quietly after having offered prayers to the diety?

Sir, we want to make it clear that we have never compromised with the unity and integrity of the country and the secularism of

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

this country and we shall never compromise.
(*Interruptions*)

This Parliament passed a Resolution on the 13th of October, 1989 when all parties supported it, opposing *Shilanyas* and appealing for communal harmony and for a negotiated settlement, in a friendly manner of this vexed question of Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue. But so far as this Parliament's decision is concerned, that has been ignored. That is why we are supporting this Motion when the secularism of this country is on trial today. Whether the Constitution will prevail or not, that is on trial today. Whether there will be communal amity and harmony or not, is on trial today. Whether the rule of law will prevail or not, that is on trial today. Can any Government permit deliberate violation of orders of courts?

Today, we know that hunger for power is seeking to obliterate the basic fundamentals of our country.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: What you sow, so shall you reap.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The very fabric of our country is being attacked today.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: Not today; eleven months back. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, we have not seen any effort made by those who are now aspiring to the top most position in this country to resolve this question. The Congress (I) did not make any sincere effort to find a solution on this vexed question... (*Interruptions*) Today we are facing these problems in the country because of the continued misrule of the Congress-I and its policies. I was amused to hear from Shri Chandra Shekhar that he was against multinationals, he was against the control of capitalists over our Indian economy. Who is responsible for that? The Congress-I is responsible, towards whom has he held out his hand? Today they have joined presumably

for fighting the capitalism and multinationals. I would like to know from Shri Chandra Shekhar: does he support Birlas, does he support multinationals, does he support the economic policies followed by them, does he support 'shilanyas' ceremony that was allowed to be performed? I would also like to know this from Devi Lalji, who fought against the Congress. Mr. Devi Lalji defeated the Congress. He said that Janata is with him and morcha is with the Prime Minister. Which Janata? Is it those people who have voted against the Congress-I?... (*Interruptions*) Or is it that section of Janata that has supported the Congress-I?... (*Interruptions*) Sir, I have great regards for Devi Lalji. He has made a significant contribution for the defeat of the Congress-I. He has made a significant contribution towards coming together of the democratic process to fight against this anti-people, anti-democratic Congress-I Party and their Government... (*Interruptions*) I do not know whether it is only a personal feeling that has made him part ways with the Prime Minister or the Janata Dal. What is most important in the country today is secularism, the unity and integrity of this country. We are so much concerned about the situation in Punjab and Kashmir because we want to maintain the unity and integrity of the country at all costs. Today this situation is there just because the Government under Mr. V.P. Singh has taken a firm action against division of the country on the basis of religion, the country is now going apart... (*Interruptions*) Sir, people are not fools. They realise that today this question is being utilised, the issue of Ram Mandir is being utilised, for the purpose of coming into power from the backdoor and it is being taken political advantage of. The greatest beneficiaries of Mr. Advani's actions today are going to be the Congress-I, who have let down the people for four decades since independence... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Your Prime Minister is also a party to that. Do not forget that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We appeal to all sections of the House to ponder

very deeply about the effect that will be created if this motion is defeated. Message will go to the minorities of this country that because this Government has taken a firm stand in favour of the minorities, today it is being voted out of power. I would like to know from Choudhary Devi Lalji. Will it be in favour of secularism, will it be in favour of the unity and integrity of this country, will it be for the benefit of the Janata, the common people that today this Government will be defeated on this issue? This issue, Choudhary Devi Lalji, you could have taken up at a proper time. You could have raised it in your party. You could have even solved it properly. But is it that this issue of leadership will outweigh all the vital interests of the country? Congress (I) is such a principled political party that they said: "We do not mind anybody else, anybody else can become the leader of the party but not Vishwanath Pratap Singh." That is the policy of the Congress Party. They say: "you choose any leader of the Janata Dal and we shall support." That shows that they have no basis, no consideration for the principles and policies and no consideration of the programme. Therefore, Congress Party's obsession has been with regard to Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh alone because the principled stand he has taken in favour of secularism, the stand he has taken for the improvement of the backward classes in this country, has made them nervous... (*Interruptions*)... I am not yielding; enough of it. The Congress (I) which has not got the courage to form the Government on its own, is trying to take advantage through Mr. Chandra Shekhar to stifle all enquiries regarding Bofors and other cases... (*Interruptions*) This is their real intention. We see the known faces on the opposition ranks led by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. They are very happy today. But what we really hear are the footsteps of Ambanis and Hinduja... (*Interruptions*) It is a misfortune that leaders like Choudhary Devi Lal and Chandra Shekhar have given them legitimacy in carrying out their illegal objective.

I wish to conclude by appealing to all sections of the House and the country at large that this country which has so many problems to face and solve, let us dedicate

our energies towards solving those major and basic issues and problems, not to drive a wedge among the people on the basis of religion in order to disturb communal amity and harmony, because only united people, united in all senses of the term, can bring the country out of this morass which has been created by Rajiv Gandhi and his Government.

I support this motion.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Sir, I am on a point of privilege under rule 222... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You know the rule.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: I appeal to you, Sir, but I will not shout... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You speak slowly.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: I shall try to be as slow and as low as possible. My point of privilege is against Mr. Kurien, the Chief Whip of the Congress (I) Party. The point of privilege, let me remind you, is that, with your permission, in Zero hour in the last session raised a point that Dwarkapeeth Shankaracharya should be arrested because he had made an announcement that he would go to Ayodhya and start the construction of the temple. There was a Press conference organised by Vishva Hindu Parishad and there was a picture which appeared in the newspaper showing that it was attended by one Congress leader of Delhi. I had appealed to Satheji and the entire Congress benches that they are a secular party and there are many many secular people among them, and therefore they please do denounce that. I hope they do remember.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Yes, I do.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: You said that next day, Sir, that this was no privilege and you rejected it. I did not want to speak, but unfortunately, today again the

[Smt. Geeta Mukherjee]

Chief Whip of the Congress Party, Mr. Kurien raised the same thing... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): Sir, when you have once disallowed it, then what is the use of raising the same matter again.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Will you not listen to a senior lady Member.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE: He has raised the same thing again just now. From here I did not want to shout, therefore, I went to you and gave you all the details. So, this is my point of privilege and I would like naturally to have your ruling on it. What the Congress Party wants to say, I would like to know that also.

MR. SPEAKER: I will look into it.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVI LAL (Sikar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make my submission on the motion seeking Vote of Confidence.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, while seeking the Vote of Confidence, the Government should have enumerated their achievements such as waiver of loan upto Rs. 10,000 and provision of 50 per cent of Budget allocation for the rural sector but instead of that he is saying that he had sacrificed his Government on the day, he stopped the Rath Yatra. I can not understand as to why they are raising the issues of Ram Janambhoomi and Mandal Commission. It is something very dangerous that such an atmosphere is being created which may cause bloodshed and riots and they may get its benefit in the elections. I am of the opinion that it is not Ram Janmabhoomi but Raj Janmabhoomi. If it was the

Ram Janmabhoomi why they did not raise this issue during the 250 years of British rule. Why it was not raised during the 40 years of Congress rule and 4 1/2 years' rule of Rajiv Gandhi's Government. Actually, it is a political issue. I was opposing it from the very beginning since it was not a Rath Yatra but a Ashwamedh Yagya. In the ancient times Chakraborty Rajas used to release a horse as a challenge to other rulers and whosoever stopped the horse, had to fight a battle with him and the winner was called a Chakraborty... (*Interruptions*)... This Rath Yatra is also meant for becoming a Chakraborty... (*Interruptions*)... For this, appreciate Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav for his courage as he stopped this Rath Yatra which was started from Somnath and nobody could dare stop it. But for that I put the entire responsibility on Shri V.P. Singh because he was the Prime Minister. It was his duty to call the meeting of all the religious leaders to find a way out before the actual commencement of the Rath Yatra from Somnath. I think that his intentions were not good. Had it been so, he would have made an announcement about the implementation of Mandal Commission Report much earlier. But an announcement to that effect was made just before the rally of August 9, which was organised as a mark of protest against my dismissal from the Government. So I have expressed my views on the two issues they have raised here. However, I have also spoken on the achievements of the Government on the economic front. I admit that the Government have done a lot on that front. But this Government has pushed the country to a situation where riots are taking place all over the country. The BJP has added fuel to the fire by raising communal passion which, besides conflict between backward and forward, resulted in Hindu-Muslim riots.

So far as the present motion is concerned, I would like to inform the Prime Minister though he is Prime Minister for the time being yet presently he is Prime Minister... (*Interruptions*)... Shri Ram Abdhesh Singh M.P. who was the President of backward classes and perhaps he is holding that post even now, started Satyagraha on 12th

December, 1977. Hundreds of persons courted arrest in Haryana. The main problem with us was the arrangement of bread. Jathedar Santokh Singh was with us. He had been in at Mohandergarh jail. I asked him to arrange for bread and we would fill the jail. He arranged for the bread Chaudhary Charan Singh who was in favour of it, has called the Cabinet meeting, but unfortunately for lack of quorum the meeting could not be held. Had the quorum been completed they would not have got the credit and the credit would have gone to Choudhary Charan Singh. What I mean to say is that we are greater champions of this. Ram Janambhoomi and Mandal Commission issues are politically motivated. It was a conspiracy of the present Prime Minister to counter balance some how the rising political force of farmers and rural people Shri Chatterjee has pointed out that in the last elections we got anticongress votes. Had it been so we would have won in Andhra, Maharashtra, Kerala and Karnataka also... (*Interruptions*) Some of our friends think that we won because of the Bofors issue. Had it been so we would have also won in Tamil Nadu and Kerala. The achievements of Haryana Government... (*Interruptions*) created a favourable atmosphere in the country as a result of which 319 Members of rural background are sitting in the House. Some V.I.Ps. are there who are farmers and who are members of this august House but have given the addresses of Allahabad, Delhi, Rohtak or Jodhpur. I call the V.I.Ps. sitting here as 'very ignorant persons'. They do not know about the rural areas. Those who belong to rural areas are well acquainted with the rural problems. With the increase in the number of rural members, the influence of rural masses has also increased. They thought it their duty to implement the party's manifesto and pressure for which was also mounting. There was awakening among the farmers which was growing and just to contain that this Mandal Commission Report was brought in. About Mandal Commission I would like to say that... (*Interruptions*) I want to go a step further. The Haryana Government has already set up a Commission and it is likely to submit its recommendations. I want that the principle

of one household one service should be followed. There are many leaders of Scheduled Castes and backward classes and there are many Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes families which have three four IAS and IPS officers. People of our area are agitating against the Mandal Commission but they do not know the facts about it. I would cite an example. What is "HM AJGR"? It means, H stand for Harijans, M for Muslims, A for Ahir, J for Jat, G for Gujar and R for Rajput. For this 'HMAJGR' several people made allegations against us that we want to establish the rule of AJGR. In Haryana Ahir constitute five per cent of the total population whereas there is only one Ahir IAS officer, Gujars constitute three per cent whereas not even a single Gujar IAS officer Rajputs constitute four per cent but no Rajput IAS officer is there. Out of 200 IAS officers in Haryana only 27 are Jat. These seven castes are called HM AJGR. Banias constitute five per cent of the total population whereas 51 IAS officers are Banias and 26 are Brahmins. Khatri and Arora constitute seven per cent of the population whereas 46 IAS belong to these communities. 129 IAS belong to Bania, Brahmin and Castes Khatri Arora. I was dismissed from the Cabinet Ministry which engaged the people but I pacified them. On these two issues only our Prime Minister wants to go to poll. BJP is also in favour of elections.

14.00 hrs.

and they want to get votes in the name of religion. This thing does not find any favour in the country nor do we approve of it. I tried my level best and suggested to remove him or change the leadership. They agreed to elect me the leader but I told them that I had not forgotten the earlier instance. I told them to give up the policy of divide and rule stand by your commitments. Whenever, I make any commitment, I stand by that. Today, I am committed to elect Chandra Shekhar as Prime Minister to save the party. They are not bothered about the nation or the party but they want to stick to the Chair at all costs. Some of my friends and I wanted to save the party which we had formed with great efforts.

[Sh. Devi Lal]

We had made nation wide tour and brought many parties together and formed this party. Then we prepared election manifesto of the party. Our election manifesto deserves appreciation about which the Prime Minister had to instruct the secretariat to think about the commitments we have made to the people before taking any decision. For this purpose copies of the manifesto have been distributed among them. It is a quality in him which has to be appreciated. But on the other hand, he is sticking the chair like a limped. In order to come to power, he has deceived me, rather it is his habit to deceive every one. During Allahabad by election he asked Shri Syed Shahabuddin to campaign for him. Similarly all colleagues sitting with me have been deceived at one time or the other. I have been the victim of this thing several times. 9th August was fixed because on that day Quit India Movement was started in 1942. I am not saying it but the Editor of a Newspaper Shri Ramaswamy has said it. You can see it. That is why this date was selected to get rid of the capitalists and to ask the capitalists to relieve us. That is why the Prime Minister is asking us to leave him. Therefore, I would like to say that all of you should help us to get him ousted. We are not going to merge with the Congress but Congress want to help us. If it is to be viewed from that angle, we are helping the Congress. Even now Congress Government is there as Shri Mufti-Mohammad Sayeed, Arun Nehru etc. all are basically Congressmen. We were running Congress Government but now Congress is helping us. I would like to ask Shri Chatterjee stop talking about principles. We have given up principles and morality. At the time of Meham incident, seven Ministers and the Prime Minister submitted their resignation on grounds of principles and morality but what happened to their morality when about 300 youth committed self-immolation while raising slogans—V.P. hai hai. Hindu-Muslim riots were engineered and thousands of people were made to be killed but our Prime Minister did not bother about them. Therefore, if you want to restore normalcy, he should be

ousted. We tried out level best but could not succeed. With these words, I once again request you to oust him as early as possible.

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to Chaudhary Devi Lai for having made even clearer here today on the floor of the House than he had done in a statement a couple of days ago that this Government which has been running all this time is really a Government of the Congress Party. My friends here did not understand it. They are still decrying this Government. But he made it quite clear saying: "What do you mean by Congress and Anti-Congress? We are all Congress everywhere." That is the whole trouble. The Congress culture is all-pervading. It penetrates into all these parties and that has led to this situation which we are facing today. (Interruptions)

The shape of things to come, we have seen today. We have got a glimpse of it when the would-be Prime Minister, who is not yet Prime Minister, spoke. People in this House, some of them are very amused to talk about the present Prime Minister because the present Prime Minister has got only a few more hours to go. Everybody is very amused to poke at him. But the Prime Minister, who is yet to come, has not become Prime Minister yet. He delivered so many sermons in this House today as though he has already taken office. He should be a little bit patient. Patience is good counsellor. He should not be impatient in these matters. Let him come to office. Let him take power with the support of those people who even gave him time of their time in order to speak out of turn. Sir, you called him to speak because they had very generously said that he can speak. They said, "Let the time be taken from our share." That is how the partnership has begun. Anyway, we do not grudge that. But I was waiting to hear something about some policy, some programmes, something that this new Prime Minister and his Government propose to do... (Interruptions) There is not a word about that. The only assurance we got from Mr. Chandra Shekhar who himself

spoke today—was that he would be willing to play a sort of role of a mediator? Between whom? Between the BJP and Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav because the relations between them have become very bitter and very bad. He is pleading and saying that you should not misunderstand him; there should be some mediation to bring you together again. Well, I wish him well. I know Mr. Chandra Shekhar is a great friend of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav. But I doubt whether Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav will accept this type of a mediation by his friends and mediation on these terms. There is no other programme. One other programme I am anticipating as soon as Shri Chandra Shekhar takes office his friends here may join up with him, that will probably come in the form of an assurance is that any further inquiry into the Bofors affairs will be blocked.

AN HON. MEMBER: What were you doing? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Your time to speak is also coming. Then you will get the same fate if you go on interrupting me like this. We would not allow your leader to speak also. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Tripura West): Do not talk like that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Mr. Malhotra from BJP and one or two other friends have mentioned this point that actually what should have been discussed here is not a Confidence Motion but a No Confidence Motion. As you know, there is an instruction from the President of India—a communique which the President of India issued on the 24th of October. That communique enjoins upon the Prime Minister to prove his majority in the House of the People. And the Prime Minister has agreed to do so on or before the 7th of November, 1990. So, the Prime Minister is carrying out the direction of the President. He cannot flout that direction. If you want to

question the conduct of the President, you are free to do so. The President in his wisdom and discretion has told the Prime Minister that in this situation when the BJP has withdrawn its support, his job is to go to the House of the People and seek a vote of confidence. And then they decided on this date, the 7th of November, that is, today. So, all this talk of No Confidence Motion and the rest of it can come later on. It could have come any time. But it is irrelevant today. Therefore, this Confidence Motion is on the Agenda with your approval and we are debating it. I do not have a shadow of doubt that it will be defeated. We know it very well. It is a question of numbers. It is a question of figures and mathematics. There is no mystery about it. Once the BJP has pulled out and once they and the Congress are together determined to bring down this Government there is no way of saving it. It is quite obvious to us. It does not require a great argument. (*Interruptions*) Now I am coming to the 11 months period that is bothering you a lot. I humbly suggested on behalf of my party a few days ago, to the Leader of the Opposition. I may reveal this now here that I went to meet the Leader of the Opposition and I said to him, "I have come to meet you. I know you for a long time. I knew your Mother even better than I know you. Please ponder over one thing. The Congress as a party is committed to secularism and is against communalism. You please think over this whether on the 7th of November when the issue which is being debated is the issue on which the BJP withdrew its support and the Government lost its majority, on that particular day, do you want your party, namely, the Congress to be seen in the company of the BJP pulling this Government?" It is up to you. It is your party. It is not my party. You can do what you like to do. It is your headache. It is not my headache. The trouble would be that if this party did not vote against this Motion, it would mean perhaps giving a further lease of life to Mr. V.P. Singh. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: He is misleading the House. He has told only half of it. He said: "You support Mr. V.P. Singh

[Sh. Sontosh Mohan Dev]

now. After two months you bring a No Confidence Motion and we will support you." He has not mentioned that part. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (Barackpore): How do you know all these things?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I know it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I have not completed. He has an advantage over me because he has gone outside and had a big fat lunch which I have not had. So he is feeling very strong now and is shouting. I know Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev.

I have not completed what I was saying. I honestly suggested to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi that if he wants to chuck this Government out, he can bring a no-confidence motion on any other subsequent date, nobody can prevent him; but on this particular occasion when the whole country is watching, what is his attitude towards these events which took place..... (*Interruptions*)..... May be it is bold on my part to advise such a big party, even then I did it. I said he should consider whether on this particular day should he be seen in the company of this BJP voting together to bring down this Government. I sat and listened to a very long lecture which was all about the virtues of Mr. V.P. Singh and then I came away.

However, they have taken their decision. Millions of people, crores of people in the country; specially the weaker sections, Muslims, minorities and the backward classes.... (*Interruptions*)..... are watching and listening. It is upto them; they have made their choice. It does not matter to me. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Our Party's attitude in these matters is very clear. We have not so far even a single day associated ourselves with BJP or any other communal party. That is very clear. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, I am not yielding. The Chief Whip of the Congress Party should not go on encroaching upon my time. You know very well how much time you have fixed for me.

Now everybody is harping and shouting on one point—for eleven months what were you doing, suddenly you have discovered the communal nature of the BJP now only. So this question should be answered. Everybody knows how this came about. Unfortunately or fortunately as you look at it, this was the result of the ballot box last year. Such a result has never come out in any previous general election. Whatever the people may have thought, they voted in such a manner that no party was given the majority. Congress was chucked out, of course. As far as the remaining parties are concerned, the verdict of the ballot box was that nobody should have a majority. Neither BJP, nor the Leftists, nor the National Front had a majority. It was done in this very unusual and, abnormal I should say, situation. Otherwise the other option was to go and tell the country that no Government can be formed, though we had a general election, have another one within one month. I think nobody, nobody would have liked that idea.

So this arrangement was made. It was not a satisfactory arrangement and now it has come to grief. But we had an understanding with the Janata Dal which Mr. Chatterjee has explained.

AN HON. MEMBER: With the BJP also.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: No, we never had. You ask the BJP. (*Interruptions*) I should say that even during these eleven months when the BJP was a part of this combine which was supporting this Government, this Government never tried to allow any construction of temple or *Shilanyas* or anything at Ayodhya. Never. When the first attempt was made to do it by force, a crisis was precipitated and then you know what has happened. But even without being in partnership with the BJP, what did the Congress Government do last year? Did it not pander

to the worst type, not only the Hindu, but also the Muslim communalism? Were they in partnership there or partnership with the Muslim League in Kerala, I know. (*Interruptions*) We never compromised on that. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding; I am speaking; if you get provoked, I cannot help it. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Speaker, Sir, now I seek your protection. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding. Please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN (Alleppey): Sir, why is a senior leader speaking like this? When he was having the Government, he was having that; but now he is saying this.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You can make your own speech separately. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN: Sir, if someone from the back bench had said like this, I would have agreed. But why is a leader like Mr. Gupta saying like this? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Is it an untruth that this party, under the leadership of Shri Rajiv Gandhi deliberately subverted the Supreme Court Judgement in the Shahbanu case? Who did it? Who did it in order to placate the fundamentalists? Mr. Basheer, you are a Muslim, you should answer this question. Why are you sinking low in your seat now? Please tell me who did this in order to placate the worst fundamentalists among the Muslims, not all Muslims are like that. One Muslim Minister here, had resigned because of that. (*Interruptions*) Why should I answer? (*Interruptions*) Why should I answer your question? Who are you? (*Interruptions*) Sir, thereafter, having thought that—having made this kind of a concession to the orthodox Muslim section—the Hindus will get annoyed, to placate the other side, this arrangement was made. Mr. Chatterjee has

dealt with it in detail; I need not go into it.

Last year, in the presence of Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari and Shri Buta Singh, that agreement was made. I want to know: that was an undisputed site, and how all the VHP leaders so easily put their signatures on that paper—from Mr. Singhal to everyone? That paper, that agreement is here. You say that that was an undisputed site and these leaders of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad.... (*Interruptions*) Mr. Kurien, I cannot go on carrying an argument with you. If you have any patience, please hear now and reply when you get opportunity. (*Interruptions*) So, the point is not whether for 11 months we had some sort of an understanding with the BJP to support this Government. But, during those 11 months on this issue of communalism versus secularism, no concession was made. No concession was allowed during that period. When for the first time an attempt was made to force the pace, well, the Government took a strong stand on that and that has led them to withdraw their support. But what were you doing last year? There was no BJP with you; there was no Muslim League with you. Why were you making that? You thought, you would get both Hindu and Muslim votes. Therefore, to pander to both fundamentalists and others you did it and that has brought about your defeat. Neither Hindus nor Muslims nor ordinary people voted for you, because of this. (*Interruptions*) Sir, what I want to say is this. We, the Leftists, are supporting this Motion, which is brought forward now, because of the stand which was taken by the Government in defence of the Constitution, the secular values and the social fabric of this country. (*Interruptions*) Sir, there are some animal noises in the House. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*)

I cannot speak like you. We will not allow you to speak if you go on like this.... (*Interruptions*).... I want to ask my BJP friends as to whether they have ever thought coolly and calmly about the consequences of the path which they have taken. Who has given

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

them the right to allow the Hindus and the minorities in our neighbouring countries to be attacked and butchered and the temples to be broken down? By your campaign those mischievous forces in Bangladesh and Nepal got an opportunity to start anti-Hindu riots. You will not have to face the refugees... (*Interruptions*)... You are very clever people. Those refugees from Bangladesh will not come to Gujarat, Rajasthan and MP. It is we who live in Bengal and Tripura will have to face the flood of refugees on the top of the riots which had come earlier. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: What about Kashmiri refugees? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Kashmiri refugees are not coming here because of something that was done by us here. So, I do not think that you should behave like that. You should calmly ponder over the implications of these dangerous things that are being done. So, I wish to say that we knew very well the day when the BJP withdrew its support the same thing could have happened if they had remained and we had withdrawn our support. It is a question of numbers. This Government will not last because its majority is based on their support. We know it very well. But we, the Leftists decided from that very day that what is at stake here is the future of the country, the unity of the country. I have every respect for the people who say that in their minds and hearts they believe and have faith that that particular place is the birth place of Lord Ram. Therefore, no other proof or evidence is required because it is a question of faith of the hearts and minds of crores of Hindus. But the trouble is that there are other people also who have got minds and hearts. Do you not respect the sentiments of other communities whose faith, hearts and minds may tell them that they have to uphold their own religion and lives? If the Muslims start saying that in their hearts and minds they believe that—it is a Masjid and if you go on saying that it is not a Masjid, then how is this problem to be resolved? Is it to be solved by rioting and

mara mar? I have very sympathy and I am willing to stand up here and join in passing a resolution if you would like to condone the death of those people who have lost their lives in Ayodhya. I am extremely sorry for that. But alongwith this, you must also condole the death of all the people who are still being killed in Jaipur, Bijnore, Karnailganj and even in the far South like Karnataka and Kerala where normally such things not happen. Let us condole the death of all the people who have lost their lives in these unhappy events of the last few days. Sir, we are proud to belong to a country where people of so many different religions, cultures and languages are living together, so many followers of different religions are living shoulder to shoulder. The whole thing taken together is India. And if anybody tries forcibly to impose one particular point of view on the other, even going to the extent of saying that this must be declared as Hindu Rashtra, then the unity of this country cannot be preserved. It will be broken into pieces. We have got neighbouring countries who have declared themselves to be Islamic countries. I do not know whether that example has given enthusiasm to some friends here to say that if they can be an Islamic country, why should we not declare Hindu *Rashtra*. But what will happen to all the other people in this country who do not believe in Hindu *Rashtra*? Where will they go? Where will the Buddhists go, where will the Muslims go, and where will Jains and Christians go? Have they no right? Our Constitution says very clearly that everybody has got equal rights and everybody's rights have to be respected equally. And nobody can tell us that the religious rights of the Hindu community have been suppressed. That is the point.

Therefore, it is on this fundamental basis that we have to take our stand. This Government was being consciously sacrificed because of adherence to this principle of secularism which is the bedrock of our Constitution. Therefore, the Leftists have decided—win or lose does not matter—to stand by this principle and policy and we are going to vote for this resolution and after that what will

happen, we will face the people outside and see the results.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Prime Minister initiated the discussion on the motion of confidence, it was pointed out by some speakers in the House that leaving all other issues, he was trying to concentrate only on one issue of secularism and Ram Janambhoomi-Babri Masjid. At the very outset, I would like to put the record straight that whatever be the doubts and suspicions expressed by various sections in the House, one thing is absolutely clear and there I give credit to BJP for its precision and definition about the issues involved. They made it explicitly clear; through their actions that initially they did not raise other issues. They did not raise the economic and political problems; made it clear that if the *Rath Yatra* was obstructed or Shri L.K. Advani was arrested, in that case, they would withdraw their support to the National Front Government. They made it further clear as an operative clause of their resolution that they need not convene the meeting again, the moment these two steps were taken by the Government, there would be an automatic withdrawal of BJP's support to the National Front Government and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was authorised to communicate to the President of India the withdrawal of the support of the BJP to the National Front Government.

So, let it be extremely clear, that whatever be the construction that may be put now on the objective of defeating us, it is self evident that the motivation was to withdraw support because of the stoppage of the *Rath Yatra* and arrest of Shri L.K. Advani.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, Sir, in response to your initial appeal not to cast personal aspersions on any one, that in this debate what is involved is not any individual, but the issues and to my mind, they are more important. Unfortunately, we are likely to raise issues against the views of some of our colleagues and friends with whom we share certain human relations. When I completely disagree with the point of view of my revered

colleagues, Shri Advaniji, and Chandra Shekhar it is not a pleasure for us, but we place the human relationship at one level and the political policies and principles at another level. They are not to be confused. How can we cast aspersions on these colleagues?

Here is Shri Advani from the BJP and Prof. Ranga from the Congress under whose leadership I have participated in my young days in the freedom struggle. Here is my old colleague, Chandra Shekhar. In the freedom struggle, in the socialist movement, and in the anti-emergency struggle, we have fought together. He sarcastically referred to those who have come to power. I would like to remind him that all of us have been in the trenches of struggle, in the socialist movement, in the Kisan agitations, in the working class movement, in the struggle against the Portuguese and British imperialism, and in the struggle against emergency perpetrated by Congress. In all these struggles we are co-participants. If we have come to power, today we have come directly from the trenches of struggle to the seat of power and we do not mind if we have to go back to these trenches of struggle in order to fight for social justice and secularism. Against this background there is no question of casting any aspersions, on our colleagues.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: That is only against Shri V.P. Singh.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Let me have my say. I never said a word when you were speaking.

As far as our colleague, Shri Advani is concerned, not only we participated in the same Government in 1977 but before the birth of this Government we participated in the struggle against emergency and fortunately or unfortunately we were kept in the same barrack in the detention camp in Bangalore jail and the human relationship which we built up during that struggle, cannot be erased even if Mr. Advani differs completely with me. I fully share what Shri

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

Somnath Chatterjee has said about our personal esteem for Advaniji.

As far as Shri Chandra Shekhar is concerned, unfortunately he has parted company with us. His group is trying to seek the support of Congressmen. I wish him well but I also warn him. In 1990 do not forget 1979. In taking the cooperation of the present President of the Congress (I) do not forget the legacy of the former President of Congress (I). Do not forget that in 1979 Ch. Charan Singh was promised the Congress (I) support of 74 persons. He was given 30 days to test his majority in Lok Sabha. We were all occupying the Opposition benches here because he was going to seek the Vote of Confidence at 11 o'clock. At 9 o'clock in the morning Mrs. Indira Gandhi announced that she was withdrawing the (Congress I) support and, therefore, he did not come to the House at all. It is said that history repeats itself. Let me tell my friend that the history will repeat itself with vengeance. Try to understand the elements from whom you are trying to get the support. There is a history and psychology of Congress (I) which you cannot forget.

SHRI MURLI DEORA: Shri V.P. Singh also should not have come to the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Please listen to me. I can understand that you don't want to listen to me. You may not swallow what I say but at least try to listen to me.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Confidence Motion is concerned, let me make it very clear that when the Congress Party and its new formed allied and the BJP are going to oppose our Confidence Motion—we know the fate of the motion—even then according to the directive of the President we have come to the House to seek a Vote of Confidence and through this debate—Mr. Advani had said that we could have realised that the arithmetic of the House was very clear, and because of the loss of majority we could have declared that we will go. But we will not

go like that—we would like to tell the entire world as to what are the issues involved in the Vote of Confidence. We want the entire world to witness the proceedings of this House and find out where does each Member of this House stand on the question of secularism.

Sir, Mr. Advani rightly said that even last time there was a Vote of Confidence but he forgot to tell the House that when the Vote of Confidence was sought by the Prime Minister in this very House in the beginning of the session, lot of discussion took place. Advaniji himself ably participated in the debate and he tried to put forward his view point.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have mentioned it deliberately. Last time the ruling party, BJP and Leftist parties had suggested that—I have got the record with me—voting might take place without holding any discussion since the President had asked the Prime Minister to prove his majority on the floor of the House but Congress party did not agree to that and that was why discussion was held. In the light of that, I said that if today I made the same proposal again and in case one section or the other did not agree, the discussion would be held. But at that time your party did agree that voting should take place without any discussion.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You have rightly put forward the facts. I do not differ with them. In fact I was trying to point them out. It is all right, if because of certain reasons, some sections of the House wanted at that time the issues to be discussed and debated. Today, it is we who demand that issues involved must be discussed. It is because we want to know the motivation of each section of the House which is supporting or opposing the Motion.

The issues are very clear. The main question before us is of secularism and its fate in India. The religious sentiments of all

sections are extremely important. In a pluralistic society like ours, how and to what extent the rights of the religious minorities, linguistic minorities, political minorities etc. are protected. That is a very important aspect of our pluralistic polity.

Therefore, today, the question of secularism becomes an extremely important one. We would like this particular aspect to be noted here. Our concept of secularism in Indian context has not been anti-religionism or non-religionism. In Indian context, secularism always meant *Sarva Dharma Sambhava*, i.e., harmonious and peaceful co-existence of various religious groups.

The debate that is taking place, has to take note of this cardinal principle of secularism. I would like to point out to this House that our concept of secularism is closely related to the controversy of Ram Janma Bhoomi and Babri Masjid. It is not opposition to religion. I would like to remind this House that Mahatma Gandhi and Swami Vivekananda were devout Hindus. But for that very reason, they were eminent and dedicated Indians.

Sir, in this country Dr. Zakir Hussain and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad were dedicated followers of Islamic religion. But for that very reason, they were dedicated followers of Indian nationhood and Indian nationalism.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar professed Buddhist faith. He was a noble Buddhist. But for that very reason, he was a good Indian.

Guru Nanak was a dedicated Sikh. But for that very reason, he was a dedicated Indian.

Mother Teresa, who accepted the Indian citizenship, was a devout Christian. Acceptance of the spirit of compassion of Christianity made her a noble Indian.

And Dada Bhai Nauroji, the founding father of Indian nationalism, professed Zoroastrian faith, but for that very reason, he was second to none in his support to Indian

nationalism. He was in fact one of the founding fathers of Indian nationalism.

Those of us who stand by secularism—some may ridicule it, a philosophy of appeasement—must remember that the legacy of secularism has been derived from Indian national struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. This is the legacy that we had derived and it is this legacy that we have to preserve. What is at stake in the Ram Janma Bhoomi and Babri Masjid dispute is not merely the structure of the Mosque, it is not merely the structure of the Temple, but it is the noble value of secularism which we have cherished during the freedom struggle in this debate we want to see how many people stand by us as far as this concept of secularism is concerned.

When we discuss Ram Janma Bhoomi and Babri Masjid, we are not among those Indians who believe that there is a first class and a second class citizenship in India. There is no discrimination as far as the citizenship is concerned. There is no monopoly of any particular religious group in the country to claim the spirit of patriotism. It is neither the monopoly of the majority community; nor of the minority community. Just as there is no monopoly of any religious group to claim patriotism and national loyalty, similarly we cannot have a stigma on any particular religious group, and allege that it is treacherous to the country. This is the cardinal principle on which our entire philosophy of secularism is based. I am sorry about the way in which this controversy about the Babri Mosque and the Ram Janma Bhoomi temple is carried on, and the manner in which the agitations are organised. We feel that the cardinal principle of secular democracy, and secular nationalism are being destroyed. That is the reason why we are worried.

Let us not forget 1965, let us not forget 1962, let us not forget the Bangladesh War; and if we look at all these wars—(Interruptions) yes; the aftermath of portion of 1947 also—if you look at all the history of various aggressions on our country, you will find that there have been so many patriots and mar-

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

tyrs who belonged to various religious groups; and so also there have been traitors and spies who belonged to various religious groups. You just try to find out: during the India Pakistan war of 1965, who were the people found guilty of espionage activities; and if you do it our arrogance that one particular community has the monopoly of patriotism, and that others have the stigma of treachery with the nation—that type of divide will completely disappear.

In this context, I want to bring to the notice of this House a very important aspect, as far as the issues that are being raised today, are concerned. I wish to make it explicitly clear that as far as the Election Manifesto of the National Front is concerned, we had made our approach quite clear when we sought the votes. We said: "The National Front feels that the Babri Masjid should not be demolished, and at the same time, the Hindu sentiments to have a temple dedicated to Lord Ram should be respected. The National Front feels that an amicable settlement on the above lines can be found. No precipitate action should be taken by any group pending such settlement, or a decision by the court."

The BJP has its own point of view, we have our own point of view. There was one incident: since Advani Ji is in the House, I would like to quote it. When some Members raised the question of Article 370 and said: "Mr. Prime Minister, you have one point of view, and Mr. Advani has altogether another point of view." Advani Ji then got up and rightly said: "It is true that on Article 370 we have a different perception. On Article 370, the National Front and the Prime Minister have altogether different perceptions. Knowing fully well that these are our differing perceptions, we are trying to concentrate on those issues, and support them on those issues on which we have an agreement, and we reserve to ourselves right to have difference of opinion, as far as Article 370 is concerned."

I would like to point out to the House. Let us not forget the facts. I would like to remind all my colleagues who are unfortunately parting company with us, about what was the mandate of the last elections: Some Opposition parties had adjustments. We had electoral adjustment with the Left parties; we had also adjustment with BJP. We had adjustment with the Independents too. We had adjustments with other parties, like the regional parties. But throughout India, from the north to the south, and from east to the west, there was not one constituency where we had any understanding or adjustment with Congress (I). Therefore, all of us who fought with adjustments, or without adjustments, were very clear about our fight against the Congress, and all of us—whether you remain with us, or you are going away from us to seek the support of the Congress today—should not forget that every vote that we received was a vote against the misdeeds of the Congress. Chaudhry Devi Lalji Saheb has rightly said it. It was against the misdeeds of the Congress and its policies. (*Interruptions*) Some colleague who have parted company with us are today declaring with retrospective effect that they are in essence Congressmen. That is the trouble. (*Interruptions*) But frankly, every vote that they and we secured, was a vote against the Congress.

This is a free country. Even one who has to leave the party, subject to the Anti-Defection Law, can leave the party. One can choose any colleague. There is no ban on political marriages. And therefore you can choose your own party and support them. But don't be under the impression that you are not violating the promises that you had given to the electorate.

Look at the speeches of all those who had campaigned during 1989 election: From each platform, it was said, that we are totally against the policies of the Congress. Now some sections may go out. I have no personal animosity against them. And nobody will believe us if we attack them because for years we fought together. But let it be understood that there is a question of political

legitimacy. And to this question, there is no reply, I am sure. When you got elected against the Congress, every vote that you secured was anti Congress vote. If you now seek the cooperation of the Congress today that cannot be put on par with cooperation of the Leftists or electoral adjustment with the BJP in the last election because we had told the entire country that we having adjustments with these non Congress parties to avoid a triangular contest with Congress. It was then made explicitly clear. And therefore how far can there be a political legitimacy of those who fought and won against the Congress but are going to rely on Congress to form the Government. I do not want to make fun of my colleagues. I do not want to go into the analogy: which is the truck and which is the jeep in the Congress (I) and dissidents alliance. You can have a seat anywhere. If you want to prefer a jeep, be in the jeep; if you want to prefer a truck, be in the truck; if you want to have a seat in the trolley, be in the trolley. But do not have a complacent attitude that whatever be the vehicle I am a driver. I wish you were the driver. But when there are 210 persons, on whom you are banking; remember that 58 M.P.'s cannot say, we are the drivers and 210 are the cleaners. Remember they will not be cleaners but back seat drivers. (*interruptions*)

In 1979, those who felt that they were the driver, came to realise that the driver was sitting somewhere else; and the back seat driver, who ditched them said after the collapse of the Government. "How have I fooled them". I do not want the remote controller of the impending Government to tell the same story to those who are relying on the support of 210 members as their allies..... (*Interruptions*) Remember their history as well as philosophy. Do not forget that.

On Babri Masjid, Ramjanam Bhoomi and related issues, I would like to make one thing very clear. In the last elections, basically, as Choudhariji rightly said, the people voted against the misdeeds of Congress and their policies. Not withstanding these facts, some people in their over-enthusiasm, are

trying to project their election victory as a victory on the question of Ram Janambhoomi—Babri Masjid issue. I may be corrected if I am wrong. Shri Jaswant Singh is a sitting member of this House. Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee is a Member of the upper House. But after the election results, these BJP leaders issued a joint statement—and warned not to misread the mandate of the people. It was not an expression of the mandate of the people on the Ram Janmabhoomi—Babri Masjid issue; it was an expression of the people's discontentment against the Congress. That is what Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee had said. And therefore that aspect of the electoral mandate should not be forgotten.

I would like one more point to be understood very clearly. We have great respects for the Ram Temple. When we said that the Babri Masjid should not be demolished but at the same time Ram Mandir be constructed I am glad that the united party meeting where in all parties except the Congress and the BJP—were present accepted this approach. The BJP leaders had frankly told us, : "That is the all the party meeting question of Babri Masjid will come up. They had told us that they had honest differences on the issue and therefore instead of coming for the meeting and getting isolated, and others feeling embarrassed by their presence, it was better that they did not attend the meeting." I could understand their logic. I told Prime Minister that Atalji and Advaniji were perfectly justified from their point of view in absention from the meeting. But not only did they not attend the all party meeting but the Congressmen too did not attend. I am glad to report to this House that in that all party meeting attending even by the Muslim League and others, a very balanced resolution was passed.

14.57 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I want to go on record that the Muslim members who were present at the meeting not one but many of them said that they were not opposed to the construction of the Ram

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

temple. "We are not opposed to construction of the temple in the same complex." They said and added— "let there be *status quo*; the matter is referred to the court. If on some undisputed land in the complex the construction is made, we are not going to come in the way." They said. A very balanced attitude it was. I was happy that in that meeting even the members of the Shiv Sena were present, and we had passed a unanimous resolution. But then we are told by BJP leaders "we are also not saying that the Mosque should be demolished and the temple constructed." A very interesting interpretation is given by some of my friends from the BJP. They say, that "when we say that the temple should be built, we do not say that the Mosque should be destroyed, that it should be demolished." They claim that in the modern days of technology we can shift the entire Mosque and locate it somewhere else.

I am reminded about an intellectual. I will not mention his name. He is an important person from the judiciary. He is known for verbosity language. When someone falls down, I would say that the man has fallen down. But that intellectual will not describe the phenomenon in such a simple way. He would say, "that man's verticality has been transformed into horizontality through the instrumentality of the force of gravity". Wonderful. It means the same thing, as saying that the man has fallen down. But short of saying that the man has fallen down, he has said everything about it.

My friends say that there is a technology by which the entire Mosque can be shifted. By telling the Muslim masses that the Mosque is not demolished, but in a sophisticated manner it is being shifted to some other place, do you think that their sentiments will be satisfied? Therefore, we suggest that let us keep the sentiments of both the religious segments in our mind. Shri Indrajit Gupta rightly said that when we spoke about the sentiments of the Hindus in the country to be respected. Those of Muslims too had to be

respected the sentiments of the Hindus. Remember about we have not accepted a theocratic State, we have not accepted that the Muslims, Christians and the Buddhists etc. are aliens to this country. We had accepted the unity of the country, harmony of all the shades of religious groups, we believed that the Hindu sentiments may be protected, but the sentiments of Christians, Muslims, the Buddhists and Sikhs too must be protected. Have we forgotten that? When the Blue Star operation took place the Sikh psyche was hurt and even the Congressmen, I remember, in those days said then that if the Sikh psyche has been hurt by the Blue Star Operation we must do something by which their hurt psyche is healed. If the psyche of any religious group is hurt in this country, then the secular climate is destroyed. We hear to take note of this in the present context.

I would like to point out to you that there are so many other points. They are not relevant in the debate today. And as was said by Chowdhary Sahib, there was abolition of loans, there was the Lok Pal Bill to check corruption in high classes. We introduced certain policies for the extension of reservation for Scheduled Castes in legislatures. We introduced the concept of Women's Commission. We decided to go in for TV autonomy. There is the Gulf crisis. All these are the issues which are no doubt relevant but in today's debate most crucial issue is that of secularism.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Chirayinkil): What autonomy have you given?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You deal with it. (*Interruptions*)

15.00 hrs.

As Mr. Somnath Chatterjee has rightly said, the central theme today is our attitude to secularism.

Let me come to another important point. Some Members feel disturbed about it. I am not challenging their *bona fides* I am not

casting aspersions on them. But let me offer the analysis very clearly. When the 'rath yatra' began, there was a certain social context in the country. There was the emergence of a new upsurge of the unity of interests of all the oppressed sections. We found in this country a new upsurge of unity among the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, the backwards and the minorities. Some people were frightened by this emerging unity of the oppressed sections, and their united will. There could be only one method by which the united will of these oppressed and backward sections, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and the minorities could be destroyed, and that was by trying to overpower that upsurge by a new Hindi wave. And that is why, this agitation was taken up.

That is my assessment. I will be very happy if I am proved wrong. The question came, what the Government has to do. I do not want to refer to what the Prime Minister has said regarding the ordinance. Talks were carried out. When the leaders of the BJP were initially sympathetic to some extent. When the VHP took a hostile stand and the Muslims too took a similar posture, we found that the ordinance could not be the basis of the solution of the Babri Masjid Ramjanam Bhoomi dispute and, therefore, that was withdrawn. There are inflammable issues like communal passions, roused by Ram Janam Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute. When Shri L.K. Advani commenced the rath yatra, he might not be feeling that these would be violence. The 'Rath Yatra' was like a tiger. You can ride the tiger and the tiger could swallow others while you remain on the back of the tiger. But the moment you try to come down from the back of the tiger, that very tiger would try to swallow you because it does not distinguish between human beings and human beings. The question is, why the 'rath yatra' was stopped in Bihar? If this rath yatra were to enter Ayodya and lakhs of people were to enter there, what would happen? The spectators may remain aloof. But what will those who are running the administration do? In spite of the precautions that the administration had taken, a few

hundred people rushed forward. Some of them mounted the top of the Mosque. The photographs have also appeared. They did so not because of the direction of any organisation. Some of those with their roused passions of Hindu cause were going on the top of the mosque and if some of them were to carry dynamite and explosives and throw them on the mosque and if the mosque were to collapse, can we imagine as what would have been the impact on the religious sentiments of the Muslims? When 'Blue Star Operation' took place, many people gave their own defence of the Blue Star Operation. But the net effect was that the psyche of the Sikhs was hurt as a result of the Blue Star Operation. Tomorrow if any holy temple of the Hindu or any Buddha vihar of the Buddhist or any church of the Christian is that way desecrated, bombs were to be thrown and even explosions were to take place, there would be the explosion of religious sentiments. And therefore, the Government had to take certain steps.... (*Interruptions*) As far as the question of secularism is concerned I have very strong views and I wish to express them very firmly and freely... (*Interruptions*)

Let me come to the conclusion. Some friends of ours who have parted company, have obliquely said that we have love for the chair and the Prime Minister wants to cling to it. Many of us have fought various struggles for years together. Compared to the number of years or months for which we have occupied the chair, the number of years for which we have fought various natures and remained in jails is far greater. We came to the chair from the trends of struggle. Today if we were to cling to power, what was the softest option available to the Prime Minister? If he had only signed an agreement with Mr. L.K. Advani about the Ram Janam Bhoomi and if he had arrived at similar agreement with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad that we were prepared to allow the construction of the Ram temple even on the disputed land, our Government would have survived even without the support of the Congress. But we decided for the sake of secularism not to do so and we were prepared to go out of power. I would

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

like each one of the Members in this House to give his vote either for the Government or against it to demonstrate in this very House as to on which side of the fence of secularism each one stands. Let the world notice and take cognisance of this. As far as we are prepared to throw away even hundred such Governments to protect the soul of secularism.

[*Translation*]

*SHRIR. MUTHIAH (Periakulam): Hon. Dy. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister has today moved a motion seeking confidence in the Council of Ministers. It is the usual practice that Governments seek confidence of the House in them on the basis of the merits of their performance. Today, this Government is before us with this motion of confidence which is heavily based on one single event. The Government solicits the support of the House since they had arrested Advani and stopped the Rath Yatra.

While speaking on the motion, several members belonging to the various sections of the House expressed their opinions. I cannot but recall at this juncture the identical eventuality that occurred 11 months ago when this Government first sought the confidence of this House. When hon. Prime Minister moved the motion of confidence 11 months before for the first time, the Hon. members of the communist parties and the BJP supported the motion. That was really a laudable achievement for these warring factions had come together for the first time. But, today, we regret that the same Hon. members from the communist parties who voted with BJP 11 months before to save this Government accuse us of joining hands with the same BJP to vote down this Government. This question that how the Congress and the supporting parties are joining hands with the BJP now to vote down the Government is being repeatedly asked.

[*English*]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is no translation, Sir.

SHRI R. MUTHIAH: Sir, if there is no translation, that means you are purposely omitting our language from the proceedings. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Have you given the notice?

SHRIR. MUTHIAH: I had given a notice that I was going to speak in Tamil. When there is no translation, that means our language is being purposely omitted from the record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Translator has come now. You can continue.

[*Translation*]

*SHRI R. MUTHIAH: The Hon. Members from the communist parties and even the Prime Minister have been often giving emphasis on one point. Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Madhu Dandavate and Hon. members from the communist parties have been repeatedly postulating that the verdict in the last elections was against the Congress. Accordingly, they come to the conclusion that a vote against this Confidence motion would be a vote against the mandate of the people.

Hon. Dy. Speaker, Sir, if you look at the composition of the House, 195 seats are with the Congress. The other parties in the House have secured only a lesser number. Then how can it be construed that the verdict in the last elections was against the Congress. On the other hand, the people of India voted for the Congress in the last elections giving it the largest number of seats in Lok Sabha. Today, the Congress party is in Opposition because Hon. leader Rajiv Gandhi preferred principles to power unlike the motley group of parties which have forged an opportunis-

*Translation of speech originally delivered in Tamil.

tic alliance to stick to power after sacrificing principles, goals and objectives. If Congress would have decided to have alliance with parties which are diametrically opposite in principles, it would also have been in power very easily. They have forgone power for upholding principles. It is, therefore, regrettable that such a party is being branded as anti-people party. You are now accusing us of joining hands with the BJP while voting against the motion. I would like to ask my communist friends. In that case, when we brought an adjournment motion of price rise some time back, why did you vote for the motion along with the BJP? Was that a correct decision then? What justification these communists have to level such an accusation?

We are opposing this motion because we are convinced that this Government is not worth continuing. The Hon. Prime Minister has laid stress on three issues namely secularism, integrity and the upliftment of backward classes.

But I would like to express my dismay over the plain and naked disregard this Government had shown to this suddenly eulogised 'secularism' over the past 11 months. The word secularism does not find a place in two Addresses the President was kind to deliver during the life of this Government. Neither the Prime Minister was that much keen to lay the same stress which he is now laying on secularism when he replied to motions of thanks on these two president's Addresses. He has also not given any firm commitment to the House over the past 11 months that his Government would abide by the court order on Ram Janam Bhumi issue very strictly. Now suddenly he asks for our support on the plea that he had arrested Advani. When several incidents mutilating secularism took place in the country, the Prime Minister was silent and inactive. To cite an instance, take the case of the appointment of the J & K Governor. When Kashmir was tense under communal fire, he chose to send a man with doubtful secular credentials to the State as Governor much

against the wishes of the communists themselves. The anarchy which the Governor had unleashed is yet to be overcome. Today, for wriggling out of this extreme situation, you are invoking the bogey of secularism.

Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister has profusely praised our defence forces for their integrity. I would like to remind the Prime Minister of one thing. The IPKF was sent to Sri Lanka to keep peace in that island and to safeguard the interests of the Tamils. When it returned to India after accomplishing the tasks entrusted to it, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu had the audacity to brand the IPKF as an army of killers and as an army which perpetrated genocide. He refused to attend the reception given to the returning army. This was the greatest insult that could ever be heaped upon our armed forces. Several Hon. Members from our party and from other parties like Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam, Shri Saifuddin Chaudhary and Prof. Malhotra raised the issue in the House. The Prime Minister did not even rise from his seat to at least pass a token condemnation on the Chief Minister. Today what justification is there for the Prime Minister to seek the vote of confidence in the name of integrity?

Over these 11 months, what have they done to resolve the Lankan tangle. Lakhs and lakhs of refugees have come and the influx is still on the increase. What concrete step has been taken by this Government to safeguard the interests of Tamils in Lanka? Whether the External Affairs Minister of this Government have ever paid a visit to Sri Lanka with a view to solve the problem?

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must finish.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

*SHRI R. MUTHIAH: I have been allotted 25 minutes. Please allow me a few

[Sh. R. Muthiah]

more minutes. I will conclude.

When there were several communal incidents in Tamil Nadu due to which the unity and integrity was threatened on several occasions. Whether this Government condemned the State Government?

How many times the Home Minister visited Tamil Nadu when on several occasions law and order situation was at serious peril?

You had been treating Tamil Nadu as a vassal State and the Chief Minister as your nominated prince. You never took notice of the Chief Minister's misdeeds which have jeopardised the unity and integrity of the country.

You ask our support because you have implemented the Mandal Commission's recommendations. But when we placed our views before the all party leaders meeting, you did not heed any of our views. Our party has a very long tradition of fighting for the upliftment of the poor and the downtrodden since 1951 and 1952. If there was no Anna or Periyar, we would not have seen this Mandal Report. We, as members of a party which was nurtured by Periyar and Anna, welcome wholeheartedly the recommendations of the Mandal Commission. We very clearly and categorically stated that if this Government is seriously interested in the upliftment of the backward classes, then the report has to be implemented in toto. In that case, we would be the first party to welcome its implementation.

Sir, we demanded that 52% reservation as recommended by the Mandal Commission should be provided. We also demanded that reservations should be mandatorily extended to admissions in educational institutions. These demands have fallen on deaf ears. I would like to ask Shri Yadav a question. Let him sincerely reply to it. Apart from the announcement of 27% reservations for backward classes, what steps you had taken

to honestly implement it? You have moved not an inch further. But you are boasting that you have implemented the Mandal Report. As rightly pointed out by Shri Devi Lai, this announcement for backward classes is a step to checkmate a backward class leader and to reap cheap political gains.

A party which has been nurtured and politically sustained by Periyar and Anna cannot be deceived by these hollow announcements made to counter a backward class leader and reap petty political benefits at the cost of the nation.

I would, at the last, categorically affirm that this Government which seeks the confidence of the House on three issues has miserably failed on all these three issues of secularism, unity and integrity of the country and upliftment of the backward classes, and, therefore, has no right to continue in office. I strongly oppose the confidence motion on behalf of AIADMK party.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI (Khajuraho): Honourable Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak. Though I would like to say in the beginning something which may seem to be out of context. But a few days back on my arrival in Delhi, I received a piece of paper which was sent to me from Lok Sabha and in which it was mentioned that I was arrested on 28th October, 1990 and released on 31st October, 1990. I am surprised to see it that the Uttar Pradesh Government has shown me as released on 31st October, in their papers, then why the family members whose vehicle I boarded to reach Ayodhya, were arrested under National Security Act on the charge of helping a prisoner to come out of the prison? Secondly, I am surprised as to why only myself was released on 31st from the Circuit House of Banda which was used as a jail by the local administration? Since other honourable Lady Members of Parliament like Shrimati Vasundhara Raje, Shrimati Sumitra Mahajan and Shrimati Jayawanti Navinchandra Mehta were also with me. Why only I was released from there? And after my disappearance on the night of

the 31st October, their security was all the more tightened. If I was a dearer person to the Uttar Pradesh Government as only I was released and all others were kept under detention, then why was I forcibly dragged like a beast in to the streets of Ayodhya to take me to the police station? I am saying all these things because I was wonder struck at the contents of the paper I received from here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, just now Shri Somnath Chatterjee, who is an honourable Member of this House, was saying that the support of communal forces was always sought. Earlier it was Bharatiya Janata Party and now probably it is Congress which falls in that Category. Respected Shri Chatterji is not present here, but I would like to communicate my words to him through you that even upto the last session he was with us and was supporting that very party which we were supporting. Though he is not prepared to come close to us today, but it is not long ago that he was with us to support a particular Government.

Respected ex-Deputy Prime Minister, Chowdhary Devi Lalji has said something which needs immediate reply. He is also present in the House but I would like to inform the whole House through you as to why the question of Rama Janam Bhoomi was not taken up; during the British regime and why it is only this time that the issue of Rama Janam Bhoomi has been raised. I would like to inform respected Chowdhary Sahib and the entire House that this bickering had started on that very day when the temple built on Rama Janam Bhoomi was demolished. There was a continuous tussel on this issue even during the British regime. Lakhs of people had sacrificed their lives for the same and that struggle has been there right from the time of Britishers. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you will be surprised to know that a Muslim gentleman named Amir Ali collected an army of 4-5 thousand persons belonging to the Muslim community and took an initiative to construct a temple on Rama Janam Bhoomi to develop friendly relationship with Hindu brethren. But since British-

ers were following the policy of divide and rule, they visualised that if such a thing happens Hindus and Muslims will come closer and the Britishers won't be there to rule for long and Amir Ali was imprisoned on the charge of treason and led to the gallows. What Britishers did with Amir Ali at that time, the same thing has been done by Vishwanath Pratap Singh and Mulayam Singh Yadav to draw a dividing line between Hindus and Muslims now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, since I am present here to tell you the reality in respect of Ayodhya and the reason as to why we have withdrawn our support. So I would begin my very brief narration on this point. When Vishwa Hindu Parishad resolved to construct a temple on Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi on 14th November, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh made an appeal that since they had taken over very recently, they wanted to be given some mere time to resolve the issue. He asked for a four months' time to solve the problem. An appeal to that effect had been published by the PM Secretariat in a newspaper, a copy of it I have with me. In that appeal, the Prime Minister had promised that if a four months' time was given to him, he would devote each single day to find out a solution of the problem. He said that he would definitely solve this problem within four months. But needful was not done in the specified period. In this way, this problem of Rama Janam Bhoomi was not taken with the slightest seriousness. When the period of four months was about to expire and only four days were left, the leaders of Vishwa Hindu Parishad had a talk with the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said in his familiar style, that four days were still left, anything could happen and they should wait. Later on, that period of four days was also over. In that way, the period of time demanded by the Prime Minister was also over. On 24th, 25th and 26th June there was a meeting of the Steering Committee of Vishwa Hindu Parishad in Haridwar and a resolution was passed that they would proceed with the construction work of the temple on the 30th October on Rama Janam Bhoomi. It was something favourable for Shri Vishwanath

[Kumari Uma Bharati]

Pratap Singh that he got four month's time on his appeal in the first instance and a period of another four months without an appeal for the same. Had he been genuinely interested to find a way out he would have solved the problem within those four months. Leaving aside the controversy, a solution could be arrived at by a mutual discussion. But during those four months, instead of making serious efforts in this direction, they gave a free hand to the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. And he went around all the places in Uttar Pradesh in the name of Sadbhavna and anti-communal rallies and was out to label the movement of Vishwa Hindu Parishad as communal. Hon'ble Mr. Madhu Dandavate is present here. Just now, it has been said that the disputed construction on the site of Rama Janam Bhoomi is a Mosque according to some people but that creates a doubt in my mind, because according to Shariat that particular place can't be a mosque because a mosque does not have an idol in it. So if there is an idol, it can't be a mosque, and if there is a mosque, why an idol should be there in it? So I would like to say that if a Hindu calls it a mosque, I am sure that he has little knowledge of Islam, but if a muslim calls it a mosque, I will doubt his being a true muslim and won't call him a true moslem. So, if an honourable senior member says this thing in the House about the hoisting of saffron flag, by some persons, I would like to inform the House that in our resolution of 30th October, we did not mention even once that we would demolish the mosque. Neither Shri Advani, nor the spokesman of Vishwa Hindu Parishad nor any other responsible person from Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh said it that they would demolish the mosque. Instead we had said that we would construct a temple there. We never uttered a word about the demolition of the mosque. But if some angry youngmen went up the mosque, it was none of our fault. It was Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav who was exclusively responsible for all these things because Shri Vishwanath Pratap had given him full liberty to throw an open challenge during his tour of

the entire Uttar Pradesh that even a bird could not have an access in the vicinity of the site. For how long the youth could be stopped. They got provoked with it and thought that if a bird could not fly towards the site, at least a youth from Uttar Pradesh would definitely go and do something there. It is also really a matter of great shame for Mulayam Singh Yadav that the person who hoisted the flag while standing atop the building was none else but Sunil Yadav of Suhagal, from district Faizabad. When Mulayam Singh Yadav said these words that he was there to oppose and resist the construction of a temple on Rama Janam Bhoomi, the people of Yadav community were feeling ashamed, and this shame has been cleared off by a youth named Sunil Yadav who unfurled the saffron flag on the site. For this thing, that youth was not at fault. Advaniji had not asked even once about the demolition of the mosque. He talked only of the shifting and not of the demolition of mosque. But Mulayam Singh Yadav vitiated the whole atmosphere and deployed force which was a clear violation of the Constitutional provisions under article 25-26 of it. A ban was imposed on "Panch Kosi Parikrama". The people of Madhya Pradesh and Bihar were prevented from entering Uttar Pradesh. It provoked some youth to go to the extent of ascending the top of that building, but all the same I would like to say that these Hindu youth had no intention of doing any damage to it. Though I am not an intelligent person, nor am I a good orator, but I want to echo the sentiments of the youth assembled at Ayodhya in this House. I want to ask the entire House whether the hon'ble members are aware of it that there is not only this mosque which is there on the Ram Janambhoomi but there are so many mosques, hundreds of grave-yards and thousands of Muslims in Ayodhya. Let a single person come forward and tell me if there was any one among the lakhs of youth who had assembled there and dismantled the bricks of a mosque or a graveyard to hurt the sentiments of the Muslims. It shows that these youth did not want to demolish the mosque, they only wanted to give a proper response to the challenge put forth by Mulayam Singh Yadav.

I was also under detention in the circuit House of Banda district which was converted into a prison. There were 20 thousand people who were put under detention with us in Banda. They were kept in the building of Inter College. Twenty thousand people were raising the slogans of "Har-Har Mahadev" and "Jai-Jai Shri Ram" continuously in Banda. Thirty per cent of the population of that city is that of Muslims and when the day of fast came off on 30th October, a Muslim trader sent a truckload of bananas for them. He said that nobody should go without food on that day. Hindus passed through the areas inhabited by Muslims with the slogans of "Jai-Jai Shri Ram" on their lips and Muslims invited them to their houses and served them with tea. I don't agree at all that a large number of Hindu youth were standing on the dilapidated building.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, today I will not stop without making my point. I am not going to conclude even though you ring the bell. I want to urge you and want to beseech you. Today Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh is urging for vote of confidence with the hands stained with the blood of innocent, religious and the God loving citizens. I want to tell him that he has now lost that right. Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, you may kindly give me full opportunity to express my views.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You were given 10 minutes to speak, but you have already taken 15 minutes. You should speak very brief.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I reached Ayodhya on 1st of November, when a large number of people were present in Ayodhya. I would like to submit something about the information given to me in connection with the incident on 30th October. It is being said about this incident that some people climbed up forcibly on this building. On that day also some devotees and the people who were singing the hymns of the lord Rama were killed there. These persons were totally innocent and there was no tension at all. One or two incidents of stone-throwing also took place on the day

and as a result, firing took place. Sir, It has been proved that a Member of Parliament from a district adjacent to Faizabad had sent some people as kar sewaks and mixed them among kar sewaks as devotees of Rama. When they were caught and beaten by the police, they owned up all these things that such and such Member of Parliament had sent them and asked them to burn the buses and jeeps. Uttar Pradesh Government and Prime Minister are responsible for all this episode.

It has been argued to accept the court decision. If someone else says that this decision should be accepted for a moment, we will accept it, but if a man like Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh says so then I am compelled to say that when late Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi imposed emergency in this country ignoring the verdict of the court, I find that same Vishwanath Pratap Singh was with Shrimati Indira Gandhi at that time, when Shri Rajiv Gandhi enacted Muslim women Bill in Shahbano case ignoring the court, at that time also the same Vishwanath Pratap Singh was with Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Same Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh was the Prime Minister when court ordered that Rath Yatra of Advaniji should not be stopped and when court ordered that *Panch Kosi Parikram* should not be stopped, same Shri Mulayam Singh was then Chief Minister. I want to submit that "*Par updesh, Kushal Bahutere, Jo aacharahin te nar na ghanere.*"

I want to tell here that similar preaching was given to Ravana in Ramayana whatever was preached to others, one should follow the same. Ram Janambhoomi issue is beyond the jurisdiction of the court. Which judge or magistrate can prove that Lord Ram took birth on a particular place. One thing more has been said that there is clash between faiths. In this connection I would like to submit that the words like clash between faiths should not be used by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh with regard to Ram Janam Bhoomi as it is the centre of the devotion and faith of Hindus. Babri Masjid can never be the centre of the devotion for Muslim brothers, it can be Macca and Madina. If we think

[Kumari Uma Bharati]

to construct a Hanuman temple or a Ram temple in Macca or Madina, then the question of a clash between devotion and faiths may arise. Babri Masjid can never become the centre of devotion for the Muslims, but for Hindus Ram Janam Bhoomi is the centre of devotion and its reason is that there are thousands of mosques in the country like Babri Masjid, but Ram Janam Bhoomi is only one. We cannot ask Lord Rama to take birth once again so that Prime Minister Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh could have some satisfaction. We cannot say it to Lord Rama. When there is a clash between faiths, comparison between Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid cannot be made. Comparison can of course be made between Ram Janam Bhoomi and Macca-Madina.

I want to make one more submission. Hon. Chandra Shekhar talked about integration here. Through you I would like to ask all the Members of leftists parties, Congress party and Janta Dal as to why they want to create religious harmony or want to make experiment with secularism in the country at the cost of Hindus only. Do you think them guinea pigs? Why do you want to make all the experiments on them? In this connection I want to say that if experiments for bringing about integration, secularism are undertaken, these should be done for all religious faiths. Experiments should not be undertaken for Ram Janam Bhoomi only. Ram Janam Bhoomi can be compared with Macca-Madina, but it cannot be compared with dilapidated building like Babri Masjid.

Hon. Deputy Speaker the last 2nd November is that black Friday which cannot be forgotten in future. Such a black Friday had also not come in the past. I am myself a witness to the incidents of 2nd November. On the eve of 1st November, when we held a meeting, it was decided that in the morning of 2nd November at 9 o' clock...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I had given you only ten minutes, but now already 20 minutes have passed. Please conclude.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: It was decided in it that very peaceful procession will be taken out. It was also decided that the processionists will not cross the police barriers and we will stop the procession wherever police will stop us. It was not at all decided that we will forcibly move towards Ram Janam Bhoomi. We had decided on that day that wherever police will stop us, we will sit down on the floor and start singing hymns of Lord Rama peacefully there. Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you will be surprised to know that it was told to about 50,000 devotees of Ram there that neither anybody will abuse and throw any pebbles on anyone, nor anyone will resort to violence and every body had sworn in name of Lord Rama that no one will indulge in such things. Everybody had promised that no one will indulge in such activities.

Processions started from three sides. I also accompanied the procession from one side. When our procession reached the barrier, we stopped our group three and started singing 'Bhajans' according to the given directions. Administrative officers of that zone came to us and they asked us to vacate the place. But we told them that we would not vacate that place. We also told them that it is Ayodhya, Birth place of Lord Rama, and asked if we can not recite the holy name of Lord Ram while sitting there? When we were forcibly sought to be removed from that place, our youths prayed to police and touched even their feet, but neither they abused them nor they hit them with pebbles. They did not burn buses and jeeps, as reported. It has all been done by the police later to justify their great massacre...*(Interruptions)*

Officers started getting worried as to what they will reply to the Chief Minister. On our part it was decided by us that no body will move even an inch wherever we will be stopped. I do not know as to who ordered firing and firing started all of a sudden. The way firing and massacre took place in the streets of Ayodhya is unprecedented in the history of India. I think that such a massacre has never taken place at any place even in

the world. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Kar Sewaks who had taken shelter in rooms and in the houses of the people out of fear were dragged out. A lady teacher, Hariom Bharti was residing in a house in a street there. Five kar-sewaks were dragged out from her house and they were shot dead. On 30th October two youths from Calcutta had hoisted saffron flag on that building. They had hoisted saffron flag on one of the three domes. These youths were dragged out from a house and were shot dead at point blank range... (*Interruptions*) When I was kept under detention, a wounded youth was brought there. By face he looked to be a South Indian, he was writhing in pain, a bullet was fired in his stomach and his intestines had come out. He was bleeding very profusely. I requested all the officers present there for making arrangements for his treatment, but they said that transport was not available. I said that so many vehicles were available and these vehicles could be used and he should be treated. They did not listen to me and in my view....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bhartiji, now conclude please.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am just now concluding. He died before my eyes and then he was dragged to a vehicle and nobody knows about him till now. Whatever occurred before my eyes and whatever I had observed there, according to it, at least thousands of people have been killed there. I have myself observed that hundreds of people were killed there and as people say that bodies of thousands of people were thrown in river Saryu and dead bodies were burnt collectively. We are collecting information about the number of kar sewaks who had reached there from different places. You will be surprised to know that not only Hindus came there as kar sewaks, but these kar sewaks included 108 muslims from Bhand, ten muslims brothers from my district and two muslims from Maharashtra. One Muslim brother is still missing out of them. He might have been killed in that massacre which had taken place in Ayodhya. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir,

I want to say in this House through you that as Nuremberg trial had taken place and a trial on Nazi atrocities was undertaken, similarly a trial of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and Shri Mulayam Singh should also be undertaken... (*Interruptions*) Even ladies in great number have been massacred. Stringent punishment should be given to those found guilty.

Now I am concluding. In the last, I want to say one thing more. In your views this place should be left as it is. I would like to submit that this problem could not be solved in this manner. The appeasement policy for the last 45 years and the incidents of this entire year, wrong policies of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh and Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav about Ram-Janam Bhoomi have changed the hearts of Hindus and Muslims both and due to this change, whenever Muslim will visit that place he will see a idol of Lord Rama there and whenever a Hindu will visit that place, he will see a dilapidated building which is called a mosque and both will think to remove it. Therefore, it can be solved and it could have been solved on 30th October also. Its only solution lies in a letter which was published in 'Jansatta' in name of Abdulla Bhukhari. I will repeat the same words that even now solution can be found out. Its only solution is that muslims should themselves come forward and should cooperate in building the temple there. In future, in India prayers will be held in temples and Molvies will pay Namaz in temples. We can hopefully look forward to that future. In the last, I am concluding with a couplet. It is said, "Bahati Ganga me Hath Dhoya Jata hai". I would like to say that you must have listen saying to make hay while the sun shines, 'Bahti Ganga me Hath Dhona', but the people who have stained their hands with the blood of innocent people and with the blood of innocent devotees will never be forgiven in the history of India. here are two lines—

"Ram Vimukh us Hal Tumahara, Raha
Na Kou Kul Rovanhara."

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All of you sit down. Yadav ji, you may start.

THE MINISTER OF TEXTILES AND MINSTER OF FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (SHRI SHARAD YADAV): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in this House which is supposed to be the supreme Panchayat of the country, I would not like to say anything out of favour and hatred. This is the first occasion since I contested elections, that I have stood up to express my views. My submission is that none of us belonging to Janata Dal, tried to provoke any BJP, and Communist Party member including of course Shri Chandra Shekhar. Today I rise to speak here not as a Minister of textiles but as a political workers (*Interruptions*) we want to win the confidence motion not to get the majority but for the rake of the value of independence values promoted by Mahatama Gandhi, (*Interruptions*) You must know that today we have come here to win the confidence and not just to save this Government from fall. You have ruled this country for forty years, you may have the hunger for power. But we reached here only after fighting against poverty and exploitations.

I would like to urge you on this occasion that I have come here for the values promoted by the supreme personality of the world Mahatama Gandhi who believed in every religion and had faith in humanity values, who was the father of the nation and who sacrificed his life for these values. My submission to you is this that Mahatama Gandhi was an aretar. My faith is my principle. Originally I belong to a Congress family my father had also under gone five years imprisonment Mahatama Gandhi's message was meant not only for Hindus or Muslims but also meaningful in prevailing situation and the future of the country. It was equally meant for social justice or economic justice. Mahatama Gandhi was the first person to know that slavery of the country meant the slavery of the weavers or artisan and it was animed at rooting out the craftsmanship in the country. In order to remove the slavery Mahatama Gandhi became a weaver himself. Gandhian philosophy can play a very

vital role in the prevailing circumstances. I know that as the post independence period passes installation of Gandhi's statues are increasing. Whereas Gandhian ideology is being disrespected, by the common people. I have observed this tendency in the House itself. I have been elected as the Member of this House 4-5 times and my submission in this respect is this that the House has never been so unkind in this respect as I see it today. (*Interruptions*)

I do not intend to speak against you, just listen to me. This country has a rich cultural heritage. The geography of this country, its historical and cultural heritage are the oldest in the world. But being a common man I would like to know for what qualities we are proud of? I would like to ask those who are proud of such cultural heritage of this country what are those qualities for which we can have that pride. We may feel proud of the places like Khajuraho and Konark which are the best examples of the creating of the helpless and poor craftsmen of India, we may be proud of Pt. Ravi Shankar, Allaudin Sahib but what else. Should we feel proud of that the maximum population of India leads life of poverty or the maximum number of blind persons are in India or atrocities are committed maximum in this country. We great Mandela in the name of apartheid, but can we take pride for practising untouchability with that section of our society which constitutes about 1/4 of the total population. Is it appropriate to know the person from the occupation he does. Those who do wood work are called carpenters, those who are associated with steel work are called blacksmiths, and similarly those who are associated with cow are supposed be Yadavs and so on. We applaud Shri Mandela who fought against apartheid. But here in India the living standard of people in one area differs from that of the people residing in other area, it appears that people in Chandni Chowk and the VIP area where Parliament House is situated appears to live in 21st Century while the people residing in trans-yamuna area appear to live in 16th century. Can we take pride in it. Or we should be proud of that the maximum number of blind persons and lep-

ers are here or that maximum gods have been here. Beyond Bay of Bengal there is no god, but from Jerusalem to we have Jesus Christ, Mohammad Sahib, Mahavir, Buddha, Guru Nanak, Ram and Rahim. India has been at the top in this respect. I am true follower of Hindu religion however I consider the arrogance in Hinduism as enemy of humanity. India can be proud of maximum number of incarnation, Mahatama Buddha was born here, however people of this country did not accept his views but of other countries became his disciples. This country can be proud of his 33 crores gods. It means that for about 62-63 crores people 33 crores gods are there, that means one god is there for every two persons. But in what bad condition the country is?

16.00 hrs.

To what extent the situation in this country has deteriorated what role have you played in bringing this country to this degradation. My submission is that we have come here to discuss the matters and not to win vote of confidence. I would like to ask those who allege that Mandal Commission report is being implemented merely to fulfil the political motives what was Mahatama Gandhi's motive behind to providing reservation facilities to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. Why did Baba Bhim Rao Ambedkar, Jawahar Lal Nehru, Lohia and Shri Jai Prakash Narayan favoured it? It was the constitutional requirement. I am standing here in this House, from where this mike, multiple sound system has been brought? Watches on your wrists have been brought from outside you have not done even a single creative work during the long period of 2500 years. It was because you were never bothered about anything except in the incarnations of gods. You did nothing for the welfare of people. Kindly listen to what I say, I did not interrupt you. You may be impressed or not after hearing what I will say. Massacre took place here and the county was destroyed. My submission is that if 11th incarnation takes place the country will be thrown in the work condition. What for the political parties are there? I would like to ask

what is the duty of the political parties. If you are not concerned about the promotion of human values, you are not the true followers of your religion. The purpose of this House is to provide the basic facilities to people, for the political and cultural development. I would like to submit to the hon. Member of this House that so many people of the country have not been killed in the wars, as has been killed in the wars fought on the name of Allah and Ram. Such a thing has never taken place in any war in the history. Such has not taken place even in the first and second world wars. It is true that genocides has taken place in the name of Ram and Rahim, but whenever Ram and Rahim has come together they had changed the course of history also. The first war of independence in 1857 is a shining example of such alliance which ultimately lead the country to freedom. We should remember that we had nothing to be proud of in our history. In the history of the world, our name is at the top for living in slavery for the longest period. But we have no shame or feel no insult for this. The Americans call of jokers, but we feel no insult in that. But we feel insulted before the Hindus and the muslims. So many pages have been written in the history of this country. But they are all lies. It had been written on every page that they fought with bravery but eventually lost on account of Jaichand. Somewhere it is written that they failed, because there own elephants trampled their soldiers and sometime they ascribed defeat to the treachery done by their own brethren.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not the only example Once an opportunity came to fight with China. The war between India and Pakistan is actually no war. They are alike, that means, both the countries have rotten-minded people. In that case, it is a game of numbers. 70 people are bound to defeat 7. But when the country had to face China, the army had to retreat and so, the General Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, whom I respect a lot, had said that they had been deceived. The Chinese could have bombed Delhi also and they had cheated us. Then Lata Mangeskar was called to sing this song. "Aai mere vatan ke logon, jara aankh me bhar lo pani"

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

because the chinese had given a sound beating. Due to this caste system in our country, the forces had been filled with cowards. This is not bravery. China had attacked us and we lost the war and cry on our defeat. Never such an opportunity has come in the history, when this country has won. We had decided that day that we will resign and Shri Advani had said that we will construct a temple at Ram Janam Bhoomi on the 30th. The Hon. President had said that the status quo will be maintained...*(Interruptions)* I would like to submit that we had been elected to this House to discharge our obligations with our convictions. We are not proud of our posts or power and we will sacrifice ourselves for the goals cherish by Gandhi, Lohia and Jai Prakash. Why do you raise the question of the Government. We are ready for sacrifice. The down trodden of this country followed Baba Saheb Ambedkar to the extent of worshipping but he didn't get anything. I would like to submit that every citizen of this country belongs to us. There can be difference in the minds, but that is not here. Here it is difference of opinion. We had tried to open the shackles of the downtrodden man, who has been exploited and tortured and was in proverty for centuries. We are not saints. The dreams we were seeing in the streets and in the parties, that we will fulfil them after coming to power, we had fulfilled them. We tried to bring social justice and provided the right to work. Gandhiji sacrificed his life for secularism. We cannot give a bigger sacrifice than that. Secularism has taken a lot of sacrifices. The country was divided and lakhs of people had to migrate from here to Pakistan and vice-versa. A lot of destruction was caused to the houses and to the people. We are ready to withdraw the Mandal Commission in view of this unity among these people I would life to ask them whether they had tried to bring forward a caste in these last 43 years. You had been in this House for the last 40 years.

16.09 hrs. '

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

whether you marry your sister and daughter in your own caste. If you are sincere to abolish the caste system, you must amend the Constitution. So that the castes are merged in the society as salt is dissolved in water. We will withdraw the Mandal Commission Report by asking forgiveness. We don't want that a caste should remain as backward in the society we want that the society should become one. We want to remain as Hindus, but not with dishonour. We don't want to call ourselves hindus on your terms. You had a lot of doubts about the Mandal Commission. I respect Shri Advani.

The day Government decided to implement Mandal Commission Report, the earth under his feet started slipping. The M.Ps. belonging to backward classes continuously kept the issue in the meeting and since he had included it in his manifesto, he cannot change it. I respect him a lot. The rath, on which he rode was not the rath of Lord Rama, but was of the B.J.P. You have raised the temple issue just to counter the recommendations of the Mandal Commission and it is not for the sake of Rama. One of the Members belonging to your Party, whose name I will not take, told me that I have spoiled the entire thing. If I had felt that I have done something wrong, I would have apologised to the House. I am proud of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, who had to face all the allegation levelled by the people of his own caste. Is there any other person, who has been abused by his own caste and whose caste does not come under the Mandal Commission also has done all this for his own vested interests and for wining the elections. We are prepared for the elections. If it is for elections we are prepared for it.

My submission in that neither Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh nor any other person has told me to say this. Select a Care taker Prime Minister from the oldest Members of the Hcuse and let us face elections. Then we will see who is the greater champion of hindus. We want to test who is spreading this castism in the entire country. This country has a population of 62 crores. We are those people who will save the country, even if we

had to sacrifice our lives. Regarding reservations Shri Rajiv Gandhi says that there will remain no importance of merit, so the reservations should be given on the economic basis I would like to submit if your mother Shrimati Indira Gandhi had not been the Prime Minister, how would you have become the Prime Minister which examination had you passed. I would like to tell Shri Rajiv Gandhi, who spoke for three hours on the Mandal Commission, that when I fought the election from his constituency, he was not capable of saying a single word. But being the son of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, he became so capable that he became the Prime Minister.

We have come here to seek the vote of confidence. We have been elected to provide social justice and communal harmony as against communalism. You should remember that the day efforts are made to suppress any religion, the country will be divided. Just now, Shri Chandrashekhar was speaking here. It is good that at present, he is not here. Earlier, he was in P.S.P. but he changed over to Congress and then again changed over to Janta Dal from Congress. Now, he is again going to Congress from Janta Dal. We had never gone after the ruling party. The defection means greediness for the chair. Those who are changing over to the other parties from our party, are doing so, to get the post. We know how principled they are, who allege us that we are going against the principles. This country will not be allowed to run with the support of Mafia. Today, Shri Dhuru Bhai Ambani is knocking at the doors of the Lok Sabha and the horse trading of the M.Ps. in taking place. (*Interruptions*)

We have come here to the vote of confidence we want that the Congress party should be unmasked, so that their actual faces can be seen. You asked to stop the Rath of Shri Advani and you welcomed the news of his arrest. You should support this confidence motion in view of secularism. We will submit our resignation tomorrow. Today, in India is not only the question of religion and Ram and Rahim. Politics and the politi-

cal parties are for solving the problems of the people. They are not for the construction of temples of Ram and Rahim. I urge the hon. Members of the Bharatiya Janta Party that today the country is in a very helpless condition. It is already facing poverty and is in a mess of problems. They should work to build up the country. The day this country will become strong, Ram and Rahim will also get the required honour. Both the hindus and the muslims of this country will become strong.

With these words I thank you for giving me time to speak.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, will be allowed to speak or not? We are sitting here for three hours now. You should make it clear that we will be allowed to speak.

SHRIMATIGEETAMUKHERJEE: *rose*.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

[*Translation*]

Chitta Basu, please take your seat. Both of you will get time.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Now Shri Rajiv Gandhi will speak. Please sit down.

[*English*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI (Amethi): Mr. Speaker, Sir: The Prime Minister moved a Motion this morning—if I may read it out from the business paper: "That this House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers.", and then he went on to speak for about 30 or 40 minutes perhaps, and he did not give one argument on the performance of this Government, on why this House should have confidence in his Government. The Prime Minister said that the issue is secularism; but the business paper does not say

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

that the issue is secularism. The paper says that the issue is confidence in the Council of Ministers. It is a completely different issue. The issue in front of this House today is the performance of this Government, for the past eleven months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lokanath Choudhury and Mrs Geeta Mukherjee, please sit down. Mr. Nirmalda, please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Just because your eleven months affairs has come to an end...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gandhi is not yielding.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Speaker, Sir: There is only one issue before this House today: Has the Government performed to the satisfaction of this House and the country, during the past eleven months, and does this House, based on that performance, have confidence in the Council of Ministers? This is the question that we have ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury, he will speak from his point of view.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Lokanath Choudhury, I am not permitting you to speak. He is not yielding. He can formulate his own views.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: When we look at our country, when we look at India today, we do not see the picture of the India that we

saw just a year ago, not the picture of the India that we have been building for 40 years. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Not like that.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Never in the history of Independent India had there been so much hypocrisy from a government; never in our history of Independent India had there been so much chicanery from the Government, never so much scam, never so much dissimulation or deviousness perhaps even diabolism. (*Interruptions*) Our people should keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: No cross-talks please.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: In 11 months, this government had unleashed every divisive force. Our society today is more divided than ever since partition. Every raw name of the country had been exposed during this short period. This has come about as a consequence of managing contradictions. I do not want to waste my time on you. (*Interruptions*) During this period, casteism had been raised to levels seldom seen before; casteism was raised for the purpose of dealing with inner party disputes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: You are talking as if there was no casteism earlier. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it necessary that you, Dr. Biplab Dasgupta, go on commenting on every point that he has mentioned?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sometimes people get seniled; sometimes political parties get seniled. Casteism was fanned. It was brought up because of inner party problems; it was further fanned because the government found it convenient to do so.

If we just look back at August and September, a picture comes out very clearly. Agitations started on their own. Government Ministers provoked counter-agitations. And then if you remember, Sir, during the third week of August the agitations were dying

down and coaling off. And it was the deliberate action of this Government outside the Prime Minister's house at Gole Mothi round about where they cleared an anti-reservation and a pro-reservation demonstration, almost at the same time. That is where violence took place, students were man-handled, especially girl students and then it caught fire. It was the Government that instigated, by allowing two counter demonstrations at the same place, at the same time, and it was deliberately done by the Government, because it did not want to see this dying out. (*Interruptions*) Did the Government not take a dual position? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Nani Babu, please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Now, the Government took one position outside the Supreme Court and a different position inside the Supreme Court. The Prime Minister kept saying that he was willing to talk, but with the same voice he kept saying that he was not willing to change his position. Is this not deliberate provocations? Did the Government not want the agitation to continue irrespective of the fact that there were almost 170 to 180 attempts of self-immolations?

The Prime Minister talked this morning of children dying. Where was the Prime Minister when the children were dying? (*Interruptions*)

By deliberately dividing one part of our society the Government provoked communalism to raise its head. If you go back into this recent history of three or four months, you will see that the communal forces started consolidating their position because of this action of the Government. And then the Government started playing off casteism against communalism. (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (Calcutta South): Would you please repeat? We did not understand. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Biplab Babu, please sit down. He is not yielding. You are not in the Chair.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Is it not a fact that this Government has played casteism versus communalism? Is it not a fact that this Government by deliberate leakages, by bringing about ordinances surreptitiously and trying to hoodwink various sections of the community, particularly one community, by maps drawn by, I believe the Prime Minister himself, where I am told that parts of the Babri Masjid were earmarked to be taken out. Is this not hoodwinking the people. Did you not hoodwink the Babri Masjid Committee in that manner, the BJP and the VHP? What games were you playing? What was burning while you were playing these games? Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, the damage that you have done to this country, the social tensions that you have brought about in this country will take decades to cool down again. The damage that this eleven months has done is going to take many years to undo... (*Interruptions*) Sir, suddenly approximately one week ago, the Prime Minister has discovered secularism. Where was the secularism for this whole one year? You had forgotten about it. You had forgotten about secularism when you were sharing seats in the elections. All is gone. For one year you have collaborated with those people, whom today you have decided as communal. We have a lot of disagreement with the BJP. But I will say one thing about the BJP. They have not hidden what they stand for at any time. They spoke out at every point that this is what they want, that this is what they want, that this is what they want. You have collaborated with them. The Leftists also have collaborated with them... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Now you are collaborating with them... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, after eleven months of collaboration... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Whom do you want to collaborate with now?... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, I am not yielding. Last time he did not yield. That is why I am not yielding. Otherwise, I will yield.

Did the Prime Minister at any point in these eleven months try to dissuade the BJP on these points which they were raising. Did he warn them the dangers of it. Did he try to stop them at any point? No. Today suddenly secularism has become a question because his chair has become a question... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You would have agreed with Advaniji and kept the chair? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: It is too late now and nobody is going to believe your banner of secularism at this point of time after you tried to cheat the Babri Masjid Committee on the ordinances. How can anybody believe you stand for secularism after you drew the map in your own hand giving away parts of the disputed land? Calling yourself secular at this point is of no use because you stand exposed, naked in front of the nation.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That will be a horrible sight.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Secularists do not share platform with the BJP one day and then turn to them for survival the next day. Secularists do not keep mum when a political partner raises communal tension and denigrates one particular community. But you were silent; you acquiesced. Hypocrites cannot be try secularists. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

The leftists are feeling restless. Now communism has disappeared from the world.

[*English*]

The consequences of casteism and

communalism that this Government have raised are horrendous. Fear stalks every village, every town and every street. All over northern India we have had hundreds of people getting killed in riots. Muslims have got killed; Hindus have got killed. Perhaps, never on this score since the partition have so many people got killed... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: How many communal riots were there when you were the Prime Minister? Have you forgotten that? When Bhagalpur riots started, who was the Prime Minister? It was started during your period. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Then there is Jammu and Kashmir. What have you done to Kashmir in one year?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Who created it?—You.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You have completely alienated the people in Jammu and Kashmir. You have created the conditions where the non-Muslim population of the valley has left the valley. It has happened during your period.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: It was started during your regime.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You have appointed a Governor. Within 200 days you have changed the Governor. You released hardcore terrorists in exchange for the Home Minister's daughter and you still have not answered the questions we asked you in December when we debated that kidnapping and the exchange that took place. You destabilised a popularly elected Government. You dissolved the State Assembly and by dissolving the State Assembly, you gave credence to Pakistan's propaganda. You joined hands with Pakistan in Kashmir. You have inflicted untold economic hardships on the people of Kashmir. Normal life is completely disrupted. Communication and telecom links have been disrupted. Trade, industry and exports from Kashmir have crashed. Tourism has finished. The people

of the valley are in turmoil. Have you done one thing to try and help them? Have you had a policy on Kashmir? Have you had a plan of action on Kashmir? Many committees were set up. A lot of talk...*(Interruptions)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Who allowed Pakistani flag to be hoisted?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: This Government mortgaged the security of India and our foreign policy by allowing Pakistan to put the Simla Agreement on the back-burner and by letting Pakistan raise the issue in international forums and even get a resolution passed in the O.I.C. It is a total failure on the part of this Government.

Then, there is the question of excesses by the para-military forces in Kashmir. Is it not true that ordinary businessmen, not in link in any way to terrorism or secessionism are disappearing in Kashmir for small amounts of Rs. 20,000 and Rs. 30,000? Is it not true that this was brought to the notice of the Governor? And is it not true that the Governor said if he takes action, it will demoralise the police? Are we becoming Chile or Peru here that people are disappearing? The police are picking up people and they are disappearing. It has never happened in India before.... *(Interruptions)* There was a specific case of a journalist who was picked up by the police by the army...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

In West Bengal also it is being done. *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Please, Biplab Babu.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, is it not true that a journalist was picked up by the army and this Government denied that it had any knowledge of it? It denied that the army or the police was involved. Did they not say so in the Supreme Court as well? And then suddenly we discovered that the army had

picked him up. What was happening? What would have happened if we had not made noise for two days in Parliament? Sir, that journalist would not have come back. The functioning of this Government has reduced the credibility of the nation in the eyes of the world. How did all this happen in Kashmir? Is it not true that this was not just by default or mistake but it was by deliberate designs? Is it not true that the Governor had a plan to eliminate the National Conference and the Congress, the only two nationalist parties in the Valley, and replace them by what he called a new political force? Where was he getting this new political force from? We have seen the new political force he has raised in the Valley. That is your policy in Kashmir.

What has been your performance in Punjab? Has it been any better?*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Biplab Babu, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, is it not true that just a couple of day after your Government took over a call for Khalistan was made in Amritsar? And is it not true that it was by the delayed intervention of the Prime Minister that the persons were not arrested? Did the telegrams between the Prime Minister and the Governor not come out into the newspapers in those days? What were you doing, Sir?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH. Is it a Questionnaire that you are giving today? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: That is what a no-confidence or confidence motion is. It is a questionnaire on your performance. Was there not blatant appeasement of the terrorists in Punjab? And have most of the terrorists released not gone back to terrorism? Is it not a fact, Sir? Is it not true that terrorism has spread to almost every district of Punjab now? There is no area of Punjab which is free

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

of terrorists. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, is it not true that the Gurudwaras which were being used only for religious purposes and praying when this Government took over are today in the hands of the terrorists and are used for all sorts of thing including harbouring terrorists?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Have you revived the question Hour, Sir? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Are the Granthis not being terrorised once more? Are the pilgrims not being intimidated? Again, you had to change the Governor within six months.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Every three months you changed the Chief Ministers. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Biplab Babu, is it necessary that you should interrupt point to point when Shri Rajiv Gandhi speaks? It is not necessary.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I want to bring one point to your notice on an earlier intervention.

[*Translation*]

I am submitting that in my last speech. (*Interruptions*) I spoke for two hours and 20 minutes. When I went through the transcript

SHRI RAM ASHRAY PRASAD SINGH: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

[*English*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I spoke for two hours 20 minutes, Sir. Then when I went through the transcript, when I just removed

the time taken by intervention, my speech was only 46 minutes.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That was long enough.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, these people are just not ready to listen to anything. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Biplab Dasgupta, please take your seat.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Sir, have this Government done anything to break the linkages between the terrorists in Punjab and others in Assam, the LTTE in Tamil Nadu and perhaps also the Naxalities in Andhra Pradesh? The fact is, gimmicks and empty gestures are not going to find solutions. We have had 11 months of gimmicks, 11 months of 'notanki' and that is what the nation is facing today. For Punjab, there was no political initiative; there was no administrative package. What was your plan for Punjab? Today, there are more people dying every week than they were dying every month last year because of the hopelessness of Mr. V.P. Singh and not because Mr. V.P. Singh. What has happened in Assam where there is a National Front Government? The AGP Government is a part of the National Front. What have you done? Why are the Bodos and the Karbis on the war path?

[*Translation*]

If you are running the Government in this manner, what can I do.

[*English*]

Is your Prime Minister that hopeless?

Sir, my hon. friends from the Left are admitting openly that this Prime Minister has no control over Jammu and Kashmir, Punjab and Assam. That is what they are saying.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We shall see your control, your backseat control.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: There is a virtual surrender of Government authority to ULFA. There is continued harassment and intimidation of linguistic and religious minorities; there is unabated killings and extortion of industrialists and others in Assam. What have you done? Have you taken one step to do anything? Not at all.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Will you yield for two seconds?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I will yield.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, of course Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is referring to various questions. I would just like to ask him one thing. Is it not a fact that the entire question of Confidence Motion has arisen out of the single fact that the BJP withdrew its support because of the obstruction of the 'Rath Yatra'? If that is so, why don't you touch the original issue as a result of which this Confidence Motion has come before the House? Your question-answer will follow as starred, unstarred question.

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, with reference to what Prof. Dandavate has said right now, I would like to submit only this much that his contention would have carried weight, had Mr. Madan Lal Khurana's No-confidence Motion' been taken up for discussion, but when it has not been admitted and as the Prime Minister has sought the confidence of the House, it is but natural on the part of those, who never had confidence in this Government even before and who had voted against a similar motion last year also, to oppose it. (Interruptions)

I would like to add that Prof. Dandavate has not gone through the contents of our motion and his remarks about us too is not correct. Prof. Dandavate should reply to it.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The

identify of BJP and Congress-I has come to be established.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Just because we happen to be voting on the same side of BJP, it does not mean that we have links with BJP. Let it be very clear. We have opposed this Government right from day-one. We have not had confidence in this Government from December, 1989 itself and it is not just today. That change today is only in the BJP, not in the Congress-I. BJP had confidence in you till a week ago. They have lost the confidence now. It is between you and the BJP; it has nothing to do with us. Till one week ago, it was not a problem for the CPM, CPI and others to sit and have dinner with Advaniji. But today suddenly he has become an un-touchable.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We are ready to have dinner with you also. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: The country will not miss this hypocrisy. You cannot hide it under any amount of noise; you can do as much shouting as you like but the truth will prevail and it will be out. The fact is that you the Leftists will go down in the history of having shared seats with BJP.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We have never shared.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: It is the Janata Dal and Mr. V.P. Singh who will go down in the history of having shared a common platform but not a *manch* with BJP.

[Translation]

The platform is common but the *manches* will be two. What have you done in Tamil Nadu? It was total policy failure on Sri Lanka. You have brought terrorism to Tamil Nadu.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. UPENDRA): Who financed the LTTE?

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You have brought drug-trade to Tamil Nadu. The Linkage between your National Front partner DMK and the LTTE is very clear. Is it not true that the coastal areas are under your control? Is it not true that coastal waters are not under your control? What sort of Government is this?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: One common answer is, 'No'.

17.00 hrs.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Is it also not true that this Government could not protect the Sri Lankan political refugees in Madras? What sort of refuge did you give them that they were shot and gunned down, 10 to 11 together? You may think it is funny. It is not. It is sad. It is even more sad that you do not realise the gravity of the situation.

What have you done to the economy? In spite of a very good monsoon, perhaps the best monsoon for decades inflation is running higher than ever before. Who is suffering? How did it happen? Prof. Madhu Dandavateji slaps on this tax and that tax but who pays for it? You know at what price vegetables are selling outside, Prof. Madhu Dandavateji? Last time, I pointed out to the Prime Minister that wheat and rice is costing too much. He said let them eat cement. You are in this House.

The price of everything is sky-rocketing. The deficit, as forecast today, is going to be around Rs. 24,000 crores. What is going to happen to this country? What has happened to the foreign exchange reserves? Tax collections are down. Where is the performance of this Government? Foreign exchange reserves are down between Rs. 3,000 crores to Rs. 4,000 crores. They were never so low before. And I am told they are depleting at the rate of Rs. 1,200 crores to Rs. 1,500 crores a month. You have got foreign exchange only for two or three months. You are going at the right time. I do not know who is

coming. Whoever is coming, is going to be in trouble with the economy you are leaving.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You know who is coming. He is coming with your consent.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Now the word is that you are going to do something that we have never done before. You are going to sell the gold of India. (Interruptions) You are going to sell Rs. 2,000 crores worth of gold and this includes the gold that was collected during the Chinese aggression. It was donated by the poorest, the weakest, from the villages. It came and because of your non-performance it is being sold. Mangal Sutras were there. What is happening with the BOP?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Only one thing. All this Questionnaire that is going on is on wrong basis or on wrong facts. Last time, out of 2 hours 20 minutes, the speech was 45 minutes. But the substance was not even five minutes and this time it will be even less.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You are relying on a wrong note.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What is happening with our Eighth Plan? It is in total confusion. Planning Commission is doing one thing. Government is doing something else.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Read out the Questionnaire.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: When we are talking about confidence in the Government, it is a Questionnaire on the performance of the Government. What else is it? What for do you think you are sitting in the confidence motion? You are being charged for your misdeeds and failure and you have to answer this.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I will answer.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: If you do not answer them, you stand exposed.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Can I have one minute? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No. He is not yielding.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: He will yield.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Leader of the Opposition, I will take one second. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, he has forgotten to put one more question. Is the Prime Minister Shri V.P. Singh not responsible for India's showing in the *Baijing* Asiad? He is responsible for that also. That is the type of question he should ask. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What reply can I give to that?

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: please order.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: If you remember, Sir, the Government was highly embarrassed while some of our friends from the left were jaunting in Beijing watching the Asian Games when the Punjab Bill fell here. 13 people from the left were in Baijing, if I remember rightly. It is more important than Punjab. They were watching the Games there. Perhaps that is still going round in your mind. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You are holding him responsible for everything. Why not for this also?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What has happened to the development of Anti-Poverty Programmes? Has anything happened? There is a virtual standstill today. If you go out into the field, if you go to the villages, you

can see. The Prime Minister does not have time to go to the villages. So, he doesn't know what is going on there. When I went to Fatehpur I got an opportunity. They told me that the Prime Minister doesn't have time for Fatehpur, Fatehpur has had no development for one year... nothing

DR. BIPLABDASGUPTA: Unlike Amethi where all the money was put.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Development programmes are at a total standstill. What is the Core Sector's performance? What is the performance of the Coal Sector, Power Sector, all the major sectors? There is a sharp downfall in every sector—from 6 to 12 per cent down from last year. It should have been 6-12 per cent up from last year. There is a difference of 20-25 per cent in performance.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You are relying on wrong note.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Who is going to pay for all this? Who is going to suffer for all this?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Who is responsible for the Gulf crisis? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: What has happened to the Anti-Poverty Programmes? What has happened to the employment programmes? Each one of them remains reduced and they have been distorted... (*Interruptions*) What has happened to the international credit rating of India? I am told that certain people from the Government went to get some loans and nobody was willing to give India loan. I am told that you floated certain bonds on certain schemes which were half to one per cent higher than the international rates and still nobody came forward. Why? It is because the country has lost credibility because of your Government... (*Interruptions*) With this pathetic economic performance, it is the poor who suffer, it is the salaried class who suffer. If you go out in the street and see what

[Sh. Rajiv Gandhi]

is happening to them, you will find out what you have done during these 11 months. What did you do, when you came in to the institution of Governors? Is it not a shame the way a large mass of Governors were dismissed? They were all made to resign. What did you do to the institution of Governors? What did you do when the Chief Justice of India was ill in London? Total failure. He could not even get adequate medical attention. And what happened to all that talk about autonomy for Doordarshan and A.I.R.? Have you watched Doordarshan these days?(Interruptions)

SHRI P. UPENDRA: Only your picture is coming. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: You know the 2nd of November was one of the worst days in recent weeks in terms of number of people who died for various reasons whether it was police firing, rioting and other things. And what was the Doordarshan's news coverage? It only covered the Janata Dal meeting and they gave lots of time to our vociferous friends of the Left—21 minutes of the news. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. UPENDRA: I am happy you fund one Minister who followed you.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Upendraji, nobody will believe what you say about the Doordarshan and the A.I.R. We were blamed for all sorts of things on the Doordarshan and the A.I.R. that we were doing. Compared to you, we were so innocent.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Give them Nobel Prize for innocence.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Lastly, I would like to join the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister, if I remember correctly, appealed to this House to vote across party lines. Yes, let us vote across party lines on the performance of this Government. In eleven months, over 5000 people have died in Kashmir, Punjab and Assam. He was speaking about

atrocities against Harijans. The Prime Minister spoke with great emotion about the Bharat Ratna that he has given to Dr. Ambedkar. Yes, we appreciate it. He spoke with great emotion about the Portrait that was put up in the Central Hall. Did he visit one Harijan even in his own constituency? Were you there when they were being burnt? No, You did not even once.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes. You are telling untruth. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: How many Harijans have died in Fatehpur? Did you go to Agra? Did you go to Rajasthan? Five thousand people have died in eleven months in this country. (*Interruptions*) Muslims have died; Hindus have died in numbers unthought of before. Children have died. There is a galloping retreat on all fronts— political, economic and diplomatic. India's unity is being sliced. India's integrity is being questioned today. India's security is in danger. India's future is in peril today India's destiny cannot remain in the hands of a Prime Minister who has made a carnival out of principles. Our wounded nation must be nursed back to health and I appeal to this House to vote unitedly, to vote against this Government because this Government has lost every confidence that it could have had. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have risen to oppose the motion of vote of confidence moved by the Prime Minister, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh. About eleven months back, also, a confidence motion was taken up for discussion, and the period between these two confidence motions has been one of distress and trouble for both the country and my party. I still remember, that when on 21st or 22nd December last year when the Hon. Prime Minister sought a vote of confidence, Mr A.R. Antulay spoke on behalf of the Congress Party as its main Speaker, or as its first speaker. It is still fresh in my memory that I was entrusted with the responsibility to reply to the criticism made

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

by Mr. Antulay and to defend the Government. While refreshing to the situation in Punjab and Kashmir, he had said that:

[English]

"We had given to you an integrated country and now the country is going to the dogs."

[Translation]

He used somewhat similar words in his speech. At that time, I said that it is indeed surprising that such allegations are being levelled against a Government, which had assumed charge, handle 15 days back. I also said that if a Senior Member of the Congress Party like Shri Antulay really felt that.

[English]

Today the country is going to the dogs.

[Translation]

and that the country is on the verge of disintegration, then he should squarely blame the leaders of his own Party for it and not a 15 day old Government. At that time also, I had made it crystal clear that our party had extended its support to this Government, because of a very simple reason. At that time, I had no subjective assessment on the performance of this Government, what I want to say is that the support was extended on the basis of the mandate got by it in the November 1989 general elections. It reveals that the voters of this country want a change in the political set up and Secondly the people of this country are not in favour of the Congress Party. I have drawn these conclusions from the mandate. I do not consider this positive for any party or any combination of parties. As such at times when it is said that the mandate is meant for three of us I do not believe it. This mandate...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is not for congress.

SHRI LAL KRISHNA ADVANI: Yes, the mandate is not in favour of Congress and the public is want a change. Keeping this in view our party has taken this decision that we will extend our support to Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh or in other words the Janata Dal and 2-4 parties comprising of 2-3 member and their coalition which is known as National Front. Which the National Front went to the President and started its claim and expressed it's willingness to form Government at the Centre, we also expressed willingness extend our support to them but our support was not unconditional as is was case with the communist Party. In my letter in which I expressed my willingness to extend my party's support to them, I had emphasised that our manifestos would not be totally alike. The communist Party may have supported the manifesto of the National Front in totality but as regards my party, we have not supported their manifesto in toto since we had diverse opinions in this regard. This fact should be kept in mind. We will expect this from you although we are not putting any condition. While extending our support we shall not withdraw the same in case our demands are not fulfilled but at the same time it should be noted that although many of the points in our manifestos are alike there are some issues which are different and the said issues are considered vital by my party. In the last election my party got the support of the people because they wanted to remove congress from power but the major reason behind it was that my party had a different image of its own and on the basis of which other parties call it communal whereas the voter respected that image and proved that our party is not communal. During the last eleven months I also expected them to discuss certain subjects, with us so as to reach a consensus. I am deeply hurt to say that nothing in this regard was done in the past eleven months and we were alleged of violating the constitution when we took a decision to withdraw our support from the National Front Government for some reason

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

lapse of eleven months. I shall mention the reason later which forced us to withdraw support from this government. The Prime Minister has alleged that I am against the constitution and the judiciary. Everyone says that I am communal. It is an old thing and I do not understand it. Right from Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee to Sardar Vallabh Bhai Patel, Purushottam Das Tandon and Dr. Sampurnanand were called as communal by Congressmen. The Marxist Party was playing the leading role in this regard. This is not a major thing. If my name is linked with these eminent leaders I do not mind being called as communal. But today I was taken aback when the Prime Minister charged me of violating the Constitution in the House because I took oath only after reposing my confidence in the constitution. Mr. Madhu Dandavate, Mr. Chandrasahekhar and George Fernandes who are also present in this August House do not make such allegations, but when it comes from a person like V.P. Singh that Advaniji is against the constitution it is something which goes against the principles of my party.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have limited time at my disposal because before me two of my colleagues have already spoken. Thus I shall not give a detailed account of the failures of this Government but I certainly want them to be on record. The Prime Minister as well as Dandvateji whom I expected to be more realistic have stated that we have withdrawn our support only for one reason. They have not referred to any second cause where as the fact is otherwise. My resolution is with me and I shall read out apart of this resolution:—

[English]

The country had welcomed and the BJP had backed the Janata Dal Government with great expectations. But all these expectations have been belied.

[Translation]

Therefore we had made a mention in our

revolution about Punjab issue, the Kashmir issue, the issue of the terrorist, the Assam issue and the issue of terrorism in Andhra Pradesh. We had also made a mention of the economic policies in our resolution and had also pointed out that an account of the defective fiscal policies.

[English]

Prices have sky rocketed making life miserable for more and more millions.

[Translation]

Thereafter we had said a very important thing which I am quoting:

[English]

The BJP has been in favour of reservations to socially and educationally backward classes. However, the manner in which the Government announced its decision about the Mandal Commission Report without any consultation with the supporting parties and without qualifying it with any economic criteria was utterly wrong. The decision was prompted not by any concern for the backward classes but any considerations of political expediency. The Government's decision can only lead to dividing and sub-dividing the society. The result has been not only serious disturbance of peace and enormous loss of life and property but the immolation of some of the flowers of our youth.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is the resolution of 17th October. I want to say this emphatically that ever since June the situation has taken such a turn that our support to this Government would mar our image before the public when we asserted that we did not agree with the policies formulated by the Government with regard to Kashmir and Punjab and we also did not share the same opinion regarding Budget then we were questioned as to why we continued extending our support to the National Front Government. To this question our reply was that the mandate

was in favour of a change and the same has been achieved. Thus we are also a party to this change. If we think in terms of changing our decision we shall not do it in haste but do so only after careful consideration. But I hold this opinion that when we brought forth the resolution of 17th October we had already reached the conclusion that the mandate given in the November 1989 elections has undergone a change. But in the present times if we suddenly take a decision, this decision should have a positive have. However, we want to tell them that the most important reason for taking such a decision is that the President of Bhartiya Janata Party started the Rath Yatra on 25th September in order to gain public support for the construction of a temple at the Ram Janmabhoomi site. I shall discuss it in detail later but now we want to say that our decision is not confined to only one issue. This decision is related to the activities of the Government in the last eleven months and each activity is a reason in itself. On the contrary it was only a question as to when it precipitates and on which issue. Taking note of it we issued a warning to the Government that in case the Rath Yatra is stopped the support would be withdrawn since 17th October, implied that the *Rath yatra* went unhampered for the three weeks at a stretch.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the President of the Congress party is present here. I would like to tell him that in the meeting of the National integration Council he had openly said that the Janata Dal will not prevent the Rath yatra but Congress run State Governments would certainly stop this Rath yatra if it passed through those states.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Advaniji, I had not said this. In the meeting of N.I.C. held in Madras, I had said that the Chief Ministers of Congress States would go by the instructions of the Central Government and they would help the Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, if it appeared to him that the people with full emotion were

rushing to his State from the Congress ruled States.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I do not know this. But I have stated just what I got from the news Papers.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: As far as I know, the Central Government did not instruct any of our Chief Ministers to stop the Rathyatra.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: That may be right. Even they themselves did not stop it in Delhi... (*Interruptions*) ... Mr. Speaker, Sir anyone who listened to my speech during the Rath yatra might have taken the notice. That I have publicly condemned 'Babri Masjid ko tor do' I always told that such slogans were wrong and these would ultimately weaken our movement. The Bhartiya Janta Party is of the view that some solution which regards the feelings of both the communities should certainly be evolved because sentiments of the Hindus with that place and sentiments of the Muslims with that structure are associated with. In that very context, I had moved a proposal, of which Prof. Dandavateji giving a definition from a scientific angle, tried to make a fun of it. He said, "Verticality is being changed into horizontality." As in Andhra Pradesh, the Government had re-located all the twenty ancient temples which were feared to be sunk due to the construction of three dams there. So if I propose here to relocate,

[*English*]

It is not merely a euphemistic way that it should be pulled down. It is a concrete proposal. I am happy to say.

[*Translation*]

I am happy to say that there are many our Muslim brethren though small in number, who welcome this idea of relocating the structure as that place is associated with the Hindu's sentiments.

Now, I would like to mention about the propaganda that was made about my Rath-

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

yatra particularly by the Government media i.e. Radio and T.V. that after the Rath yatra in Hindustan there would be nothing but riots in which the Muslims would be massacred. Most of the persons had begun to think in that terms. While during my Rath-yatra, in my usual speech of one hour, I used to appeal repeatedly to the people not to raise any such furious slogan because in my opinion, it is wrong. I hope that the persons who wish to maintain the communal harmony in the country, will never say any such things, as may endanger of the unity of the country. Radio and T.V. must also care for that and should never indulge in making such propaganda as they had made during my Rathyatra. Contrary to it, Radio and T.V. had repeatedly been making this propaganda and giving impression that the Rathyatra is only meant for demolishing the Babri Masjid. Mr. Speaker, Sir, however, I do not deny that due to this propaganda our Muslim brethren were much terrorised and worried. I, myself was much worried as my Rath yatra was to begin from Somanath and I know it also that there were some places like Ahmedabad, Baroda, Surat, Bharoch etc. in Gujarat where disturbance often occur even without any reason. I am not a great leader but only a simple political workers, so I do not claim that I have practised the great principle of Non-violence as had been adopted in the country after the chauri-chaura incident (by Mahatma Gandhi) Even then I would like to announce it publicly that I have certainly a sense of responsibility. If any such big incident occurred anywhere in the country, all the responsibility would be laid upon me. And it is a fact that while taking a decision of holding Rathyatra, I told the journalists that I was not posting any threat to the country rather I was putting my prestige at stake. If anything happened during my Rathyatra the people would definitely think about me as to how irresponsible I was and that is why I had been worried all the time when my Rathyatra was passing through Gujarat. During the Rathyatra, throughout Gujarat, even the Muslims also warmly welcome the yatra at a number of places but here in Parliament in

both the Houses, a different picture was being given. I am sorry to state that wherever, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav went to deliver his speech and if riots occur there even after three days, the riots are also linked with my Rathyatra. If I keep aside my Rath yatra episode for the time being, even then I do not see any good deed performed by this Government so far over which it may feel proud. After all, a Prime Minister besides being the leader of the ruling party, is the leader of the house, as well as of the country also, so he should possess a lot of merits. And above all, in much opinion, the most important quality of Prime Minister is that he should be the leader of his team. he should possess the quality of team Leadership. The colleagues with whom he is working, must have their faith in him. Has the Hon. prime Minister got time to think over it that for the last 11 months he has not been able to keep the country together? Has he taken notice of the number of the clashes that have taken place in the society while these have been being high-lighted by all of us as well as by Newspapers.

[English]

He has not been able to keep even his Council of Ministers together. He has not been able to keep even his Party together.

[Translation]

Not to talk of the Party, he could not even keep together with him his own faction—Jan Morcha. Out of six Chief Ministers, three have left him.

[English]

What kind of team leadership is this? Can there be a greater failure than this?

[Translation]

In these circumstances, if the Prime Minister thinks that he can form a campaign plank for the election through moving this motion of confidence here in the House, I do not think it will be ever possible; the people do not

forgive anyone. The people did not forgive them, so they will not forgive us as well. And you too will not be forgiven by the people. This is the greatest achievement of the democracy.

[English]

You cannot take people for granted.

[Translation]

Whosoever, he may be, should not think that the people will forget the wrong doings of the leaders because now the people are more politically conscious and they will not forgive the wrong doers.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the mentioning of this thing was necessary for me because Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, Shri Madhu Dandavate and probably Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri Indrajit Gupta had given such an impression as the Ayodhya issue was the only reason of our anger. If there would not have been the Rathyatra and the Ayodhya issue, the people are always there who call me as communal. I do not defend myself againsts such allegations.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Would you have withdrawn your support but for the Rath Yatra?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Yes. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Advaniji, if the Government had not stopped the Rath Yatra, would you bring down the Government? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Yes.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: You should tel me. Don't try to deceive yourself and deceive others like the Congress (I).

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

KUMARI MAYAWATI: The people from all the corners of the country had been asking you not to hold Rathyatra. ... (*Interruptions*) ... The shops of the Muslims have been burnt... (*Interruptions*) ...

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, because he has just now made a very categorical statement I would only want to know from him whether it is not a fact that on behalf of his party, the Government had been warned that if they stop the Rath Yatra and if they do not permit the *Kar Sewa* to take place there, then they will withdraw their support.

You did not warn them that you will withdraw your support on one hundred other issues. Is it not a fact? Ultimately, you withdrew only on this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Your letter was lying ready. You have kept your letter ready and only upon your arrest that letter was sent. Then, obviously, you linked it with your arrest. (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: There is some truth in your statement. We had pointed out a number of their misdeeds. Referring to Ram Janam Bhoomi issue, in the last paragraph of the resolution, we had warned them that we would withdraw our support from their Government if they would stop the Rathyatra or the Kar Seva.... (*Interruptions*) ... Our frustration from this Government is not a new one. There are so many reasons for our frustration... (*Interruptions*) ... Mr. Speaker, Sir, though I do not want to quote an example from the Mahabharat, yet my friends insist on me for quoting that. The people were surprised to see that Lord Krishna was tolerating the abususes that were being made continuously upon him one after another by Shishupal. But Lord Krishna had decided himself to oppose Shishupal only when his

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

abuses came to hundredth number... (*Interruptions*) ... Sir, I would like to remind this about Ayodhya also... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduars): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on the point of order as to when did Shri Advaniji become a religious guru?... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I am just a simple political workers, not a religious worker. But I would like to say that objections were raised against Lokmanya Tilak also when he started Ganeshotsav. In the same way, the Bhartiya Janta Patty is being opposed now. I an show you that book which was much criticised. It was said that he being a political leader had no authority to publicise the Ganeshotsav as it was a work of a religious leader only.

But leaders like Lokmanya Tilak and Gandhiji had fore-sight and understood the situation. People used to ask Gandhiji as to why he recited the Ram Dhun. I would like to tell the entire House that my Rath yatra has further strengthened my faith.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): No one will be allowed to speak. We will not allow even the Prime Minister to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I am on my legs.

SHRI SATYANARAYAN JATIYA (Ujjain): We will not allow the Prime Minister to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to tell all the hon. Members that there should be no interruptions when Shri Advani is speaking. Please sit down.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know the working system of Gandhiji and what the Muslim leaders said about it at that time. Do these people have any knowledge of it? He must be having this knowledge because there were also people in the Muslim League who supported Pakistan. They held the view which I would like to quote in the words of Shri Jinha that he had said in 1942.

[*English*]

"The Congress is nothing but a Hindu body. The presence of the few Muslims, the few misled and misguided ones, and the few who are there with ulterior motives, does not, cannot, make it a national body.

He also said in his Presidential Address in 1943 as follows:

"The Gandhi Ashram at Sevagram, Wardha, has been created 'to serve as the Vatican of Gandhism and the capital of the Congress'; Gandhi Harijan Seva Sangh, 'to consolidate the Depressed Classes as integral parts of Hinduism and to prevent their conversion to Islam or Christianity'; Gandhi Hindi Prachar Sangha, 'to propagate Sanskritised Hindi as the State and national language ...of India and to displace Urdu from its place of primacy and popularity'; Gandhi Nagri Prachar Sabha, 'to propagate the idea that all Indian languages should be written in Devanagari script and to displace Urdu script'; Gandhi Wardha Talim Sangha, 'to propagate Gandhian principles of religion, spiritualism, national economy and nationalism through a State-controlled system of compulsory primary education. Under the Wardha scheme, the entire system of education of the country was sought to be made subservient to the propagation of Gandhism (which was only a new form of Hinduism to exclusion of all other religions)', etc."

(*Interruptions*)

I feel unhappy today when the same allegations were made either by Prof. Madhu Dandavate or by my friends from here or sometimes occasionally from there also.

[*Translation*]

When their turn comes, they should be given the chance. I was objecting because in these 15 days a concerted effort has been started. Since 23rd, the day from which we withdrew support, efforts are being made to prove that the Bharatiya Janata Party was trying to introduce theocracy in the country in which non-Hindus would not be able to live and they would have a secondary status. This is what I feel.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Practically, this is what you want.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Being an Indian, having faith in the Constitution of India and as a Hindu I would like to say only this much that the concept of a theocratic State is against Indian tradition, against Indian culture and also against the Indian history. I would like to quote from BJP manifesto.

[*English*]

"The idea of a theocratic state is an anathema to Indian mind and the BJP believes that State in India has always been a civil institution which respects all religions equally and makes no discrimination between one citizen and the other on the ground of language, color, caste or religion.

It is the duty of the State to guarantee justice and security to all minorities—linguistic, religious or ethnic. The BJP considers that it is also imperative for national integration that minorities do not develop a minority complex.

The BJP believe in positive secularism which, according to our constitution—makers, meant *Sarva-Dharma-Sama-Bhava* and which does not connote an irreligious state."

[*Translation*]

Our Marxist brothers have to face bitter criticism. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri) Now do you reconcile this with the slogan of "Hindu—Hindustan"? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: "It certainly does not mean rejection of our history and cultural heritage, the very foundations of this great nation. The BJP stands for" *Justice for All and Appeasement of None*".

[*Translation*]

I have read out our manifesto and would not like to repeat the same. In the recent past an article authored by a Senior Correspondent had appeared in "Illustrated Weekly". I met him once. Neither I nor the BJP has any familiarity with him. His name is Shri Nanpuri. I would like to read out a portion of his article that appeared in "Illustrated Weekly". He is of the view that...

[*English*]

"By repetitive statements, innuendo and manipulative techniques the impression of Jan Sangh-BJP-RSS as communalism incarnate was gradually shaped until it became a common place of Indian politics, the validity of which were hardly ever questioned."...

"And for the Nehruvian secularist",—that is the word he used—"it offered the opportunity to insinuate that 'Hindu' in the BJP sense represented bigotry, narrow-mindedness, petty shop-keeping and near illiteracy, and traditionalism of a sort irreconcilable with 'progressive modernism'."

And then, he goes on to say,—

"In post-war India there has not been a more successful venture in political disinformation than this, and since it had behind it the entire weight of every party's support, barring the BJP, it soon became, as it is even now, an

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

integral part of the nation's ethos."

[*Translation*]

The Article further explains:—

"The relative 'isolation' of the BJP-RSS combine is, indeed, a tribute to the psychological conditioning that went on during the British days when the Hindu was equated with all that was devious and corrupt and unreliable, and the bias in favour of the Muslim became a part of the imperial cult."

Now this is something over which you and I, and all of us have to think. This is a non-Hindu partisan interpretation as why this has happened.

[*Translation*]

The Britishers gave full publicity to the fact that struggle of independence was being fought by the Hindus under the leadership of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru and Sardar Vasllabhbhai Patel. The Muslims are fully supporting them under the leadership of Muslim League. As such the bias they had in favour of the Muslims was being highlighted in all their approaches. The bias they had against the Hindus was also being highlighted in their every move. That is why Mr. Jinha used to say:—

[*English*]

"The Congress talks of independence. I ask, which independence? I warned you and I have repeatedly warned you that they mean the independence of Hindu India, and the slavery of Muslim India."

[*Translation*]

It pains me a lot when all the critics who criticise the Bhartiya Janata Party use this type of language. By that they are not doing any good to the Muslims. At best, they may

mobilise some votes by this tactics, but by and large they are doing harm to Muslims. (*Interruptions*)

18.00 hrs

I feel that the Government should keep itself aloof from this Ayodhya issue and the Hindu and Muslim leaders should themselves resolve this issue by sitting across the table. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the course of my Rath Yatra, I was about to visit Calcutta on the 19th since we had some programmes on the 14th and 15th. I came to Delhi on the 14th instant. I was staying in Delhi during the Dewali days on 16th, 17th and 18th. I was about to leave for Calcutta on the 19th instant. During those days one more effort was made to find some way out. During this period, some proposals were brought before me. In response to some of these proposals I had said that we should proceed further in this direction. I believe and this belief is nothing new. This belief comes from the resolution adopted in Palampur session in 1970 and has been recorded in black and white. The belief is that this type of problems cannot be solved through litigation. It is very often being alleged that I would not accept the court verdict. This is not true. I always say that it is doubtful whether party against whom the court gives its verdict will accept it or not. As such this problem cannot be solved through litigation. It is very regrettable that instead of understanding my point of view, my hon. friends and the Prime Minister have time and again been saying that I was not prepared to accept the court verdict.

Even after 40 years of independence, what are the reasons that the Government

cannot accept a small demand of the Hindus. The Hindus want to know its reason. They feel that a temple should be constructed at the place where Rama was born. On the other hand, let us take Muslim sentiments. Since 1954 no one has ever offered namaz at the mosque. The place is prohibited for the Muslims. As per the 1951 court verdict no Muslim can go there. The court gave a ruling that an idol existed there and Puja is being performed, the idol cannot be removed from the site. The court verdict further states that no Muslim can go there. (*Interruptions*) Now everyone is being told that the Hindus and the Hindu leaders are about to demolish the mosque. (*Interruptions*)

My hon. friends desired to know as to why shilanyas was performed. But they forgot that shilanyas was performed during the times of Congress Party. Now I do not want to cite all quotations. Since Mufti Saheb is sitting here. There is no need to say anything. Mr. Soz put the question and Mr. Mufti gave the reply. He said that the site is not disputed and shilanyas was not performed at the disputed site. Question No. 70 dated 28-12-89.

(*Interruptions*)

SRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Now the matter is in the court. No decision has yet been taken. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I am telling of shilanyas. I would like to inform the hon. Members who raised a question about shilanyas that the shilanyas site is not disputed. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ: Subsequently the Home Minister himself had corrected it. That is on the record. (*Interruptions*)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: You are saying that the property was not disputed. But I have with me an order of the High Court (original suit No. 4 of 1989) which shows that the property on which shilanyas was carried

out, was indeed a disputed one.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: On the 18th the hon. Prime Minister telephoned me, because during the last 3 days there were some discussions to issue ordinance. From the very beginning we have been saying that this problem can be resolved by Government either through mutual negotiations or by decision and if an ordinance was issued, it would be a step forward towards Government's decision. With the proclamation of the said ordinance the title dispute would not have remained in the court and the entire land would have been placed at Government's disposal. Besides, the litigations that existed before the title suit would not have come into picture and it would have been incumbent upon the Government to take a decision in this regard. The moment this proposal was placed before me, I said that it was a good suggestion and we should think in this direction. During those three days one after the other people called on me and held talks in this regard. At one stage it came up that they were prepared to transfer the disputed land to the Vishwa Hindu Parishad except the structure. (*Interruptions*) I cannot say whether he said this thing at the instance of the Prime Minister, but at one stage this point was raised. There were different stages. The total complex consists of 70 acres of land and out of this only 2 1/2 acres of land is a disputed area. The remaining 67 acres which includes the shilanyas site are not disputed. As such they made an offer that they were prepared to hand over this area of 67 acres of land to Vishwa Hindu Parishad or the Ram Janambhoomi Nyas where they could start the Karseva. No karseva should be taken up at the site which is disputed. In this connection a proposal was brought before me to refer only one case to the Supreme Court i.e. to decide whether a temple existed at the place where a mosque was constructed after demolishing the said temple and there was no question whether Lord

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

Rama was born there or not. We say that no court could take a decision in this regard? No court, what I feel, whether it is the Supreme Court or a Sessions Court can take any such decision. The courts will definitely give opinion that the issue whether a temple existed there and whether a mosque was constructed there after its demolition is not judicially determinable. It could be referred to historians, archaeologists and a decision could be taken on the basis of views expressed by them and on the basis of other information available in this regard. It is judicially determinable. When this proposal was brought before me, I said:

[*English*]

This is worth working upon. You work it out. What is the shape of it finally I do not know. But this is a direction in which you should go and I would favour it.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Advaniji, how much more time will you take?

SHRIL.K. ADVANI: I shall conclude just in 10 minutes. At that time two Ministers also came to R.S.S. office. They held talks with the R.S.S. leaders and teachers of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. On the basis of talks held there, it was expected that some progress could be made and a solution could found. On the 18th, the hon. Prime Minister telephoned me at night. He said that since my Rath Yatra programme was scheduled to take place at Dhanbad the day after tomorrow, I should extend the stay till the next day as he has some rays of hope. He wished that final solution could be found out in the course of talks and thereafter he would himself accompany us and participate in the karseva. It was a matter of great happiness which delighted me a lot. (*Interruptions*)

.Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last few days there was a discussion on an article contributed by Arun Shourie which appeared

in the press. In his article Mr. Shourie had made a reference to an event that took place a year ago. Almost the same thing has time and again been referred to during the course of discussion just now. It is a fact indeed. Even in my public speeches I have been saying that Babar demolished the temple there, but the Muslims of Ayodhya quit the mosque at that site. The Hindus should understand this thing and honour their stand. The Muslims of Ayodhya quit that mosque in 1936. There are many other mosques in Ayodhya. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR:
Wherefrom the idols came?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The idols were installed after the achievement of independence and the mosque was quit in 1936 i.e. 11 years before independence. (*Interruptions*) So on that night I told the hon. Prime Minister that I had a programme for Calcutta and I would take a decision after talking to him. Later Mr. Jyoti Basu also came. He wanted to talk to me. As such I deferred my programme for Calcutta and extended my stay till the next day. In the evening when I left Delhi and reached Dhanbad I had expected that some headway would be achieved from talks held during those 3-4 days. The next day I learnt from the press reports that an ordinance had been issued. Though details of the ordinance had not appeared, yet I presumed that the ordinance might have been issued as a result of the talks held. I said that I accept the ordinance and it was a right step in the right direction. At the same time I had said that the extend to which the problem could be solved can be said only after going through the details of the ordinance. At least, I was satisfied that as a result of the ordinance the title suit which remained undecided for the last 40 years and would have remained so far the next 40 years, would soon be decided. Now way has been cleared for holding a dialogue between the two parties and a decision which would appear reasonable to the Government and acceptable to all concerned could be possible. All of a sudden I learnt from the next days' press reports that Members of the Babari Action Committee

met the Prime Minister and the ordinance had been withdrawn. After coming to know of this development, I said that during the last 40 years never before such a Government was there. At the first place, the Government should not have issued the ordinance but when once it had been issued, it should not have been withdrawn under somebody's pressure. In view of this I was convinced that this Government has crossed all limits so far as the policy of appeasement was concerned and its continuance would be harmful of the nation. It would neither be in the interest of the minorities nor anybody else. Even now I agree that had there been no such policy of appeasement during the last 40 years, the secularism would have been accepted in the country in its real sense which meant that all citizens in the country were equal.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: For the information of the House, please first say as to why the Vishwa Hindu Parishad opposed the ordinance.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: They did not meet me. *(Interruptions)* We work in association with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. In his Cabinet two Ministers make two different statements whereas here there are two organisations. So it is not a matter of surprise if there is some difference in our procedure. The attacks being made here are on me and my Rath Yatra. I am replying to this point. Mr. Vajapayee also said that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad might not have come for talks and the reason for that could be that they were staying in Delhi and they know that the way this Government is gradually succumbing to pressures, it would back out. I know about it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make humble submission to the hon. Prime Minister and would like know from him whether there was any secret deal between him and Mr. Advani about which the letter made a mention and if so whether he has a right to talk on secularism.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

I will give a complete reply. Please keep sitting.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Bloodshed took place on 30th October and 2nd November. A vivid description of incidents has been given by Uma Ji. Had this Government submitted its resignation on 23rd, the day Bharatiya Janata Party withdrew its support from the Government, the country could have been saved from the human massacre. The area considered as undisputed upto the 21st consisted of 67 acres of land. We were asked to take up karseva there. Mr. Parmod Mahajan was there with me. He asked whether the Government was foolish because it is trying to stop Rath Yatra. He expressed the view that karseva could be taken up in the undisputed territory. After all we were not entering the disputed territory. Were we going there to ask the Government to arrest us? *(Interruptions)* The Government decided that no Panchakosi Parikrama would be undertaken there and entry to Ayodhya would not be allowed on any day. Never before a situation had arisen in the country in which a State Government ordered that nobody should be allowed to enter in the State. Barriers were put up for this purpose. The Government decided to stop Panchakosi Parikrama... *(Interruptions)* On that day they acted in an irresponsible manner. Lakhs of people went there and said that stones and bricks cannot be placed on the disputed territory. The same thing, which was expected happened there. The Government is of the view that it has protected the secularism even at the cost of existence of Government we have safeguarded that secularism I admit at on 17th we passed a resolution that whenever they will stop Rath Yatra and Kar Sewa is not allowed, we shall withdraw our support. The Government evaded all the means of compromise. I feel that in future no Government will do any compromise in this regard. I am surprised to see this ordinance but where was it for the past eight months. The Prime Minister repeatedly says that it is the issue of Vishwa Hindu Parishad. We are giving the moral support. In the month of June, Mandal Commission was under discussion. I had

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

given a detailed interview... (*Interruptions*) ... The Government has not taken any steps to solve the Ayodhya dispute even after the lapse of four months. This dispute should be solved. In future if there is any conflict on this issue between the Government and the public, there will be such an unprecedented revolution in India, which history has never seen before. Our friend Mr. Akbar who has written a lengthy article on this, is present here. I had said this thing in the month of June. That time I thought that the Government would understand this. Should I say it on 17th November that we will withdraw the support if the Rath Yatra is stopped. Even after this warning, they thought of bringing an ordinance and not before that. Is it not expressive of the fact that they were only worried about their Government and were not concerned about this issue. They are now talking about the Mandal Commission. Shri Hukumdeo Narain ji is sitting here. He was the Chief Spokesman of Janata Dal on Mandal Commission issue and we also spoke on this issue. He might be remembering it that I congratulated him afterwards and told him that his speech was excellent from all aspects. It was excellent from financial point of view, eloquence and authenticity. I admire authenticity of this speech when he says that there is not only the question of poverty in India but it is the question of their respectability in the society also and upto when poverty and respectability does not find a proper place in the society the problem won't be solved. I respect this whole-heartedly, but at the same time, I said that I am not ready to give this certificate of authenticity to your Government. Because I told them to wait for two days. Shri Somnath and myself will discuss this and don't make an announcement tomorrow. We will be meeting the day after tomorrow. We have certain reservations as to how the Mandal Commission Report should be implemented. He says that he will make an announcement tomorrow only. You can also understand why he was doing so. There was no mention of any rally. You can very well understand that why he had to announce it. I admit that if Shri Mu-

layam Singh had not frequently made this announcement that he will stop Shri Advani's Rath Yatra and will arrest him, there was a possibility that I would not have been arrested in Bihar and perhaps I would have joined Kar Seva peacefully and nothing would have happened. If my presumption is right then it is a matter of concern for me that if such important decisions are taken in the party on the basis of disputes then what kind of Government is this and what is its standard and thinking. Nearly one year has passed but this Government has not done anything.. How it can expect from us to tolerate it for the next four years. Can we do any good to the country? This is the reason due to which our party has decided not to support this Government.

We are repeatedly being questioned that whether we will vote with the Congress party. if we have to vote with the Congress Party, then let me know on how many issues, we have done it. The same thing Congress Party used to say to these people that whether you will support them in coalition with B.J.P. I would like to say clearly that they should understand the limits of politics of untouchability. It is a very big country and politics of untouchability is wrong in the same way as the social untouchability is. If you will follow the path of political untouchability, its results won't be good for anybody, particularly for this country. But I would like to conclude my speech with a few words about what will follow. This motion will not be passed today and this Government will have to resign after a few hours. ... (*Interruptions*) ... should come prepared.

Some days back, I read a story of Harold Wilson. When Harold Wilson handed over the charge to Callahan, he told him that I am giving you three envelopes which will help you in case you face any crisis. First envelop should be opened at the time of first crisis, second envelop at the time of second crisis and the third at the third crisis. When the first crisis came, he opened the first envelop and it was written in that envelop that you blame the previous Government for this. Then came the second crisis and he

opened the second envelop. In that envelop, it was written that you should dismiss your second-in-command. Then followed the third crisis. There was the third envelop for that. Regarding this, I will say one thing that the day when this Motion was passed, I thought that the time to open the third envelop has come. When the third envelop was opened, it was written there.

[English]

You prepare three envelopes.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Are you suggesting for the new Captain?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I am suggesting for everyone.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I am visualising after 7th November, about that all I can say that:

[English]

I am seeing the replay of 1979.

[Translation]

I am seeing the replay of 1979 and who will participate in this replay is to be decided by them only. Some people says that we are talking about mid-term poll and we are demanding for it because our party will be benefited in the mid-term polls. But I don't say it from this point of view. I believe that there is no other alternative in the present situation. There is no other permanent alternative except the fresh mandate. That is why I am saying that only those people should decide themselves, I mentioned it in my speech in Bhopal;

[English]

That our support should not be taken for granted.

[Translation]

Because we have not done it all of a sudden. We have been continuously criticising them from the month of June. We have been giving warnings and in Bhopal also I said publicly that this Government is committing mistakes, one after the another and it should not take our support for granted and his immediate reaction was that the day, when the BJP will withdraw its support, I will sit in the opposition. After that announcement, when Shri Vajpayee met the President on 23rd and gave him letter from the party the whole country was expecting that Prime Minister will at once resign according to his announcement made earlier and sit in the opposition. But it was not done. People went on writing articles that they will not do that what you were expecting from them. They will try their best upto the last. Even my partymen were getting phone calls seeking support for them. This is the indicative of one's character and wisdom and we are getting telephone calls from them and even at the level of Prime Minister..... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You must answer this.

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, I think I have said whatever I had to say and even now I say that we have taken this decision because of.....

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Please tell me the name of the MP whom we had persuaded to defect. (Interruptions)

SHRI BABURAO PARANJPE (Jabalpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was about 10.15 P.M. and I was asleep. Shri Bal Mukund Soni was sitting near the telephone at my residence. Suddenly there was a phone call that Prime Minister wanted to speak to me. I was awakened and while attending to the phone I recognised the voice and said

[Sh. Baburao Paranjpe]

"Namaskar". He asked me that what is going to happen I said, "I am a soldier, we will obey our commander." I could very well recognise that it was the voice of the Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have never called you on telephone. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Prime Minister says that he never telephoned. I accept it. Somebody else must have given you ring, and not the Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We do not expect this from you.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Who telephoned to him? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I say I accept it.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please be quiet. Be seated, please.

(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I would conclude by saying one thing. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I said that there were so many reasons behind my decision but I am happy that today the attention was focussed on the meaning of secularism in India, what is nationalism and I wish that the discussion should not be limited to this House only. We should hold elections on this subject and if elections are held immediately I have no objection. I thank you very much for giving me time to speak.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Mr. Speakers, sir, it has become clear from the motion being discussed since morning that three are two main reasons of

out going of our Government today: Firstly, it is the implementation of the recommendations of Mandal Commission and secondly, Babri Masjid-Ram Janam Bhoomi dispute. The other reason linked with this is that our Government has chosen to uphold the law of the land. Under such circumstances one thing was very clear that if in connection with Rath Yatra, law is followed, Bhartiya Janta Party would withdraw its support from Government. Just now, Shri Lal Krishan Advani made a mention of the proposal of his party and read it out in this House. We had raised many economic and political issues of this proposal on 17th October and therefore, Ram Janam Bhoomi dispute is not only the reason for withdrawing support from Government for which an impression is sought to be created here. But Mr. Speaker, sir, it has not only been clear in this House but all over the country and also in the words of Shri Lal Krishan Advani that the moment he would be arrested and Rath Yatra stopped, they would withdraw their support. The Bhartiya Janta Party very much know about it on 17th October that Ram Janam Bhoomi issue would not be solved through mutual negotiations and we were committed to solve the problem through law. If our efforts were not successful, it became necessary to stop Rath Yatra. Whatever may be its reasons, but a lot of discussion has taken place on the issue and the circumstances in which riots take place. Whatever may be said in this context, the day when Kar-seva was announced in Ayodhya, the efforts made and decisions taken by Government have been praised by Shri Chandra Shekhar just now. He has said that if such a situation arises stringent action has to be taken and stringent action should be take in those circumstances. In spite of that, what has happened there attempts were made to destroy the mosque or to hit it. Had we not taken stringent action one can imagine the state of things which would have followed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as the question of Ram-Janam Bhoomi is concerned, I believe that Bhartiya Janta Party would not have withdrawn its support had we not introduced the recommendations of Mandla Commission. I do not want to prove it because there are certain thing which need

not be expressed and we would not do so.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: Hon. Speaker, whether you have..... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding to you, Umaji please take your seat.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It has been evidenced in many forms and in personal talks with the persons responsible for decision taking. There is evidence of it in many other ways which show that if our Government had not introduced the recommendations of the Mandal Commission in August, the question of withdrawal of support would definitely not have arisen.

Mr. Speaker, sir, many persons here are waiting eagerly the fall of this Government. They are not waiting for it today but we have observed that they are waiting from the day when we made an announcement about the recommendations of the Mandal Commission.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the leader of the Opposition has gone. The Leader of opposition made his speeches in the same manner as if a debate competition is being held in a college. I do not blame him but I believe that he could only think and speak within his understanding and mental capacity. I have never expected more than that from him, but he and Shri Chandra Shekhar have simply touched upon the economic and political issues which should have been seriously discussed. The debate has been limited only to pin pointing the failures weaknesses of our Government. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Chandra Shekhar has not taken the issues which required detailed discussion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a need to debate the economic problems of the country. The performance of this Government during the last eleven months should be discussed as to know how far we have succeeded in fulfilling the promises made to the people in regard to solving the economic and political problems. We are ready for

such a discussion whenever the leader of the opposition want it. Because such a discussion would make the people to know the work done by this Government and answer all the questions raised by him. There is a need to sit together to find out the solution of this dispute. Hence, it is necessary to have a debate and it would definitely be held but I think it necessary to reply to some of the questions raised by the leader of the opposition.

First of all, I would like to reply the question in which he has tried to blame our Prime Minister and our Government by using a word (casteism). He has alleged that Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh has tried to encourage casteism in the country. I would like to place two things before the House. A leading newspaper of India 'The Times of India' considered it proper to bring out advertisements for the facility of their readers for the last few weeks and by publishing an advertisement this week they said that they have given a lead and others are following. They are publishing Matrimonial advertisements On Page 2nd to 5th and 6th. The advertisements start with Brahmins followed by Baniyas and Vaish. After that comes the names of other castes and then Bengali, Madras are mentioned. Such abusive words are used about the people of South India. Bal Thakray of Bombay generally address the Madras people as Yandu-Kundu speaking Madrasis. This is the thinking of the people of North India about the people of the four states of the South India. The 'Times of India' has also the same thinking about the South India people. Such type of caste-based matrimonials are given by the people of India but we are being blamed that Shri Vishwa Nath Pratap Singh encouraged casteism in this country.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a newspaper.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is a newspaper but this discussion has been started on the basis of newsreports of these newspapers been that youths are commo-lating themselves and editorials were also written. The Indian Express wrote in its edi-

[Sh. George Fernandes]

torial that an agitation should be started. The Times of India' supported it in one of its editorial. Shri Nanavati Palkhiwala, an orthodox thinker of India sad that there is no other alternative to oppose Mandal Commission. *(Interruptions)* Therefore, the allegation that our Government had encouraged casteism is totally irresponsible. One example would make it clear to some extent that most of the English educated persons like Government officers, Doctors and Engineers on the one side mention their castes and on the other side, they call themselves Government officers, doctors and engineers. But they are not recognised as doctors, engineers and Government officers, they are known as Rajputs, Brahmins and others for matrimonial purposes in India. What else it is if not casteism? The leader of opposition is not present here. If he was here as I was waiting for years to say this thing in his presence. During the Amethi election in December, 1980, Shri Sharad Yadav was the candidate for Lok Sabha from there. I stayed for four days there for his election campaign. The day I reached there, I noticed three things. The slogans on the walls of the area were "Sharad Yadav Vapus Jaao, Lathi Lakar Bhains Charao." Another thing I noticed was that people with lathis were shouting this very slogan in the processions passing from the vicinity of my meetings and this slogan was already in every street that "Sharad Yadav Vapas Jaao, Lathi Lakar Bhains Charao. Yadavs are not only for grazing cattle. I this 20th Century, and particularly those who were talking about a jump in 21st century should not call Yadav Bufaloo grazer..... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BHAJAN LAL (Faridabad): I have a point of order. It is baseless to blame Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Any party can use such language but to blame Shri Rajiv Gandhi is totally improper.

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES: My third experience was that when I reached to speak in these meetings, I had to become victim of

stones and lathis. Was it not 'casteism'? By which name they were campaigning for votes against Shri Sharad Yadav? It was being said he was Yadav..... *(Interruptions)*

Bhajan Lal ji, you will not be able to understand it. A person who was a pilot by profession, considers himself to be capable of discussing important issues in the house, but he doesn't have the proper knowledge of the actual situation. When his brother expired he abandoned his regular western dress like jean, Pant and T-shirt and started playing political drama. I would like to ask him whether blue jeans, T-shirt and cap are symbolic of Indian culture. Afterwards he started wearing khadi, symbolic of Indian culture just to look like a leader. He is ignorant of the qualities character and capability of Shri Sharad Yadav and exaggerates the things here. You can yourself see as to who encouraged casteism *(Interruptions)* The opposition leader alleged that the riots which took place during the last eleven months are unprecedented in the history. His friends should persuade him to read the book of Dr. Rai in this regard, because he has never gone through it. Once he himself had said that there is no need to go through the history, rather we should engage ourselves in creating history. *(Interruptions)*

The opposition leader referred to the Kashmir problem also. He must go through the book of Dr. Rai. By doing so he will come to know as to incidents took place at various places. He specifically mentioned the communal riots and violence. But he should not confine himself only to Hindus and Muslims. On Oct 31, 1984 Shrimati Indira Gandhi was assassinated. Whether he is unaware of what happened in the next three days in Delhi, how many people were killed? During that period, about five thousand people were either killed or burnt alive on the roads of Delhi. It was publicised through television that the other community would revenge for blood. Innocent, unarmed people including children, women and old persons were burnt alive and murdered brutally. This is not the end of all After one month, on Nov 20, about 40 feet high platform was raised near Boat

club where a photo of Shrimati Indira Gandhi was put upto and the same leader had said:

[English]

"When a big tree falls, the earth is bound to shake."

[Translation]

At that time about fire thousand sikhs were murdered (*Interruptions*)

[English]

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

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Then, I rise on a point of order... (*Interruptions*) ... Sir, the hon. Member must remember that it was the same Rajiv Gandhi, while the corpse of Indiraji was lying there, who went to the streets to save the people of this country. You must chaos. remember that. It was he who rushed to the streets to put down.

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What do you talk of? Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was our Government only which made arrangements to provide relief to the widows and facilities of study to the children of the deceased during our tenure of eleven months, and we are proud of this. What do they talk of, they worked rather to finish them. The former Prime Minister refers to the Kashmir problem, this is the limit that he in the presence of our Prime Minister and the Government, refers to what happened in Kashmir. On 1983 he dismissed the Farooq Abdullah's Government elected in a democratic manner on the plea that it was anti-national... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: What fate did he meet in regard to Kashmir? In what a disgraceful manner the Minister of Kashmir Affairs was stripped of his portfolio (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You

should be concerned about your own leader and not about the Minister of Kashmir Affairs.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Don't play with the sentiments to tell a lie. How Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh treated him in regard to the Kashmir does matter. He is responsible to divide the country. Your friends also did the same how many killings took place you may know all this from your own friends. Why are you sitting there? Today they support the present Prime Minister... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: George Sahib. Nobody insulted you so much as the Prime Minister did in regard to Kashmir... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What is this happening?

[English]

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, I am on a point of order. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Akbar, please sit down. Mr. Kumaramangalam is on a point of order.

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: Mr. Speaker Sir, as per the procedure, different parties have been allotted time. The time allotted to National Front is 1 hour and 27 minutes but they have crossed 2 hours and 11 minutes. They know it very well and even though it is their last chance, they cannot go on like this... (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Special discussion is going on, that is why I said this.

(*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have noted it. It is not a point of order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, what Mr. Fernandes has said is totally false.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as the Kashmir issue is concerned, I may remind you of the happenings particularly of the period between 1983 and 1987. During that period atrocities were made on a large scale. Soz Sahib is present here in the House...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN-SOZ: I will certainly speak.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am mentioning your name just as a witness. The opposition leader called the Farooq Abdullah Government as treacherous and Pakistani agents and what not in order to dismiss that Government. Afterwards the same person was... *(Interruptions)*... Afterwards the same Governor with whom these people had so many grievances, was deputed there to restore power to the same person.

19.00 hrs.

He who is making propaganda in favour of Pakistan, also worked to bring him back in power. In the elections of 1987.... *(Interruptions)*... looted. The Kashmiri youths are called terrorists. They had been the election campaigners, polling agents..... *(Interruptions)*..... They have been insulted and called terrorists... *(Interruptions)*...

Mr. Speaker, Sir, he also alleged that V.P. Singh's Government brought defame to the country in the international affairs during the last eleven months. This is just one point. The day when Shri Lal submitted the resolution and they threatened the Government to withdraw their support The Economist, a weekly published from London... *(Interruptions)*... on which even Shri M.J. Akbar has full faith... *(Interruptions)*... a new item in

that newspaper stated that it appears as if the VP Government is going to fall but no final word can be said yet. However everything will be clear by next week. The paper says:

[*English*]

Whether India will be ruled by the Rajiv Gandhi mafia or by the small crooks.

[*Translation*]

These are the remarks of an Economist... *(Interruptions)*... we have lost our honour there, so far as the international affairs are concerned we may agree in this respect that.... *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

I am not admitting, I am only pointing out that across the world, internationally, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi is known a mafia Chief. *(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Shri Chandra Shekhar was delivering his speech, the opposition leader had asked one question. Whether he agrees to what is being said in regard to the Kashmir problem, Punjab problem, Assam problem or other internal problems of the country. In regard to the financial problems his role has been totally negative. He raised the issue of unemployment. Since when the country has been facing this problem of unemployment? He referred to exploitation, the deteriorating law and order situation. Since when all these problems have been there? The present Government was in power for merely eleven months. We are alleged to have created similar other problems rather complicated the matters. We are being advised as to how we should tackle the basic problems of the country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Lai is not present here, however, you are closely associated with BJP and VHP and you have started the movement on the issues raised by them. It

would be necessary to refer to those issues in a dignified manner. In the end of the speech it has been suggested as to how the country should be administered. He pointed out that clash within the social values and religious matters has been increasing. Many persons assert that we should act according to the promises we have made in our election manifesto or what we speak in only public meetings. However we should not be confined to it. We have to take into consideration the impression which we create in the minds of people and the atmosphere which is created in the entire country.

I have consulted Shri Lal, the members of BJP and other leaders in regard to Babri Masjid issue. (*Interruptions*) I have discussed it with Babri Masjid Action Committee too. (*Interruptions*) I made every effort to solve the problem but they insisted that the mosque will have to be demolished to construct the temple. BJP refused to make any compromise in this connection and they have been insisting to build the temple at that very site where the mosque is situated.

My submission is that a debate should be held over it. This issue of historical value, if complicated, will cause a severe set back to the history. That is why they are not at all ready to make any compromise in this connection. We will have to think over it, discussion will have to be held, the issues of Muslims will have to be taken into consideration. But why all of us should forget that every person in this country. Whether Christian, Hindu, Muslim or of any other religion is basically an Indian and we agree that any person whether he belongs to a minority group or to any religion... (*Interruptions*) Therefore, we should make joint efforts so that the society does not break. Therefore, through this House I would like to submit to the BJP and others that efforts should be made to solve this problem by means of mutual dialogue and with harmony otherwise court will be the only option. (*Interruptions*)

I would like to give an example of Sardar Patel before you. In 1949 when the idols

were placed in Babri Masjid, the situation became explosive. Shri Govind Ballabhai Pant was the Chief Minister at that time. Sardar Patel was called and he went there to study the situation. I would like to read out a few lines from this letter written on January 9, 1950.

In fact what had happened there was that Lord Ram's idol had been installed in the mosque.

[*English*]

"I realise there is a great deal of sentiment behind the move which has taken place. At the same time, such matters can only be resolved peacefully if we take the willing consent of the Muslim community with us."

[*Translation*]

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: That is what we also say.

SHRIGEORGE FERNANDES: It is not so. Had it been so, the Karseva problem would not have arisen. If you hold this view, talks can be held even now. Listen ahead

[*English*]

"There can be no question of resolving such disputes by force. In that case, the forces of law and order, i.e. the police, the para-military and military, will have to maintain peace at all costs

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Are you saying this thing?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: It is what had been said by Sardar Patel of whom you are the admirers.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRIGUMANI MAL LODHA (P.O.): What did Sardar Patel do at Hyderabad? (*interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): When atrocities were committed on the railway employees by the police, you had criticised them in your speech. At that time you were their leader. *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: "If, therefore, peaceful and persuasive methods are to be followed, any unilateral action based on an attitude of aggression or coercion cannot be countenanced.

[*Translation*]

These are the words of Sardar Patel. In this reply to it, Pandit Gobind Ballabh Pant had said on the 13th January:—

[*English*]

"I have to thank you for your letter about the Ayodhya affair. It will be of great help to us here. Efforts to set matters right in a peaceful manner are still continuing and there is a reasonable chance of success."

[*Translation*]

That is the letter of 13th January 1950.

(Interruptions)

There was no Janata Dal Government during the last 40 years. It has come to power only 11 months back. However the people who are the admirers of Sardar Patel, did not relish his ideas. It was with great courage and forbearance that Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav and Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav tried to control the situation which, otherwise, would have taken an explosive turn. While controlling the situation, it so happened that such a situation had been created.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: General Dyer had also expressed the same view with reference to Jallianwala Bagh incident.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We all

are pained at the sequence of events that took place in some parts of Ayodhya. Though Mr. Advani has said these words at the end of his speech that temple will be constructed there, and it was taken as a slogan, but I would like to make a humble request to him that while taking a decision in this regard they should keep the words of Sardar Patel in their mind.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: What had Sardar Patel done in Hyderabad.... *(Interruptions)*....

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset I have submitted here that it is not the point as to what we have said in our manifesto, but the point is to see as to what feelings or situation is likely to be created with their implementation. Several of the Hon'ble members who spoke here made a reference to the Kashmir problem. I have heard the youth and elderly persons of Kashmir talking on the riots in many parts of the country with their expression of anguish that they had worked to associate themselves with India which was secular. But in those days, they had never thought that clashes would take place over the issues like the construction of temple on the site of a mosque or on some other grounds. *(Interruptions)* When we are talking of Kashmir situation, I would like to apprise my hon. friends of the present position on Indo-Pak border where Pakistan has been mobilising its troops posing a constant threat of war. A great danger exists there at the Kashmir border. So we should take precaution lest there should be a war between India and Pakistan on Kashmir issue or any other issue and the situation may go out of our control. In this connection, I would like to inform the august House and the people of this country that in case Pakistan attacked Kashmir, the first person on Indian side to face the Gurkhas of Pakistani Army will be General Bashir who is a Muslim and who is the Corps Commander of our armed forces guarding our country's border in Kashmir...

(Interruptions)...

[English]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am on a point of order, Sir. No one should try to communalise the Army. To bring in the name of a Corps Commander in terms of religion is the worst thing that one can do against the spirit of the Constitution. Sir, he is trying to communalise the Army. Can he do that? He must not communalize the Army. Don't be so cheap. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am not communalising the Army. I am only making a statement of fact. People of India *(Interruptions)* are for secularism. *(Interruptions)* There are people whose patriotism cannot be judged by their religion. That is the point I am trying to make. There is an effort in this country today to judge people by their religion.

[Translation]

Their patriotic fervour is adjudged on the basis of their religious identity.

[English]

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You have got derailed now... *(Interruptions)*....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He talked about the secular values of the Army, and was not communalising the Army..... *(Interruptions)*.....

[Translation]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Today, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians, all are there to guard and stand to defend Kashmir. The Corps Commander of Kashmir is a Muslim. Commander of our division in Kashmir is a Christian. The commandant of the C.R.P.F. in Kashmir is a Sikh and B.S.F. Commandant is a Hindi so at the moment Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians are standing guard with their rifles in their hands to protect Kashmir..... *(Interruptions)* I am saying the same thing that in India religion.... *(Interruptions)* We know that

the present moment is a historical moment. Today, the Government of our party is quitting. Today, accusations have been made to condemn our Government and Shri V.P. Singh and efforts have been made to ridicule us. All this bill come to an end. It will not go deep into the annals of our history. The Government of Janata Dal has two things to its credit, first one is our efforts to implement the Mandal Commission Report. We took steps to maintain the communal harmony in the country..... *(Interruptions)*....

[English]

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: My name was mentioned in the House when I was not present here. I would like to clarify my position. He had specifically referred to a book. *(Interruptions)* It is my personal explanation. Whether I spoke to my Congress (I) President, Shri Rajiv Gandhi or not on the subject is another matter. Shri George Fernandes has made a speech. He has touched upon every year of the last 15 years except this year. I would like to remind him that another chapter has been written of that book; that chapter is on the place called Gonda. There is a place called Karnal Ganj. I want to know from this Prime Minister how many times he had shed tears about that place? I also want to know whether Shri George Fernandes has read that chapter or not. *(Interruptions)* Not one word of regret came out from the mouth of the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Where are you talking? I am not permitting you.

SHRI M.J. AKBAR: Can I not give my personal explanation? I want to know from Shri George Fernandes—when his leader Shri V.P. Singh went there—whether one word of regret came out from his mouth. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: I just want two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I am coming to that. There are many speakers who want to speak... *(Interruptions)*..

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: There are still many members who want to speak. As such, I would like to make a request to all the Hon'ble members who are speaking here, to conclude their speech within shortest time before I ring the bell so that maximum number of Members could be provided an opportunity to speak.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA (Bengaluru): I shall not take much time. I would like to express my thanks to you for providing me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. I would like to make a few submissions in support of the Motion brought forward by the hon. Prime Minister. From Congress (I) side, Shri Rajiv Gandhi has made a mention of 'several point except one point i.e. the Ayodhya issue. He did not speak on the situation of communal turmoil in the country. It appears that he is trying to gain political mileage for his party by playing the card of Hindu fundamentalism and caste Hindus. He did not utter a single word on Ram Janmbhoomi and Babri Masjid issue and did not throw any light on this problem. It creates some suspicion in one's mind that his party is time and again trying to take political advantage of this issue in the elections and would continue to do so in future also. Communalism is very dangerous for the country. I would like to congratulate the National Front Government for the battle it fought against it and I extend my support for that..... (Interruptions).....

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not indulge in talks among yourselves, and listen to Nani Babu.

SHRI NANI BHATTACHARYA: Don't you remember that the communal riots in Bidar took place during the Prime Ministership of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi? Was not the Congress Government responsible for those riots? Similarly, the Congress was responsible for the outbreak of communal violence in Bhagalpur and in many districts of Uttar Pradesh, including Meerut. The Congress has no reason to deny this.

I would like to say that the single reason, which has forced the National Front Government to seek a vote of confidence is that it tried to stop the 'Rathayatra' of Shri Advani we also witnessing the outcome of the conspiracies hatched by the Congress leaders including Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, to create dissension within the ruling party. Some opportunist elements within the ruling party, leaving this party in the lurch are bent upon forming a new Government. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that the factionalism being engineered by these defectors, will prove harmful to the country in the long run. If these defectors will be able to form a Government, it would tantamount to a crucifixion of the principles of Parliamentary democracy and murder of democratic norms and values. These cannot be anything more dangerous for the country than this. This is a conspiracy being hatched by them in the name of 'constructive co-operation'. This intention is crystal clear. They are bent upon installing a Government of defectors, to scuttle the inquiry that is being conducted against the corrupt people within this fold. Therefore, I would like to warn each and every one of you that if Mid-term polls are not held and these defectors are allowed to form a Government, then this country will go to the dogs. I would like to say only this much.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: You please tell us, when is the Prime Minister going to reply to the motion? At least you should fix the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I will let you know. Not it is the turn of Shri Chitta Basu to speak.

[English]

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a Confidence Motion which has been moved by the Prime Minister for the second time. Earlier when the Confidence Motion was moved by the Prime Minister, the majority of the House was for the support of the new Government. But today this Confidence Motion has been

necessitated under a particular set of circumstances. The circumstance is very clear. The circumstance is that the BJP has withdrawn its support at a particular point of time on the clear unequivocal issue, on the dispute of Ram Janam Bhoomi–Babri Masjid.

Unfortunately I had an opportunity of listening to the Leader of the Opposition. He was perfectly oblivious of the reason which has necessitated this Confidence Motion of today. He has not said anything about his Party's stand on the present crisis that has arisen out of Ram Janam Bhoomi–Babri Masjid dispute... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: There is no mention about this in the Resolution... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: What is the reason? They do not want to make their position clear with regard to communalism. They are afraid. Mr. Vasant Sathe does not know, who unlocked the temple, who unlocked the Masjid? Has it not happened during your regime? You collaborated for spreading communalism in our country. The Leader of the Opposition was holding responsible this Government for the spread of communal riots. Was it not during your Government when the shilaniyas was performed? Who is responsible for the Meerut riot? Who is responsible for Hasinapura riot? Who is responsible for Bhagalpur riot? Therefore, when you accuse the other Government for its failure on the communal front and aggravation of communal riots, you should also realise that it is you who have engineered that kind of communal riots in different parts of the country. There are other issues also. They should make their position clear as to what is their stand regarding Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid dispute. It is very amazing to see that there has been collaboration, at least identity of approach between the Congress (I) and also the BJP. This is an amazing thing.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What were you doing for 11 months with BJP?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: All along there has never been an occasion when we surrendered our right to criticise the communal position taken by the BJP. Have you got the moral courage to call a spade a spade? On the other hand, you show your identity of views so far as communalism is concerned. Congress Party has lost all its credentials for secularism. They have got no right to say anything about secularism.

So far as BJP is concerned, it is quite well known to anybody that RSS has given the slogan for having Hindu rastra in our country. Have they opposed that?

19.38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Not only that. VHP while giving the call for the construction of the temple has said that it is just the foundation of the Hindu rastra. Mr. Ashok Shingal, General Secretary of VHP, gave a slogan that while constructing the temple at Ayodha they are constructing the Hindu Rastra in our country and that is the foundation stone. Have BJP opposed it? Now Mr. Advani says that there should be justice for all and appeasement for no one. If justice for all and appeasement for no one leads to Hindu Rastra which has been made publicly clear by the VHP with whom you are collaborating, then you have got no powerful face to say that you are also believing in the unity and integrity of the country. I ask BJP hon. Members: What are the implications of Hindu Rastra? Do you want to divide India into Muslim Rastra, Sikh Rastra, Christian Rastra and all that? This is the implication. If this Hindu Rastra slogan is taken and if this is the aim and object of your party, you are going to destroy the unity and integrity of the country. You are creating a number of religion based States. This is what is known as theocratic state. It is not only one theocratic state in India as Islamic theocratic state in Bangladesh or Pakistan, but you are going to create a number of theocratic states in India which will be divided into different parts. So the intention of VHP, BJP or Bajrang Dal is very clear. They mounted assault on the

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

Masjid. How can they deny that? Thousands of people were there not to lay down the foundation of the temple but they were there to destroy the Mosque. Let us say in unequivocal terms that temples you might have many, one, two, three, thousands, but you cannot destroy a single mosque or a single temple. When you destroy a single mosque, you try to create a condition where all the temples or all the mosques will be destroyed. In India, when you destroy a temple or when you destroy a mosque, you destroy the country, you destroy the community, you destroy the people, you destroy the families, you destroy the culture, you destroy India as a whole. Anybody who has got an iota of idea of maintaining secularism of our country, cannot afford to tolerate this kind of treachery. This is a betrayal and nobody can tolerate it. Therefore, Sir, this House, on this Motion, is discussing not merely the question as to who will remain the Prime Minister and who will not remain the Prime Minister, whether Mr. Vishwanath Pratap Singh will remain the Prime Minister or somebody else, whether Mr. Chandra Shekhar becomes the Prime Minister or whether Mr. Rajiv Gandhi becomes the Prime Minister, but we are discussing the very important basic, fundamental issue of our country, and that basic issue is whether we are to protect the principle of secularism enshrined in our country. We are for upholding the secular principle. If you are secular, rise above your party considerations and extend support to the basic principle and foundation of secularism. This is one issue.

There is another issue whether you want to maintain the democratic content of the Constitution of our country, on the basis of which we are here. Again I will say you are going against the oath you have taken in the name of the Constitution of our country. The basic issue, therefore, is whether we shall uphold the democratic principles enshrined in the Constitution of our country, whether we shall protect the Constitution or we shall destroy the Constitution.

Another issue is whether the country will be committed for the protection of the minorities. Minorities ought to be protected. Every civilised country, every civilised community must protect the legitimate rights of the minorities. Do you want to protect the rights of the minorities? Those who are for the protection of the minorities should see that this is also the issue with which we are concerned.

Lastly, a very important basic issue with which we are concerned is do you like to ensure the social justice in our country. Do you want to perpetuate the age-old discrimination, the age-old injustices perpetrated upon the weaker sections of our society or do you want to end it? Is it not the principle of the Constitution? Is it not the principle of secularism to end this age-old injustice perpetrated on a large, wide section of our society who are suffering simply because they are poor? These are the basic issues and we cannot ignore the basic issues today. Therefore, Sir, the decision which this House will take today is of historic nature, is of vital, crucial nature. The decision we take can make the destiny of our country and can also mark the destiny of our country. It is good that every party has been shown in its true colours. I hope, not only in this House but outside also, people broadly are for secularism, for upholding the Constitution, for ensuring democracy and for ensuring social justice. This is the larger section of our people. If you have to give a political shape to the urges of the large number of people outside, then the unity of the left, the unity of the democrat and secular forces becomes the need of the hour. If you are secular, if you are democrat, if you are to maintain the principle of secularism, this is the time for you to get united. Otherwise, you will be equated, you will be bracketed with the most rabid and aggressive communal forces in our country.

Lastly, Sir, with your permission I only try to recite the poem of Rabindranath, that also in deference to the wish of our very affectionate sister, Shrimati Geeta Mukher-

[Sh. Chitta Basu]

jee. I recite the poem of Rabindranath Tagore of course in Bengali:

"He more chitta punya thirthe jagore
dhire
AiBharater maha manaver sagar there
shok hun dal pathan moghol
Ek dehe holo leen."

This is what Rabindranath Tagore said.

Again, I want to recite from the poem of Nazrul Islam:

"Hindu na ora muslim
Oi jigyase kaun jan he
Kandari bala dubiche manush
Shantan nor mar."

Sir, It is Rabindranath who said that this is great India which is like a sea and in this sea of humanity, Shok Hun, Pathan and Mughal were submerged into one.

Nazrul Islam says, 'Don't ask who is Hindu or who is Muslim. Everybody is the son of the great Mother whether Hindu or Muslim. I feel that it is in the fitness of things that we should remember these two very important quotables. Thank you.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Baramulla): Sir, the hon. Prime Minister referred in his speech, in fact he made a remark in the beginning, he referred to 'Siddhant' and that word translated into English means 'principle' and that word touched my heart and I feel I have to divide my response to the Prime Minister's speech in two ways.

I will briefly come to Ayodhya. But the thrust of my brief speech will be on Kashmir. As far as Ayodhya is concerned, the Prime Minister did show 'siddhant', and I salute that gesture and response although Mulayam Singh had the better for a pretty long time. In fact I wrote an open article in Urdu.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lalu Prasad also.

PROF. SAID-UD-DIN SOZ: Yes, Lalu Prasad also. And I had advised the Muslim brethren not to come on the streets because I paid a tribute at that time to the Prime Minister, to the Leader of the Opposition, to Mr. Mulayam Singh and many others because I told them of Gandhiji.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which Gandhi you are speaking about?

PROF. SAID-UD-DIN SOZ: Mahatma Gandhi. And I told this Gandhi also because in the National Integration Council he has made a speech regarding Ayodhya. And then, Sir, I said: "After Mahatma Gandhi if I heard a clear call for communal harmony, it was from Mulayam Singh." But I give credit to the Prime Minister that on Ayodhya issue, his response was correct and I accept his stand. After Advaniji's arrest, he was taken to a Rest House and his family was flown in by an aeroplane and I do not know by whom. But by media, it was made into a very big affair. But I accept the Prime Minister's spirit. I remind the Prime Minister today that it was after a pretty long time that he came to know the real designs of the BJP. It was because of Prime Minister's electoral alliance with the BJP they came to this political arrogance. It was he who gave them 88 Members in this House and therefore the Prime Minister came to know the realities after a pretty long time, after the BJP had created a disaster in this country. Now, I am reminded of a verse which I was hearing from Banatwallaji; I think Arifji is here and he will agree with the verse. I was telling him that the Prime Ministers words touched my heart even though I may not agree with his motion. But I want to pay tribute to him because he rose to the occasion later. I want to recite this couplet.

[*Translation*]

After eleven long months of honeymooning, now you are telling that BJP has caused you harm.

[*English*]

The Prime Minister is also a poet. I am not a

[Prof. Sif-ud-din Soz]

poet. I am quoting somebody else's couplet.

"Ki mere katl ke baad usne jafa se tauba
Hai us Zor-e-Pashemani Ka Pasheman hona."

After killing me he offers '*tohfa*', repentance for this cruelty.

You have used this repentance, but you have done the disaster. This is also a Court. I raised a question when the first Member from the BJP spoke that they have lost the moral right to be present in this House. Did they not take oath that they would abide by the provisions of the Indian Constitution? The Constitution of India provides for the authority of the Supreme Court or the High Court. Did not Advaniji and his colleagues say that they would not accept the verdict of the Supreme Court? Did they not show disrespect to the Constitution of India? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

I am ashamed of it that such a religious fanatic was appointed as a judge.

[*English*]

I know many Members in BJP who stand for laudable ideas, who have '*siddhanth*' and I have respect for them. The BJP has been taking this country to fascism and we have to reject that. We have accepted democracy and we shall continue to do so. They have caused great harm to social fabric; they have done the damage to the social fabric, to the religious harmony and they have tried their best to divide this country on communal issue. Part of that blame at least must go to this Government. (*Interruptions*) Sir, I do not want to say anything more on Ayodhya. I have accepted his *siddant* despite the position cleared by Mr. Advani. Despite his revelation, I give the credit for his *siddant*. But for Kashmir, I do

not want to go into the issues about the prices, about foreign policy, about caste divide. But I have to raise a question to the Prime Minister. If he goes out of the Prime Minister, it will not be my personal joy. I will continue to respect him as a gentleman but I will not agree to his politics. But it is not my personal joy that he will be going out of the Prime Minister or chair.

But as a Kashmiri, I want to raise this question and when he replied, his conscience must feel prick him. Mr. George Fernandes has referred to me. I will respond to his observations also. What was the policy of this Government on Kashmir? In fact, I had earlier said that they had no policy on Kashmir. Before Mr. V.P. Singh came to this chair, in their election manifesto, they have taken a vow that they will implement the Sarkaria Commission recommendations. You talk of *siddant*. Jammu and Kashmir is governed by article 370. You must consult every Chief Minister when you send the Governor but in case of Kashmir, it is an imperative for you. How did you send Mr. Jagmohan to Kashmir violating the provisions of article 370, showing disrespect to the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission? I say, they have no policy on Kashmir. If they have one policy, it was devised by the BJP. Under the pressure of BJP, they sent that man. They sent Mr. Jagmohan and therefore, they cleared the way for the exit of Dr. Abdullah. At that time, Mr. Chandrasekhar said and I repeat it in this House. You can ask him. The Prime Minister told me privately over a dinner. There was a dinner at which Comrade Surjit and many Left leaders were invited. They had warned the Prime Minister not to send Mr. Jagmohan to Kashmir. But the Prime Minister finally confided with Mr. Chandrasekhar. He said, "Mr. 'X' is adamant." He told him, "Mr. X can be put in some other chair. But do not send Mr. Jagmohan because putting Mr. X in another chair, he will be paying a lesser price than he will be by sending Mr. Jagmohan to Jammu and Kashmir." He was sent there and he hoisted his Government there. Precisely the Prime Minister did under the pressure from BJP what was predicted by Mr. Chandrasekhar.

I do not want to go into the details. He went there with venom in his heart. He wanted to teach Kashmir Muslims a lesson. The first thing he did was to organise an exodus of Kashmiri Pandits so that he could deal freely with Kashmiri Muslims. There was a documentary evidence. He was the architect of this exodus and he committed atrocities against Kashmiri Muslims. He committed atrocities against Kashmiri Pandits also who were made refugees and have been suffering very great hardship life at Jammu and Delhi. Everybody knows that Mr. Jagmohan imposed curfew and 17 days of continuous curfew. Could you impose that curfew anywhere Mr. Prime Minister?

20.00 hrs.

I would raise a further question. When Malvi Farooq was assassinated and mourners were taking his coffin on their shoulders, they were fired upon. It was on that day I raised this question and went to the well of the House. Mr. Chandrasekhar came to me and he agreed with me that it was a shame on the nation that mourners were killed by the forces. He invited me to come out of the well of the Lok Sabha.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: How long you want to speak?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I suggested that the Prime Minister should go to Kashmir and hear their sufferings. He never went there and thereafter on a number of occasions, I begged the Prime Minister "You visit Kashmir. Send Parliamentary Delegation. Send Members of your own Party." But, he never did that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz, there are other Members to speak.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I had expected a better treatment from the Prime Minister regarding Kashmir. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Please sit down.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Not only did the Prime Minister not go to Kashmir, but he also did not continue with a separate Ministry for Kashmir Affairs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz, please conclude.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I have borrowed some time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken others time also.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will say my points briefly. You will see every point is logically woven into this texture. Not only did the Prime Minister not go to Kashmir, but he had also abolished the Ministry in charge of Kashmir Affairs here. Mr. George Fernandes is here right now. That Ministry had started doing some good work in Kashmir. Mr. George Fernandes had started understanding the situation. That Ministry on Kashmir was created again not only through a Presidential Order but in consultation with the political parties. I raised a question through you when the charge of Mr. George Fernandes was taken away and when that Ministry on Kashmir Affairs was again abolished. He did not consult the political parties and he did not issue a Presidential Order. Mr. George Fernandes was merely informed on telephone that the Ministry was abolished.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz, please cooperate.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am telling you something very important. As if Mr. Jagmohan had not committed enough atrocities on the people of Kashmir, his Government got two draconian laws. Under those two laws, terrible atrocities were committed because those two laws gave authority even to open fire, to kill anybody, to arrest anybody. People were killed. Houses were burnt. Rapes were committed. Then you saw what happened in Kashmir, Puzipora, Magam, Sopore, Handwara, Anantnag, Mashali Mohalla and Kawdara. That is on record

[Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz]

These are draconian laws. These were passed when he was the Prime Minister.

There is one rape case in Fatehpur. The Prime Minister went there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How can you discuss all these cases? Please conclude now.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Why did not the Prime Minister go to Kashmir to find out how many women were raped there? How many houses were burnt?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, don't try to exhaust all the papers that are with you.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will take only three or four minutes. I come to my point now. We have presented so many memoranda to him. But he never responded. That is the situation. (*Interruptions*) It was this Government which made the State of J&K a Police State. Previously, the Governor was a police officer. Three of his Advisers are police officers. There are six DGs. It is not only a police State but this Government has been treating Kashmir as a real colony and made it the worst example of a police State. I want to tell you the latest position.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please don't do this. The time which was given to you and the time given by the Congress Party to you is over.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will tell you the latest position. 90 per cent of the people who are languishing in jail are innocent people. Even political leaders who were in Jodhpur like Abdul Ghani Lone, Abas Ansari, Syed Ali Geelani, Prof. Bhat and others were not provided even newspapers and treated as criminals. They have no radio. They heard after three months when Mr. Lone went to that place. They heard after three months because Shri Jagmohan had been removed. Moulvi Farooq has been assassinated. Let

the Prime Minister institute an inquiry whether it is a fact or not... (*Interruptions*) Let him do it today. They have no radio; they have no newspapers. For the past two months, the Government servants there are on strike. Nothing has been done. Banks were closed. Insurance Companies were closed. Schools and Colleges were closed for two months. I went to the Governor. I talked to them. But nobody talked to them. It all happens in a various circle. We talked to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister would talk to the Home Minister. The Home Minister would talk to the Governor and the Governor would talk to the three advisors; the three advisors would talk to the police officers. Finally, they will talk to the Chief Secretary who is enjoying in the miseries of Kashmir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not going to allow you. You have already taken 30 minutes. This is a something which you should not do. I will not give you a single minute. You must conclude now. You have already taken too much time.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am concluding by saying that TADA courts should be shifted. The Government Servants had a demand that the TADA Courts should go to Kashmir. TADA is a draconian measure. Why did this Government not ask the then Governor and the present Governor that the TADA Courts should be shifted to Srinagar? I can go on giving the details. The fact is that atrocities are committed against the people. The Prime Minister may have a different intention. But this Government created a disaster in Kashmir. They created a terrible situation there. So, it is not possible for me to support this motion. But my personal respect for Shri V.P. Singh will continue.

[*Translation*]

KUMARI MAYAWATI (Bijnor): Hon. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at a time when the country is passing through one of the most critical phases in its history, if becomes the duty of the entire house to think from all angles, before arriving at a decision. Since morning, we have been discussing the

Confidence Motion, brought forward by the hon. Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*) Before expressing the views of my party on this confidence motion, I would like to comment upon some of the issues raised by the hon. Prime Minister and his supporters, in the House. The Prime Minister has said that he is prepared to quit the office, for the sake of principles. In this context, I would like to tell him that if he had been sincere about his principles, if he had no lust for power, then he would have not preferred to sail in two boats. On one hand you tried to appease the proponents of Ram Janambhoomi. I would like to ask him why he did not stop Shri L.K. Advani's 'Rath Yatra', on the very first day of its commencement? Why was it allowed to proceed on its journey? On the other hand, you are misleading the muslim community of this country. When you found that Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav was adamant not to allow the procession of Babri Masjid by the BJP people, you stopped the Yatra in Bihar because you felt that if Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav stops the Yatra he will become undisputed later of the country's muslim population as they have come to know about your double standards.

I would like to tell the entire House, something about the Muslim leadership as well. At the very outset, when the elections were announced and an electoral understanding was being reached with the BJP and Janata Dal and left parties felt apprehensive about the safety and security of the muslims. At that time, I felt that by joining hands with Mr. V.P. Singh the Muslims leadership has betrayed the interests of the muslim community. I would like to say that the Muslim leaders should have never trusted that a person like V.P. Singh would provide justice to the Muslims, for himself was trying to get the support of a communal outfit like the Bharatiya Janata Party which hate the very sight of Muslims. I would like to say that it is the Prime Minister, and not Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav, who is responsible for the current impasse in Uttar Pradesh, for the serious situation that has developed in that State since the 30th of October.

I would like to say something with regard to the situation in Bijnor, from where I was elected. I know what happened in Bijnor. From 30th October to late, curfew is in force in Bijnor. While Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav is leaving no stone unturned to protect the Babri Masjid from destruction and vandalism, Mr. V.P. Singh is covertly trying to destroy the Muslims and the Bharatiya Janata Party people in collusion with the Government machinery in Uttar Pradesh, is spearheading a defamation campaign against Mr. Yadav. The State Government machinery has played a very dubious role in the present crisis. I would like to cite the examples of Bijnor, where shops owned by Muslims have been raged to the ground, while those owned by the Hindus and sharing a common wall with that of the muslims, have been spared. Why did it happen like this? Because, it was all preplanned, it was planned months back. Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, today you are speaking the language of the Bahujan Samaj Party with regard to the down-trodden, the exploited, and the minorities. In this regard, I would like to say that you tried to win over the down-trodden through political gimmick, like declaring the year 1990 'as the year of social justice' on the occasion of the birth centenary of Baba Saheb Dr. Ambedkar, installing his portrait in the Central Hall of the Parliament, bestowing 'Bharat Ratna' on Dr. Ambedkar, formulating excellent legislation for the welfare of the poor and down-trodden. Not only this, you tried to fool and cheat the exploited and down-trodden people of this country by installing a puppet like Ram Vilas Paswan, who airs his concern for the poor and down-trodden only through the Government controlled media. Had your concern and sympathy for the down-trodden and exploited people of this country been sincere, you would have distributed land to the poor instead of simply adopting populist measures.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, who tills the land in this country? Who ploughs it? Who works in the factories? Who constructs the roads? Who assists the trade and business in the country? Who toils day and night? The common answer to all this is that it is the poor

[Kumari Mayawati]

and down-trodden people of this country and I would like to say that, had the Prime Minister been really sympathetic to this cause, then first of all he should have abolished the private ownership of land and nationalised education. Then, we would have believed that he is a well-wisher of the poor and the oppressed, in the real sense of the word.

The second question to which I would like to refer is that of the Mandal Commission Report. I would like to tell this august House, that this Government has implemented only a part of that report, but from 10 August 1985 to 31st May 1990, we, in the Bahujan Samaj Party have been spearheading an agitation throughout the length and breadth of the country, under the leadership of our beloved leader Shri Kaushi Ram, for the full implementation of the recommendations made by the Mandal Commission. I would like to say that if you had been sincere about the implementation of the Mandal Commission report, you should have held detailed discussion in the House on it, during the course of which we would have told you that it is much more important to make reservations in educational institutions, before making it applicable on jobs, but you were afraid of Devi Lal. He had called for a public rally on 9th August. You got frightened and in order to minimize the impact of that rally and to divert the attention of the people, you decided to implement the recommendations of the Mandal Commission in parts. I would like to say that the wounds of the clashes that took place in the Panwari village of Agra are still fresh. So many women were raped there, so many innocent people were killed in cold blood, so many people belonging to the depressed classes were put to death. Mr. Prime Minister, you say that you are sympathetic towards the cause of the down-trodden, that you love them, but I would say that it is not true. Had it been so, you would have gone to Agra and provided justice to the Jatavs. I am not speaking either in your favour or in favour of the Congress Party, but I would like to tell you Mr. Prime Minister that those who were in favour of the unlocking of the Babri Masjid

are today members of your cabinet, they are no more in the Congress. Can you tell me why Rajiv Gandhi is sitting in the opposition today? It is because he did not have good advisors. The Congress Party would not come to such a position, had the late Jagjivan Ram given the right advice to the Congress Party to follow the policies of Baba Saheb Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar for the upliftment of the down-trodden. Shri Arif Mohammad Khan, who was a Congress man is presently a Cabinet Minister. The BJP too is sitting on the same side. Shri Arif Mohammad Khan is the same person, who did not give the correct advice to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, on the Muslim personal law.

So far as Arun Nehru is concerned, who too is a member of your cabinet, I would say that he is the same person who, while in Congress, could not give the right advice to Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. He was in favour of the unlocking the Babri Masjid and in the process denied justice to the Muslim community. I would like to mention here that our hon. leader, Shri Kanshi Ram has always maintained that if the Congress Party is like a cobra, the National Front is like a Uiper, Both are equally poisonous. Along with it, he has always stressed that he is ready to extend his co-operation to anyone of these two parties, which is prepared to shed its hatred towards the down-trodden and work for their well-being. Now, I would like to express our party's stand on the confidence motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister. Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, very soon, we are going to have voting on the motion moved by you, but I would like to tell you that our party has got three votes and you have sought our support. It is unfortunate that your own house is a divided one and it would not benefit anyone, if we cast our lot with you. About half of your party MPs have defected to the Chandra Shekhar Camp. However, I would like to answer you that if our three votes can save your Government from an imminent downfall, we are prepared to cast our votes in your favour, but I regret to say that our three votes won't help you to save your skin, and under the circumstances, we would not like to waste it. At the time of elections, each and

every vote counts. Further, I would like to warn the Bharatiya Janata Party people that if they try to play pranks with the secular fabric of the country, then the suppressed, oppressed and exploited masses of the country, including the minorities, who constitute 85% of the population won't tolerate it. This 85% majority will oppose tooth and nail, the sinister designs of a handful of Hindus, who constitute hardly 15% of the country's population.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

THE MINISTER OF ENERGY AND MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me a chance today to participate in the discussion on Confidence Motion. Although many other issues have been raised during the discussion on this confidence motion but basically, the issue for discussion is the crisis which our secular country is facing today. I hoped that in a hour of this crisis, all secular parties and persons would make unanimous effort to overcome it. But it is unfortunate that we could not rise above political prejudices. The basic ideals and the principles cherished by us during our freedom struggle are at stake to-day and it is need of the hour that we should have risen above party politics and political prejudices and formulate a programme to face this challenge unanimously. I do not want to criticise anybody but it is very unfortunate that we have failed to rise to the occasion. The basic fact that whatever happened due to Ayodhya dispute during the recent past led to a political crisis. The B.J.P. has withdrawn support it extended to the Government and the Government also took this decision after giving it a careful thought. As the Prime Minister has rightly reiterated that today we have brought this Confidence Motion in the House not either with the hope that it would save the Government or with this idea that the Confidence Motion would be passed. Our basic aim was that discussion in this House should help in forming a unanimous view to overcome this crisis and

showing us the right path. It is mentioned in the great epic Mahabharata that Dronacharya taught the lesson that "Satyam Vad Dharma Char" which means speak truth and abide by religion" to his Pandava and Kaurava disciples on the very first day. After that he asked the princes about the lesson. (*Interruptions*) All the princes except Yudhishtra rapidly repeated the lesson. Dronacharya rebuked Yudhishtra for not learning the lesson and asked him to do it the next day But Yudhishtira could not memorise the lesson—next day for days together. At the fag end of his life, when Dharamraj Yudhistir was asked as to why he could not memorise such a small line, he replied that merely memorising and reciting a small line does not mean that one has really learnt the lesson and he had to spend his entire life time to implement it in his life and his conduct. Thus he could not claim that he had learnt the lesson taught by Guru Dronacharya on the first day itself. We talk of secularism and national unity in the same manner as was done by the Kauravas in reciting the lines "Satyam Vad Dharmam Char" which they had learnt by heart but never implemented the same in their lives. If we had followed secularism in letter and spirit the stand taken by us would not have put the Government and the chair at stake. If these people were truly secular and believed in national unity there was no reason why they could not take a unanimous stand. Sir, I regret to say that my colleagues are not paying attention to what I am saying. Otherwise they would not comment in this manner.....

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): If you are talking of secularism, then why were you not allowed to go to Allahabad during the by-elections there.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: I will reply to your question also. I believe that whether it is the Ayodhya dispute or other riots I have been repeatedly saying that it is a symbol or a symptom and a symptom does not cause a war. Treatment is given for a disease and for a symptom. The real disease that has gripped the country today is that of communalism. Communalism originates

[Sh. Arif Mohammad Khan]

where religious sentiments of a community are used for political purposes or for achieving political power and positions. Religion is a means for realising God. But when religion is used for achieving power then it creates a problem. I am definitely of the opinion that people from both sides are involved in this dispute. I want to tell them that had these people been the true representatives of their religions, then there would have been no scope of any sort of violence or tension. Religion means compassion, and sensitivity towards the rights of others and not to hurt the feelings of anyone. If I advocate a religion, there can be no place for violence and tension. In other words, I want to say that in an atmosphere of tension and violence, religion cannot exist. Sir, about India, Dr. Radhakrishnan had said.....

SHRI VASANT SATHE: When the children were immolating, then it should have been though.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Comprehension may be a problem but what is the problem in hearing.

SHRI ARIF. MOHAMMAD KHAN: You are deviating from the main issue. Dr. Radhakrishnan had said that India is a laboratory in which different religions, cultures and languages synthesise, with the help of this successful experiment of co-existence, we can guide the world to a right path. But the ideals and principles propounded by our great leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and the other freedom fighters who dedicated their lives for the cause are in danger to-day.

Sir, what is religion...

"Darde Dil ke Vaste Paida kiya Insan ko, Varna Taaut ke liye kuch kam Na Tha Karorbaya".

The Almighty and the all-pervasive God could have made Madan Lal Khurana and me as one. It was not beyond this power. We

neither possess power to change the fate predestined by the Almighty nor do we ever try to do so. What is the ancient philosophy of this country? The old philosophy is "Ek Sadwipra Bahudha Vadanti" which means that truth is one, God is one but people call him by different names. Go through the speeches delivered by Shri Arvinda. In the course of one of his speeches he says that our ancient philosophy is "Vashudhev Kutumbakam". He said this while referring to Indians that God Vishnu resides in every person whether he be a Hindu or a Muslim. This ancient philosophy of India does not teach the lesson of exclusiveness. What purpose do the temples and mosques serve? They are constructed basically for worship. When we talk about *Dashrath Nandan Ram*, Kabir's *Ram*, Gandhiji's *Ram* and *Maryada Purushottam Ram*, we should keep this fact in mind that God Ram discarded his crown for the sake of dignity and it was Ram who quitted Ayodhya for safeguarding conduct. With great regret, I say that this agitation was launched in the name of the same Rama. I am not putting any allegation but I fear that we are violating the dignity of the nation. A question regarding Allahabad was put to me. My colleague Smt. Mayawatiji had also referred to me about Allahabad. You go beyond Allahabad. When certain remarks which I consider to be a violation of national dignity, were made by some people belonging to my own community, I strongly showed my resentment. If our speeches and our doings tend to violate court and the constitution, then I certainly consider this as a violation of the dignity of the nation. I do not deny what the hon. Member, Shri Lodhaji referred to the Shahbano case. I think that he would agree to what I had said. He was a judge of the High Court and is reputed to be an authority on law. He will agree to this that once the court takes a decision.

[English]

You can definitely initiate legislative measure to nullify the verdict of the Court. But before the verdict of the court comes, if I keep on saying everyday that I won't accept the verdict of the Court then it amounts to

contempt of the court, of the law and of the Constitution.

[*Translation*]

And I would never like to say that. This is his intention. I would not like to level this charge against the hon. Member or any party. It is quite possible that he might have uttered these words having been overwhelmed with devotion, but I am confident that when he thinks about it coolly, his conscience will definitely prompt him to reconsider his stand.

Sir, as I have already said, these problems come up when we use religion for our political ends or for capturing political power, otherwise basically all the religions show the path of love. Sir, Hazrat Amir Khusro, was a great disciple of Hazrat Nizamuddin Oulia. Once he was going across the streets of Mahaurali, a locality in the outskirts of Delhi alongwith 4 of his friends. On the other side. Some villagers were proceeding towards a Dev temple for making some offerings. They were beating drums and 4 to 5 of them were dancing joyfully. When those people came across Hazarat Khusro, Khusro stopped there and accompanied the villagers to the temple dancing and singing. When he returned from there his friends acosted him saying that since Hindus are idol worshippers what made him accompany them to the temple. To this, Amir Khusro replied:

"Har kaum rasta rahe,
Har din kibla gahe
Man kibla rasta
Kardam bartarj kaj kalahe."

Every religion, every community is on the right paths. Man's faith and his devotion is important, if is not important as to now he expresses these things. Now what is the basic thing? Temple and mosque are the places where devotion is expressed. If we follow the Indian philosophy and have no firm belief in ancient Indian hesitation to say, that I have philosophy according to which religion cannot be separate sects can be different. When religion cannot be different and only sects are different, I would like to

assure all of you that it is the same Almighty who is being worshipped as "nirgun parameshwar" in a mosque and "sagun parameshwar" in a temple. There is no difference between the two. For this, we have to accept that this is the philosophy of this country. The philosophy of this country does not ask us to follow a particular method in worship. The scriptures are very clear about the methods of worship, such as:—

"Uttam Sahajawas Tha,
Dwitiya dhyan dharna,
Tritiya pratima puja,
Hom yatra chaturth."

The best method of worship is "uttam sahajawas Tha". Where the devotee feels the presence of the Almighty in every thing and every creature of the universe. The second method is "dhyan dharana". If one is not capable of practising the first method, he could very well take recourse to dhyan dharna i.e. meditation. If that is also not possible, one could practise the third method i.e. "tritiya pratima puja." And if that also is not possible one could adopt the fourth one i.e. "hom yatra". What I want to impress is that the ancient philosophy and the ancient religious values of this country do not permit that people should fight against each other in the name of religion. There can be no fight over the methods of worship.

Sir I want to make it clear once again that all these submissions I am making, now, are not at all aimed at contradicting anybody's view point. Sir, my only intention is going into all these details is to see if some way out could be found to come out of the present crisis which is posing a challenge to the nation.

Sir, I shall conclude after making only one more submission. During the elections we made seat adjustment's with the Bharatiya Janata Party and the Leftist Parties. The National Front Parties had its own election manifesto, while the BJP and the Leftist parties had different manifestos. There were a number of points which were common in the Bharatiya Janata Party and the Janata

[Sh. Arif. Mohammad Khan]

Dal manifesto. There were several points on which the BJP took one stand while the Janata Dal took some different stand. Sir, I well remember that when the BJP which was supporting the Government was asked by the approach during a discussion on Kashmir in this House to clarify its stand on Kashmir, I distinctly remember Shri Advani to have replied categorically that they had a different stand on article 370. They had this difference at the time they were contesting the elections and also on the day they decided to extend their support to the National Front Government. They still continue to have this difference and do not expect that the National Front Government would accept their view point on this point. Similarly, with regard to Ayodhya issue also both the BJP and the Janata Dal had enlisted divergent views in their respective election manifestos. But the Government and all its friendly parties were unanimous on one point that when we swear in the name of the constitution, we shall protect it and when we protect the Constitution it would be our constitutional and moral duty to accept the court's verdict whatever it may be we never said that what either of them say is wrong. But it is our duty that till such time as the matter is sub-judice, we should stick to court orders which is our Constitutional and moral duty. So far as Kashmir issue is concerned, the B.J.P. took a very generous stand. People in their thousands were being displaced from the valley. The situation prevalent in the valley was a great challenge to the unity and integrity of the country. In this connection the B.J.P. made their stand very clear that they had their differences with the Government earlier also and as such they do not expect that the Government would accept their view point now. But I fail to understand that when the BJP showed so much of generosity in one matter, it has failed to act in the same manner in the other case which both of us held different views. But in this case they mounted pressure on the Government to accept their view point.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South

Delhi): Why did you withdraw the ordinance?

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN: Sir, our hon. Prime Minister has already stated the reasons of withdrawing the ordinance. The ordinance was withdrawn because both the parties registered their protest against it. Sir, I have not yet lost hope and I have nothing to suspect the patriotism of BJP and their trust in the Government. I am fully confident that one day or the other, they would feel the need of reconsidering the stand they had taken on this issue. And the only point on which I lay stress here is that they ought to have re-considered their stand. *(Interruptions)* My submission is not at all aimed at mobilising votes. At the very outset I have made it clear that. I am talking of maintaining law and order in the country and preserving its national ideals. So far as the Government is concerned, there is no misunderstanding on this point that the Government would survive today's Confidence Motion.

Even then we brought this Motion so that this matter could be deliberated in the House and to find out a solution of the present which is posing a challenge to the nation in this supreme parliamentary institution. Sir, things I do not remember the name of the poet yet. I would recite this Urdu couplet in the following words:—

"Jis shan se koi maktal may gaya,
Wah sham salamat rehati hai,
Yeh jan to aani Jaani hai,
Is jaan ka jana khas nahin."

Here "maktal" means the place of execution. Sir, this Government will fall today and scenes of other Governments will follow suit with the passage of time. It makes no difference. But, if we can preserve the secular fabric of the country and follow the great ideals. Which our leaders of National movement had dreamt one day, it would be a much bigger achievement than remaining in power. I am fully confident that. We will dedicate ourselves in this task.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the entire country today is passing through a great crisis in the history of Independent India. Never was the situation so grave as it is today. Emotions have been raised to the highest pitch and the communal situation is deteriorating every hour of the day.

You remember that it was eleven months back that this Government was elected and that this august House had given a vote of confidence to the Prime Minister of this country, because the country was facing very complex problem, problems like Kashmir, problems like Assam and problems like Punjab, with the hope that after coming to power the Government would solve these problems. But the Government has failed to solve the problems of Kashmir, Assam and Punjab. The country is dissatisfied with the performance of the Government.

I do not want to go into the details about the Kashmir and Assam and other problems. But I want to make it clear about the the Ram Janamabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue. About Kashmir, I know that all of us who are here realise that the policy of torture in Kashmir has only alienated our Kashmiri brothers. And furthermore, we know that Article. 370 casts a constitutional obligation but because that constitutional obligation has been eroded, the confidence of the people of Kashmir has been lost by the Government.

Then coming to Assam, the situation is nothing better. I am told that Muslims who have been living in the State for centuries are sought to be pushed out or to reduce them to second grade citizens by snatching away their right of franchise from them.

Now, do not want to go into the details about all the other problems. I must say that the most important burning problem today is of Babri Masjid-Ram Janama Bhumi issue. As far as we are concerned, we wanted a peaceful solution. We were prepared to wait for the verdict of any judicial body. But the problem is that the Mosque cannot be de-

molished at any cost. The Mosque should remain there and should be at our command. Now, it is said that the Mosque was not there till 1936. It is absolutely false to say so. It was built in 1528 and it has been there for the last 450 years, that is, more than four centuries. If the Muslims have not been using the Mosque, that is because the idols were placed inside it in 1949 or so. I do not know the technicalities of how the idols came to be placed there. The Government says that the idols were surreptitiously and wrongfully placed in the dead of the night on the 22nd December 1949. We assert that the Mosque should not be demolished. If the idols were placed there and if the Mosque was not used that is most unfortunate. This is injustice. It is certainly not good for the country today. I must tell you that it is the responsibility of the Government to protect the Mosque and we will protect it at all costs. The Government will be failing in its duty if it does not protect it.

What about the Rath Yatra? Why was it undertaken? I wish to tell you that it was an aggressive and unlawful Yatra. It was an illegal Rath Yatra with aggressive designs. People were carrying swords, *trisuls* and blood was offered. It was because of that we had demanded that the Rath Yatra should be stopped and should be banned. Though the Rath Yatra was stopped late, yet I am grateful to this Government for that. I must say that the Rath Yatra has not been stopped at an early stage. I must praise Mr. Lalu Prasad Yadav and Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav for the admirable manner in which they had tackled the issue of Rath Yatra and the attempt of Kar Sevaks to start Kar Seva at the disputed land. Kar Sevaks attacked the mosque, wanted to damage the mosque, climbed over the dome of the mosque and danced over it. We had seen the photographs. That was done at the holy place of worship.

Now I come to one more factor, that is ordinance. Ordinance was promulgated without consulting us. Let me tell you that if there is any understanding dealing or any secret understanding with the BJP with regard to ordinance, I condemn that with all force at

[Sh. Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait]

my command. We opposed the ordinance because we can never accept the acquisition of the place of worship and after acquisition of the place of worship, it becomes a Government property and thus, all our rights, titles, claims in the High Court get abrogated. We are supporting this Government for having withdrawn the ordinance as per our demand. This Government never allowed Kar Sevaks to start construction for the Ram Mandir at the disputed land, survey no. 586. One thing is very clear. This Government was vacillating for months together. The behaviour of the BJP and allied parties goes to establish one fact. There was a conspiracy of the BJP and allied parties to create a constitutional deadlock through intransigence and violence on the question of Babri Masjid-Ram Janam Bhoomi. After vacillating for a long time, this Government had refused to succumb to the pressures of the BJP and stood firmly for defending secularism, rule of law and integrity of the country. This is exactly the reason why we support the Motion of Confidence. It is very clear through sheer mathematics that this Government will collapse.

If this Government collapses, then consistent with our basic formulations that the BJP have to be defeated, we will support any alternative Government without the BJP

21.00 hrs

participating or supporting. I would like to make it very clear that tomorrow if Shri Chandra Shekhar is going to form the Government, we will give support to that Government because we do not want elections at this stage when the situation is grave and the emotions are surcharged.

One thing I must say here that there was a conspiracy by the BJP to destroy the Constitution. The Rath Yatra, Kar Seva, everything was to destroy the constitution of the country. Therefore, today one thing has happened. The BJP stands isolated. The present Government has severed its rela-

tions with it. And the coming Government will have no relations with it. So the BJP is isolated.

I appeal to Rashtrapatiji in this august House that he should in the wider national interest, in case of defeat of the confidence motion, call upon the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Rajiv Gandhi or Shri Chandra Shekhar to form the Government and seek confidence of this august House. This is what I say at this juncture. I hope the Government that will be established again will be a stable Government and will earnestly endeavour to defuse the emotionally surcharged communal atmosphere and honestly and sincerely try to solve the very provocative and sensitive problem of Babri Masjid and Ram Janama Bhoomi and thus establish peace and communal harmony.

[*Translation*]

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK (South Central Bombay): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this Government didn't remember us when we supported them for these last eleven months, but when we have withdrawn our support they are showing their anguish. Before this, they ever discussed anything with us clearly. Today their own party is divided into two groups. Anyone can ask us why we have withdrawn our support. After listening to all, I felt today that the leaders have become the pleaders and the preachers, who are giving sermons to us what is right and what is wrong. In everything, they ask us to do this and that, even though it is wrong. Our friend belonging to Maharashtra the finance Minister Shri Madhu Dandavate and Shri George Fernandes, also said many things and made a mention of Shiv Sena and Shri Bala Saheb Thackrey. I would like to tell the House that Shri Bala Saheb Thackrey, who is the heart-throb of the Hindus and is the Chief of Shiv Sena, is a very close friend of theirs. Only today, they are recollecting that we call the south Indians as Yandu. They never asked us about this in these last eleven months. It is not 22 years when Shiv Sena was formed. Once these three persons namely, Shri George, Shri Bala Saheb

hand Shri Sharad Pawar, our Chief Minister, met together in a procession consisting of lakhs of people, but they didn't remember the Yandu, Yandu that time. They only remembered about our help and we helped them. But alliance with them didn't bear any fruit for me as well as for my party. Not a single work of ours was ever done. The Chief Minister of our state never called us to enquire about our party. Neither Shri George Fernandes ever listened to us. Even if we went to him, our work was never done. Now, when we have withdrawn our support, you level allegations against us. This is wrong. I would like to ask Shri George why did he forget that he is a lohiaist, when hundreds of unarmed people were shot dead in Ayodhya. During your rule in Kerala, when Shri Pattan Tharu Pillai was the chief Minister, unarmed people were killed by bullets on order from him. He was asked by the centre to submit the resignation of his council of ministers and he resigned. I would like to ask him today as to why didn't he resign when unarmed people were killed in Ayodhya. Hindus have been killed there and they now advise us to follow secularism. Why don't you think of secularism when Hindus are who are killed when atrocities are committed on the Hindus? You mentioned Sardar Patel, but you didn't make any reference to the Somnath temple which was reconstructed by him. The riots, which took place in Delhi after the assassination of Shrimati Gandhi, were mentioned here, but the people killed in country after the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi were not mentioned.

AN HON. MEMBER: No one was killed.

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK: Many people were killed and their houses were burnt in Maharashtra. What do you know about that, you were not even born then. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, after showering love for eleven months, now they shout on us and on the B.J.P. Is it proper to be angry on what is left. You should speak politely and you can do what ever you want to do about us. I would like to know from Shri George. He was appointed as a Minister in charge of Kashmir affairs. Many Hindus have migrated from

there, their houses have been burnt or forcibly occupied. Atrocities have been committed on the Hindu women. Which Hindu officer will want to remain there? Have you ever listened to their problems...

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK: Not only this, but they also say that all the religions are equal. What did you do when the national flag was burnt in Kashmir? Shri Jagmohan was removed from there because he used to do justice to the Hindus. After committing so many wrogs, why should they give sermons to us? Why are they doing this. It is not right. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, so many temples were demolished in Kashmir, Bangladesh and Pakistan, but this Government didn't write a single line to any of the Governments that such things should be stopped. We do not care about it. All religions are equal. Our Prime Minister is Hindu and the Home Minister is muslim. Just now, Shri Arif spok in such a way that I though, the God has sent a messenger. When the supreme Court gave the verdict in Shahbano case in her favour, the Congress Government enacted a law in this House to the effect that maintenance charges would not be given to the muslim women... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Mahadik please listen to me. I have given you time to speak, please listen to me also. This debate was to be finished by 8 o'clock, but now it is going to be 9 o'clock. After this, the Prime Minister has to reply and after that, voting will be done. I still have four five names, who want to speak. I am giving everyone a little time to speak. But you are not concluding and it is creating problem for other. Please conclude within one minute.

SHRI VAMAN RAO MAHADIK: Every where, whether it is Punjab, Kashmir or Assam, Hindus are killed. If All religions are equal, then why justice is not done to the Hindus? We are of the considered opinion that there should be a national base. It may not be based on the religion or the caste. One who considers this country as his own

[Sh. Vamanrao Mahadik]

and says "Vande Matram" can be called a Hindu. Therefore, Hinduism should be the main religion of this country. All other religions can be left aside... (*Interruptions*). We also subscribe to the view that there should be one national religion this country. In other countries also, people belonging to different religions live, but they have one national religion. The people talk about religions polarisation we should not be blamed for it. We are not doing polarisation. So long as Hindus are in majority in this country and it is called Hindustan and our religion remains Hindu, Hinduism must remain as our national religion. If they are attacked, we must come together to fight such forces to project them... (*Interruptions*)... The Chief of the Shiv Sena, Shri Bal Thackeray has said that three of our temples the Ram Janam Bhoomi, the temple of Kashi Vishwanath and the temple of Shri Krishna in Dwaraka were demolished and converted into mosques. They should be restored and converted into temples. In case of other three thousand temples, which had been converted into mosques status quo, can be maintained. We must have proud our own religion, respect for to, the Hindu religion must have same place as is accorded to Muslims and Christians. Hindu are the majority people in India. We are not going to give up this pride (*Interruptions*) ... they say that Hindustan will be converted into Pakistan the country has to be saved from such forces slogans such as "larke liya Pakistan our hans ke lenge Hindustan" are being raised in the country today. This is a great danger... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: After this, Shri Mahadik's speech will not go into record. Please take your seat.... (*Interruptions*) * ...

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Mahadik. I am not allowing you now.

(*Interruptions*) *[*Translation*]

SHRI CHAND RAM (Hardoi): Mr. Deputy Speaker, sir, this debate is becoming very long. Through this debate, the Hon. Prime Minister wants to take a certificate of secularism, as he claimed that he is sacrificing his Government for the sake of secularism. He wants to become a martyr. I think Shri Advani has already exposed his claim. He said that an ordinance was issued and discussion were also held. It was said that he would also go and do the Kar-Sena there. I belong to that class which gives performance to the humanity in matters of religion. They say that they recommended the implementation of Mandal Commission Report for us. (*Interruptions*)

My hon. friend, Shri George Fernandes was saying that this Ram Janam Bhoomi agitation was launched against them, because they implemented the Mandal Commission Report. I became the M.L.A. in 1952, and Kaka Kalelkar Commission submitted its report in 1955. (*Interruptions*) From that time onwards, we made efforts to get the report of Kaka Kalelkar implemented. When the Janta Party came to power in 1977 and 1978. I was one of those persons, who were instrumental in getting the Mandal Commission constituted. The Mandal Commission submitted its report and we constantly made efforts to get the recommendations of the commission implemented. But I am surprised that after 8 to 10 months, they announced on the 7th of August, that they had accepted the recommendations of the Mandal Commission.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you and I are the former ministers. A Government order is issued, after Mandal Commission report any report has been submitted. I am not saying this, but this has been said by their lawyer in the supreme court. (*Interruptions*) To the question whether castes have been notified, they replied in the negative. We have sent Joint Secretary in States. (*Interruptions*) They have stated that list of Scheduled Castes and backward classes is yet to be finalised.

(*Interruptions*) I would like to know as to what is the importance of the report of Mandal Commission when beneficiaries have not been notified. (*Interruptions*)

They claim that they have done this and that for Scheduled Castes and they have put up a portrait of Dr. Ambedkar, and they are calibrating centenary of Dr. Ambedkar. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister whether any person belonging to Scheduled Castes or backward classes has even been appointed as a member of the Planning Commission? (*Interruptions*) Despite his promises many a times that he will appoint a member of Scheduled Castes as Member of the Planing Commission, no member of Scheduled Castes or backward classes from entire country has been appointed as a Member of the Planning Commission. (*Interruptions*) Exept Shri Paswan, no other member from Scheduled Castes has been included in his cabinet as a Minster. They talk about 66 per cent and they say that they want to provide 66 per cent seats to the Scheduled Castes. I would like to ask them whether they have appointed even a single Member from Scheduled Castes in the Himachal Pradesh Government.

Only one or two judges from backward class have been appointed in High-Court or Supreme Court, but not even a single Member from Scheduled Castes has so far been appointed as a judge. What happened to their promises of 66 per cent? (*Interruptions*)

So far as nomination of Member to Rajya Sabha is concord, a member from BJP was brought as a Member in Rajya Sabha ignoring a person from backward class. It has been said in the manifesto of Janta Dal that 66 per cent reservation would be provided to the persons belonging to Scheduled Tribes, Scheduled Castes and of backward classes, but they could not bring even a single person from these communities as a member in Rajya Sabha. It is a story of total deceit and neglect. It is only to show off. There is a difference between what they profess and what they practice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, had he tendered his resignation honourably to the day BJP withdrew its support, the valence in Ayodhya which caused huge loss of life and property would have been avoided. I had written him a letter too. I also wrote him a letter in connection with Mandal Commission that reservation should be provided for the people who are economically backward, but he did not agree to the proposal for providing reservation to them. I wrote a letter to him requesting him that he should tender his resignation honourably and should make some sacrifice for the country and the party, but what was the result. The Prime Minister had convened a meeting on 27th of the last month, even in that meeting I had said that keeping in view the dignity of the office of the Prime Minister, he should make sacrifice for the sake of the country and the party, but what reward did we get for it? I do not want to say that he is an incompetent leader to run the affairs of the country, but when he was the Finance Minister, tax arrears to the tune of Rs. 70 crores due against one Industrial House was waived off with retrospective effect. I have got documentary proof for it. I have never observed such a thing earlier, I have a copy of notification with me. I can prove it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, he dismissed the Deputy Prime Minister Ch. Devi Lal, who had got him elected from Allahabad. He had campaigned for him throughout the country and told the people that our next Prime Minister would be Shri V.P. Singh. Ch. Devi Lal put off his crown from his head and kept it on his (V.P. Singh's) head and this man did not prove to be loyal to Ch. Devi Lal. He dismissed him. How can such a man be loyal to the country. I feel that if someone takes the extreme step of self-immolation and if some one dies in Hindu Muslim riots, image of the Government is spoiled, but he claims that if one person dies, his votes are increased by one lakh votes. He has got with him one Yadav, one Paswan and another muslim as him colleagues and he feels that he has captured 52 per cent votes of backward classes, 22 per cent votes of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and now he

[Sh. Chand Ram]

has also captured the votes of Muslims in the name of Ram-Janambhoomi and now he is confident of getting 300 seats in Lok Sabha. He had said that he will contest election from Allahabad only if Shri Amitabh Bacchan contests the election from Allahabad. He did not keep that word. Again he said that if he wins the election, he would not accept any office. He accepted the office of the Prime Minister. He did not keep his words again and even now he is clinging to the Chair. There is new proverb these days. If a man is found sitting even after departure of all the member from a meeting, he is called Shri V.P. Singh who does not leave the Chair so easily. He would have to be thrown and pushed from the Chair, otherwise he is not ready to make any sacrifice. Today, the entire House and the country is of the opinion that death of a child decreases about one lakh votes of the Government, but he feels that it is increasing his vote Bank. I have written him a letter that he should not try to build up his vote bank on such deaths. Similarly, the decision to implement the Mandal Commission Report was announced to distract and discourage the people from participating in the rally of Choudhri Devi Lal Ji. So, removal of such a lender is in the national interest. With these words, I would like to express my thanks for giving me an opportunity to express my views.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri A.K. Roy will speak now. Please be brief. At 9.30 PM, the Prime Minister will speak.

SHRI A.K. ROY (Dhanbad): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Practically everything has been said and nobody is interested to listen. So, your reminding me of the time to be taken by me will help me. Today, the question is, to be or not to be. We are all victims of the Ratha Yatra. Whether it is the beginning of an end or the end of a beginning, only posterity will say.

But I can say only one thing. I am not a very enthusiastic supporter of this Govern-

ment. In this House, I had the misfortune to oppose the Government on every point, whether it is Punjab, Kashmir or it is the economic policy or non-policy or industrial policy. I reaffirm very emphatically that this Government is making concessions one after another and is showing weakness and is surviving. But this is the first time that the Government has not shown any weakness and it is falling and, that is why, though I oppose this Government, yet today I support this Government.

This Government has a positive role and the role is limited. What is the role of this Government? It is to make some changes? No. Its role was limited. The role was to clear the mess, and then set the way for any future Government with some principled stand to do some good. I have my own assessment of this Government. I expressed earlier also a if this Government falls within a year, that will be a debacle and, if this Government lasts for more than two years, it will be a disaster"

Today I want to appeal to the Congress, non-Congress, and pseudo-Congress people that the nation is in crisis. The country is in crisis. The compulsion of the situation is; at least, we should be honest in politics. We should do what we feel honestly. But what are we doing? In the name of democracy, we are practising hypocrisy. They say that they are the strongest Opposition. What the strongest Opposition is doing? They say they have no time to hold the elections. But they do not have the guts to form the Government. They are finding some Trozen horse and some Trozen horse already came out of the womb in the Suraj Kund and now they want do politics by proxy. This is what they are doing.

But I would like to warn those people who are going that side that they should be very cautious when the Congress-I will be not supporting them, but they should be hundred times more cautious when the Congress-I comes to support them. The Congress-I will support them. I was also in the House in 1979. I have seen it for myself. Congress-I will support them as the rope supports the

man who is hanged. That you must realise. We have seen the BJP. They have said that they are fostering positive secularism. In Dhanbad I had the opportunity to see their positive secularism. Petrol-driven Rath was gone there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Air-conditioned Rath?

SHRI A.K. ROY: I do not know. I could not see that. But the petrol-driven Rath was going there with the 'Om' sign. In *Upanishads* we have seen the sign 'Om'. But in the Rath, they take the lotus symbol with them. Can mixing 'Om' with the Lotus symbol be supported by any definition of secularism? Can it be supported by any court of law as far as election matter is concerned. I would like to ask my BJP friends what type of Hinduism they are supporting. By merely constructing the Temple, can they say they are supporting Hinduism? For some time, we are discussing these things. The point is everytime we are only discussing about the *Shilanyas*, *Rath Yatras* etc. etc. Everybody is discussing these issues only. Neither poverty nor unemployment or corruption or price rise is discussed. Everything has been relegated to the background. What is left is *Shilanyas*, *Rath Yatra* etc.

Sir, we have read and I think you have also read all the books of the Hindu reformists. You know our national movement came out of the womb of the Hindu Reformist Movement. I read all the books of the Hindu reformists. Nowhere a single line was written that the Babri Masjid-Ram Mandir is the focal point for the emancipation of Hinduism. Please read the books of Swami Vivekananda Dayanand Saraswati, Ranade and Gokhale. You please read the philosophies and interpretations on the *Geetha*. Where is it written like that? Not a single line is there. This being so, how is it that these self-appointed guardians suddenly ask the people to work for the emancipation of Hinduism by making temple? They are making now discoveries. These people say that unless and until the *Mandir* is built by breaking the *Masjid*, Hinduism cannot be emancipated.

They are making new discoveries. Of course, we have got the Discovery of India. One of our national leaders gave that book to us. We have read it and we are reading it. Now, these people are making a new discovery of India. They say that without the Mandir and without the Temple by breaking the Masjid, the emancipation of Hinduism will be incomplete. This is a great discovery. We are spending the whole day in discussing these things only. I do not know what the future historians will say. We are talking of lofty things about secularism. But the future historians will suspect and will question the very sanity of the House. Now, the issue before us is whether the Temple would be built or the mosque will be there. If you go outside, people will ask you why there is destabilisation. They may ask why this Government has fallen. Should we say that the Government has fallen because we could not decide whether the Temple would be built or the mosque would be taken away.

Sir, you know there is accommodation problem among the people. This time we also came to know that there is accommodation problem for the MPs also. Of course, the House Committee is there to take care of this problem. But this time, we are surprised to know that Lord Rama has got accommodation problem. Leaving everything aside, we should now go and make some special Temple for Him and that too in a special place. These people say that they are very sure that Lord Rama was born there. I would like to say that Lord Rama is not a historical person but he is a pre-historical person. Babri Masjid is also not a completely historical thing. But they say that Lord Rama was born there and it is a matter of faith. So, in Ayodhya, there are many temples claiming that distinction. Now they say that it is to be made there only. Can you tell me where the Hanuman was born, where the Sita was born or where the Lakshman was born? You tell me that. Let us know that. (*Interruptions*) I would like to know what is the purpose? I can understand your purpose of Delhi Statehood because you can become the Chief Minister. But what is your purpose for this? Can History be revived by demolishing the mosque?

[Sh. A.K. Roy]

They started from Somnath to Ayodhya that is, history to pre-history period. (*Interruptions*) We should go forward. Somnath is a historic incident and Ayodhya is a pre-historic incident. They have started from historic to pre-historic things. (*Interruptions*) If it was possible to repeat the history they should have gone from Somnath to Gajni. Why have they gone from Somnath to Ayodhya? My Party, Marxist Coordination thinks that the infighting within the Janata Dal has cleansed the party. We have felt our necessity to support this Government even more vehemently after this division. We also like to give a call because at present this Government after overcoming all weakness symbolises all values of socialism, secularism and democracy. We consider that dissolution of Parliament is even proper than the dissolution of these values. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj): I had also given my name.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I would like to tell you that this debate should have been completed by 8 o'clock, but now it is 9 o'clock. Even Prime Minister has yet to speak. Many Members stand up simultaneously and they do not resume their seat, even after ringing of the bell again and again. It creates a big problem. I will give two minutes to each member.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM DHAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at least 5 to 6 minutes should be given from the time of the Prime Minister... (*Interruptions*) I would like to say only this much that incidents which had occurred in 1979 are being repeated once again. At that time, Shri Sanjay Gandhi, Mohan Meakins and Shri Raj Narayan had split the Janata Party in two parts. Today the wife of same Sanjay Gandhi, Mrs. Maneka Gandhi, Shri Dhru Bhai Ambani and his agents are working to split the Janata Dal. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Shri Devi Lal had worked very cleverly in breaking the Janta Party in 1979. At that time, Shri Lal Krishna Advani, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpai of BJP and Shri Chandra Shekhar had compelled Shri Morarji Desai to reinduct Choudhri Charan Singh in the Cabinet and later it had disastrous results. Even at that time I had said that whosoever had shown faith in BJP had made a blunder. These people ever think about the country... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Ramdhan, please take your seat. I have understand the feeling of all the Members. Therefore, you would have to resume your seat. A lot of time has been give to you. Please take your seat.

SHRI RAMDHAN: I am taking some time out of the time given to Hon. Prime Minister. Therefore, I would like to say that same history is being repeated.

21.43 hrs.

(MR. SPEAKER *In the Chair*)

The Members of BJP are responsible for it. It is they who had broken the Janata Party... (*Interruptions*) ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, Mr. Prime Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Speaker, today's discussion does not show as to what India stands for. It is the debate of fundamental political concepts. The debate was limited to the point as to how country could be run despite differences of opinion in the country and as to how ways could be found out and what were our limitations. But a clear cut thing which has come before us during the discussion is as to what is the main issue of the debate? The last sentence of Hon. Advaniji has pin pointed that main issue. I have great regard for him. But he said in the last sentence of his speech that elections should be held on this issue. Has the issue been decided? This difference has appeared during this period of 11 months.

When this issue was raised on the eve of last elections, it was said very clearly by Bhartiya Janata Party that Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babri Masjid issue is not an election issue and today Hon. Advaniji is saying in the last sentence of his speech that elections should be fought on this issue. This is the difference between two stands which has led us to part our ways. You were asking as to what change has taken place during this period of 11 months. This is the fundamental change which was not there earlier and which has taken place during the last 11 months. On which issue is this Government being pulled down today? This Government is being pulled down as it is not agreeable to violate the order of the court. The Government is being voted out as it does not violate the order of the court. I would like to submit that if any Government, whose members have come to power after subscribing the oath of the Constitution, cannot abide by the orders of the court, has got no right to remain in power even for a single day... (*Interruptions*) This is the new element to which I am referring. This element was not there 11 months earlier. Hon leaders of opposition have raised many questions. They have got only questions and questions, but they have no answers to anything. This is the reason that we also got the questions in legacy and not answers.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Today is the last day of this Government. You may give reply to the questions.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: There is no last day in the political calendar. This is the real issue. It was also asked as to why the 'Rath Yatra' was not stopped earlier. You are aware that all efforts were being made in that period. The concerned parties like religious leaders, Vishwa Hindu Parishad, Babri Masjid Committee and political groups were being consulted and there was some hope of a solution to the problem. Our discussions with them did make us hopeful of a solution. A solution to this problem will remove fear from the hearts of people for all times to come. All our efforts should be made towards that end, but not at the cost of

principles. Of course that is the basic thing. If something has to be done, it can be done only at an undisputed place. Secondly we must accord due recognition to the 'Iijas'. We always kept these two points in our mind. Yet our best efforts were in vain and it came to a point when any further step would have required a compromise with our principles something which is not possible. The Bihar Chief Minister took a step and 'Rath Yatra' was stopped. Shri Advani said about 'Kar Seva' I even today say that it can be done with the consent of both the Parties, and the status-quo of the disputed site should be maintained and the verdict of the Court should also be respected. Almost all parties are ready to co-operate if a solution can be found within these parameters. If it is decided that a temple of Lord Rama should be constructed then no Muslim should have any objection to it, I would have no objections if due recognition is given to court in the approach to the problem. A solution found in this way would be in the national interest.

As far as the Ordinance is concerned, I said in the beginning itself that both Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Babri Masjid Action Committee were not in its favour. So there was no point in making an issue of it. (*Interruptions*) Finally some people advised that as all efforts had failed there could only be one way to solve this problem. Based on that we made a last-ditch effort. We must look for a solution through mutual dialogue. Neither I nor any responsible person will abandon the path of mutual dialogue. What must be abandoned is the false concept of 'Ram c/o V.H.P.' (*Interruptions*) even that should be abandoned. Therefore, if all the concerned parties arrive at a solution through mutual dialogue, it will be the greatest tribute to the national unity. As we have put everything at stake in solving this problem we shall continue to look for a solution. A Bill should be brought to ensure the status quo of all temples and mosques as on a particular date. This will dispel any wrong notions regarding demolition of temples and mosques in this country. We must make effort in this direction. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Joshi, please be seated. Order please.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, I want to repeat what I said this morning that even God had to take on human form in his various 'avatars'. Even he, the all powerful, has to undergo the pain that a human being has to pass through. When it comes to human qualities, even God has to relent. So human qualities are of utmost importance and this has to be accepted only where such qualities are found, we can feel the presence of God. Human qualities spring from the heart and it is in the heart that God resides. This is a fact whether we accept it or not. Shri A.K. Rai rightly said that someone who created the universe is facing a housing problem and we will give him living space. It would be wrong to think that God can be housed in a temple, mosque or church. These places are mere structures of concrete and stone. If we have human qualities, God will automatically be with us. Mere buildings do not make places of worship. Let us turn our attention to God's creations, our fellow humans. There are a number of people who are treated as untouchables and lead a life of misery.

It becomes our duty to help these people and that is exactly what we did. The Government has power and this power has been directed towards helping the poor and backward class of people and this has created certain problems.

The hon. leader of the Opposition said that the Mandal Commission has raised the issue of casteism. This aspect must be understood very clearly. The social structure and political structure are inter-dependent in many ways. There may be differences between the social and economic structures but there is lot of co-operation at the lower levels. It is also true that this lower level largely belongs to the Delhi community and small farmers. Out of them 99% are poor. And in them 90% are small and marginal farmers. It is also true that upper caste people are rich.

22.00 hrs.

If there are difference between the social structure and economic structure there are similarities between the social structure and political structure without changing the political structure we cannot root out casteism and change the social structure. To root out casteism we must bring about changes in the political structure. The decision taken by us with regard to the Mandal Commission has been taken after serious consideration and with determination. There is no doubt in this fact that this step of our's is not wrong. We all have come from villages, so we all are ready to put our might for the welfare of villagers. We brought 51 bills for the fulfilment of various items contained in our manifesto. A plant had started to grow, and give a few fruits but it was cut down before it could grow fully. We did initiate action towards helping the poor but could not complete our endeavour.

As far as stability of the Government is concerned this Government was a minority Government but now we are moving from a minority Government to a miniscule Government. What is its political legitimacy? Why should there be a need for political legitimacy to run the country? All parties which have been elected have come with some Programme. If on the basis of public mandate, we are going to start a new tradition a bad tradition, then it will a wrong tradition. There is a tradition in this respect and it would be wrong to break this tradition. When the example of jeep and trolley was given by me it was said that any vehicle is controlled by the driver. But let me say that whoever may be the driver, the identity of the owner of the jeep is quite clear. (*Interruptions*)

Hon. Shri Ram Dhan spoke of threats to his life and other hon. Members spoke of being lured by money. This is a dangering thing. Will the industrialists of Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta action the aspirations of 80 crore people of this country?

As was said earlier greater the size of

the corporate sector, greater will be its power and stronger will be its hold in the political sphere. What started as a small thing has now assumed larger proportions. This is the greatest danger to democracy. Hon. Shri Indrajit Gupta expressed fears regarding the Bofors matter being closed forever. I request the President to keep the relevant papers in his safe custody.

Lastly I would like to express my gratitude to my hon. colleagues in the Left Parties who have stood by us in this period.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The hon. Prime Minister has raised an important issue of Bofors. After all, the entire election was fought on that very issue. Since that issue has come up I think it would be better if the hon. Prime Minister gives all the information that he has on this subject... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDVATE: You know, Mr. Advani, what is the present position?

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Though I am not in the Government yet I understand my responsibility towards the public regarding investigation of this matter and finding out the truth

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDVATE: The New Prime Minister will take care of it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: At least the facts should be known (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDVATE: Do not cheaper yourself.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVILAL: It would be better if the hon. Prime Minister make the matter clear related to Bofors. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I take strong exception to the remarks of my old colleague Shri Dandavateji. There is no cheapness in what I said.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I give my unqualified apology to Shri Advaniji.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: In fairness to Parliament, after 11 months, at least this Parliament should be told what has been the result of the investigation from that?

[*Translation*]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH I agree to this. I would like to give information to you in regard to the development that took place in this station. Sir, till the coming in power of my Government, no FIR had been lodged in this coercion. It was my Government which lodged the FIR. (*Interruptions*) First listen to me. only this JPC report has been presented. Its effect was that bank accounts in Switzerland were frozen. The previous Government could take action in this respect, but they did nothing. It reveals their intentions. Not only this, we were also successful in Zurich court and the verdict was given in our favour there. Now the case is pending in the Federal Court of Switzerland. The court has conveyed that the documents of all the accounts can be handed over to the Government of India even if a single case is decided. So this is the progress which has been made. As a result of our sincere efforts we have been successful in obtaining that secret portion of the Sweden report which the previous Government had failed to do. In this manner a considerable progress has been made in this matter and in the meanwhile several decisions have also been taken. The rest will be the responsibility of the next Government. In view of this you can very well assess as to what progress has been made in this matter? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the country will like the culprits to be exposed. Because the Congress will certainly

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

be there in the new Government to be formed and the people will naturally raise objections that we provided opportunity for them to come into power due to which the whole matter was hushed up. Therefore I would like that the House should know atleast who the actual culprit is. (Interruptions)

SHRI BHOGENDRAJHA (Madhubani): With the permission of the Hon. Prime Minister I would like to ask this question Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the speculations being made in regard to the Bofores issue whether it is possible as suggested by the Hon. Prime Minister, to hand over the matter to the president. Whether it would not be appropriate to place all the documents on the table of the House so that no room is left for any bungling to be made in this case. Is it possible? (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PARATAP SINGH: Sir, at this moment neither there is any feeling of vanity nor that of anguish on our part. Rather we are feeling happy and also proud that we are not retiring disgracefully. Sometimes death is better than life. Sir, when a person chooses to sacrifice his life to attain the motive dear to him, he does not feel sorry about it. It is a matter of fight for a cause, we continued our fight for this cause when we remained in power, we will continue the same even after going out of power. Formation of Government is merely a transitional phase, it is not the ultimate goal. For those who continue their struggle it hardly matters that they are in power or not. Our fight for the causes dear to us will continue. We will continue to fight for those who have been exploited, suppressed and neglected. Merely by enacting laws the history of a country cannot be changed unless those sections who were suppressed are ready to fight against it. It is only when they come out that the history is created. We are fully resolved to continue our fight.

SHRI DEVI LAL: Our former Prime Minister claims that he is not quitting with any sense of disgrace but the fact is this that he

is being made to quit.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put the Motion moved by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against will please say 'No'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

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

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The 'Ayes' have it. Let us have a division.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the lobbies be cleared.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the Lobbies have been cleared. I shall now put the motion by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh to the vote of the House. The question is: "That this House expresses its confidence in the Council of Ministers."

The Lok Sabha divided

AYES

Division No. 1]

22.22 hrs.

Acharia, Shri Basudeb

Ajit Singh, Shri

Ali, Shrimati Subhashini	Das, Shri Anadi Charan
Amat, Shri D.	Dasgupta, Dr. Biplab
Baitha, Shri Mahendra	Datta, Shri Amal
Bala, Dr. Asim	Delkar, Shri Mohanbhai Sanjibhai
Banatwalla, Shri G.M.	Desmukh, Shri Sudam Dattatrya
Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh	Dome Dr. Ram Chandra
Bankhele, Shri Kisanrao Baburao	Fernandes, Shri George
Barman, Shri Palas	Fernandez, Shri Jass
Basu, Shri Anil	Giri, Shri Sudhir
Basu, Shri Chitta	Gujral, Shri I.K.
Beg, Shri Yusuf	Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Behra, Shri Bhajaman	Hannan Mollah Shri
Bhagey Gobardhan, Shri	Hansda, Shri Matilal
Bhartiya, Shri Santosh	Harish Pal, Shri
Bhattacharya, Shrimati Malini	Harsh Vardhan, Shri
Bhattacharya, Shri Nani	Heera Bhai, Shri
Brahmbhatt, Shri Prakash Koko	Hota, Shri Bhabani Shankar
Chakravorty, Shri Susanta	Jena, Shri Srikanta
Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kanti	Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Chatterji, Shri Somnath	Jorawar Ram, Shri
Chavda, Shri Khemchandbhai Somabhai	Kabde, Dr. Venkatesh
Choudhury, Shri Lokanath	Kaushik, Shri Purushottam
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin	Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu	Khan, Haji G M

Khan, Shri Sukhendu	Pal, Shri M.S.
Kundu, Shri Samarendra	Pal, Shri Rupchand
Lodhi, Shri Ganga Charan	Pani, Shri Ravi Narayan
Mahale, Shri Haribhau Shankar	Panwar, Shri Harpal Singh
Mahata, Shri Chitta	Paraste, Shri Dalpat Singh
Mahato, Shri Shailendra	Paswan, Shri Chhedi
Makkasar, Shri Shopat Singh	Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
Malik, Shri Purna Chandra	Paswan, Shri Sukdeo
Malik, Shri Satya Pal	Patel, Shri Ram Pujan
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar	Patnaik, Shri Sivaji
Manjay Lal, Shri	Pramanik, Shri Radhika Ranjan
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed	Prasad, Shri R.S.
Mayekar, Shri Gopalrao	Prem Pradeep, Shri
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Rai, Shri Lalbaboo
Misra, Shri Satyagopal	Rai, Shri M. Ramanna
Montosh, Shri Paul R.	Raju, Shri Bh. Vijayakumar
Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta	Ram Awadh, Shri
Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy	Ram Dhan, Shri
Munda, Shri Govinda Chandra	Ram Sajiwan, Shri
Munjare, Shri Kankar	Ram Singh, Shri
Negi, Shri C.M.	Rao, Shri K. Rama Mohan
Nehru, Shri Arun Kumar	Rasheed Masood, Shri
Nitish Kumar, Shri	Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan
Pacherwal, Shri Gopal	Routray, Shri Nilamani

Roy, Shri A.K.

Roy, Shri Haradhan

Roypradhan, Shri Amar

Samad, Shri Abdul

Sanyal, Shri Manik

Sarwar Hussain, Shri

Sayeed, Shri Mufti Mohammad

Selvarasu, Shri M.

Shakeelur Rehman, Dr.

Shastri, Shri Anil

Shukla, Shri Vidyacharan

Singh, Shri Ajay

Singh, Shri Har Govind

Singh, Shri Hari Kishore

Singh, Shri Mandhata

Singh, Shri Ram Naresh

Singh, Shri Ram Prasad

Singh, Shri Ramashray Prasad

Singh, Shri Surya Narayan

Singh, Shri Tej Narayan

Singh, Shri Vishvendra

Soren, Shri Shibu

Sur, Shri Monoranjan

Tarif Singh, Shri

Taslimudin, Shri

Thapa, Shri Nandu

Tiraky, Shri Piyus

Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran

Tyagi, Shri K.C.

Unnikrishnan, Shri K.P.

Verma, Shri Sheo Sharan

Verma, Shri Upendra Nath

Vijayaraghavan, Shri A.

Yadav, Shri Chun Chun Prasad

Yadav, Shri Devendra Prasad

Yadav, Shri Kailash Nath Singh

Yadav, Shri Mitra Sen

Yadav, Shri Ram Sharan

Yadav, Shri Ramendra Kumar Ravi

Yadav, Dr. S.P.

Yadav, Shri Satyapal Singh

Yadav, Shri Sharad

Yadav, Shri Surya Narayan

Zainal Abedin, Shri

NOES

Abedya Nath, Mahant

Adaikalaraj, Shri L.

Advani, Shri L.K.

Agarwal, Shri J.P.

Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra

Aher, Dr. Daulatrao Sonuji

Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin

Akbar, Shri M.J.

Anbarasu Era, Shri

Antony, Shri P.A.

Antulay, Shri A.R.

Argal, Shri Chhaviram

Arunachalam, Shri M.

Asokaraj, Shri A.

Athithan, Shri Dhanuskodi R.

Atinder Pal Singh, S.

Baga Reddy, Shri M.

Baig, Shri Arif

Bais, Shri Ramesh

Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari

Bala Goud, Shri T.

Balaraman, Shri L.

Bali, Shrimati Vyjayantimala

Bansi Lai, Shri

Basavaraj, Shri G.S.

Basheer, Shri T.

Benjamin, Shri S.

Bhagat, Shri H.K.L.

Bhajan Lai, Shri

Bhakata, Shri Manoranjan

Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram

Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal

Bhatia, Shri Ram Sewak

Bhosle, Shri Prataprao Baburao

Bhoye, Shri Reshma Motiram

Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh

Birender Singh, Rao

Bopche, Dr. Khushal Parasram

Brahm Dutt, Shri

Chand Ram, Shri

Chandra Shekhar, Shri

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M.

Chandrashekharappa, Shri T.V.

Charles, Shri A.

Chaudhary, Shri Ishwar

Chaudhary, Shri Ram Prasad

Chaudhary, Shri Rudrasen

Chaudhry, Shri Kamal

Chauhan, Shri Prabhatsinh

Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai

Chennithala, Shri Ramesh

Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya	Fernandes, Shri Oscar
Chidambaram, Shri P.	Gadgil, Shri V.N.
Chinta Mohan, Dr.	Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
Chowdhary, Shri Dasai	Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath
Chowdhury, Shri A.B.A. Ghani Khan	Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai Devjibhai
Damor, Shri Somjibhai	Gandhi, Shrimati Maneka
Danwe, Shri Pundlik Hai	Gandhi, Shri Rajiv
Das, Shri Bhakta Charan	Gangadhar, Shri S.
Deb Burman, Shri K.B.K.	Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar
Dennis, Shri N.	Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya
Deora, Shri Murli	Giriappa, Shri C.P. Mudala
Deshmukh, Shri Anantrao	Gokhle, Shri Vidyadhar
Deshmukh, Shri Ashok Anandrao	Gommango, Shri Giridhar
Deshmukh, Shri Chandubhai	Gounder, Shri A.S.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan	Gowda, Shri D.M. Putte
Devarajan, Shri B.	Gudadinni, Shri B.K.
Devi Lal, Shri	Gupta, Shri Dharpal Singh
Dhakne, Shri Babanrao	Gupta, Shri Janak Raj
Dhankhar, Ch. Jagdeep	Handoo, Shri Piyare Lal
Dhumal, Prof. Prem Kumar	Het Ram, Shri
Dikshit, Shri Narsingrao	Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.
Dinesh Singh, Shri	Jag Pal Singh, Shri
Dore, Shri Raja Ambanna Nayak	Jai Parkash, Shri
Faleiro, Shri Eduardo	Jamuna, Shri ... J

Janardhanan, Shri Kadambur M.R.	Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
Jangde, Shri Resham Lal	Khanoria, Shri D.D.
Jaswant Singh, Shri	Khurana, Shri Madan Lal
Jatav, Shri Than Singh	Kodikkunnil Shri Suresh
Jātiya, Shri Satyanarayan	Konthala, Shri Rama Krishna
Jawali, Dr. Basavaraj	Krishna, Shri G.
Jayamohan, Shri A.	Krishna Kumar, Shri S.
Jeevarathinam, Shri R.	Kumaramangalam, Shri P.R.
Jhikram, Shri Mohanlal	Kuppuswamy, Shri C.K.
Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal	Kurién, Prof. P.J.
Ju Deo, Shri Dilip Singh	Kushwaha, Shri Jagdish Singh
Kale, Shri Sukhdeo Nandaji	Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri
Kalimuthu, Dr. K.	Made Gowda, Shri G.
Kalka Das, Shri	Mahabir Prasad, Shri
Kalvi, Shri Kalyan Singh	Mahadik, Shri Vamanrao
Kamal Nath, Shri	Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra
Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram	Mahajan, Shri Y.S.
Kamson, Prof. Meijinlung	Maheshwar Singh, Shri
Kapse, Prof. Ram Ganesh	Malhotra, Prof. Vijay Kumar
Kareddula, Kumari Kamalaji	Mallik, Shri Mangaraj
Kasu, Shri Venkata Krishna Reddy	Mallikarjun, Shri
Kataria, Shri Gulab Chand	Mane, Shri R.S.
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila	Manemma, Shrimati T.
Keshari Lal, Shri	Manvar, Shri Balvant

Marbaniang, Shri Peter G.	Nathu, Singh, Shri
Mathew, Shri Palai K.M.	Nayak, Shri Nakul
Meena, Dr. Kirodi Lal	Netam, Shri Arvind
Meena, Shri Nandlal	Nikam, Shri Govindrao
Meghwal, Shri Kailash	Odeyar, Shri Channaiah
Mehta, Shrimati Jayawanti Navinchandra	Oraon, Shrimati Sumati
	Palanisamy, Shri K.C.
Mewar, Shri Mahendra Singh	Pande, Shri Rajmangal
Mishra, Shri Balgopal	Pandey, Prof. Yadu Nath
Mishra, Shri Janeshwar	Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan
Mishra, Shri Raj Mangal	Pandian, Shri D.
Mohamed, Shri E.S.M. Pakeer	Panja, Shri Ajit
Mohammad Shafi, Shri	Paranjpe, Shri Baburao
Mujahid, Shri B.M.	Patel, Dr. A.K.
Munda, Shri Karia	Patel, Shri Arjunbhai
Muralædharan, Shri K.	Patel, Shri Chandresh
Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna	Patel, Shri Maganbhai Manibhai
Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandra Shekara	Patel, Shri Natubhai M.
Muthiah, Shri R.	Patel, Shri Prahlad Singh
Naik, Shri G. Devaraya	Patel, Shri Shantilal Purushottam Das
Naik, Shri Ram	Patel, Shri Somabhai
Naikar, Shri D.K.	Pathak, Shri Harin
Nandi, Shri Yellaiah	Patidar, Shri Rameshwar
Narayanan, Shri K.R.	
Narayanan, Shri P.G.	Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe

Patil, Shri Basavaraj	Rajeswari, Shrimati Basava
Patil, Shri Prakashbapu Vasantao	Raju, Shri M.M. Pallam
Patil, Shri S.T.	Raju, Shri S. Vijaya Rama
Patil, Shri Shankarrao	Raju, Shrimati Uma Gajapathi
Patil, Shri Shivraj V.	Rajveer Singh, Shri
Patil, Shri Uttamrao	Rakesh, Shri R.N.
Patil, Shri Uttamrao Lakmanrao	Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.
Penchalliah, Shri P.	Ram Prakash, Ch.
Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal	Ram Sagar, Shri (Bara Banki)
Phundkar, Shri Bhaoosaheb Pundlik	Ram Sagar, Shri (Saidpur)
Poojary, Shri Ja.ardhana	Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally
Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram	Ramadass, Dr. R.
Prabhu, Shri R.	Ramakrishna, Shri Y.
Pradhani, Shri K.	Ramamurthy, Shri K.
Prasad, Shri R.S.	Rana, Shri Kashiram Chhabildas
Prasad, Shri V. Sreenivasa	Ranga, Prof. N.G.
Purohit, Shri Banwarilal	Rao, Shri J. Chokka
Purushothaman, Shri Vakkom	Rao, Shri J. Vengala
Raghavji, Shri	Rao, Shri K.S.
Rahi, Shri Ram Lal	Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha
Rai, Shri Kalp Nath	Rao, Shri R. Gundu
Rajdev Singh, Shri	Rao, Shri Srinivas
Raje, Shrimati Vasundhara	Rao, Shri V. Krishna
Rajeshwaram, Dr. V.	Rathva, Shri N.J.

Rathod, Shri Uttam	Scindia, Shrimati Vijayaraje
Rathor, Dr. Bhagwan Dass	Sekhar, Shri M.G.
Rawat, Shri Harish	Selvam, Shri Kanci Panneer
Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh	Sema, Shri Shikiho
Reddy, Shri A. Venkata	Shah, Shri Babubhai Meghji
Reddy, Shri B.N.	Shah, Shri Jayantilal Virchandbhai
Reddy, Shri Kotla Vijaya Bhaskara	Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh
Reddy, Shri M.G.	Shakya, Shri Ram Singh
Reddy, Shri P. Narsa	Shankar Lal, Shri
Reddy, Shri R. Surender	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Reddy, Shri Rajamohan	Shanmugam, Shri P.
Reddy, Shri Y.S. Rajasekhar	Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lai
Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya	Sharma, Shri Dharm Pal
Sahay, Shri Subodh Kant	Shastri, Shri Kapil Dev
Sai, Shri A. Pratap	Shekhada, shri Govindbhai Kanjibhai
Sai, Shri A. Larang	Shingada, Shri D.B.
Sai, Shri Nand Kumar	Shiwankar, Prof. Mahadeo
Saini, Shri Gurdial Singh	Shrivastava, Dr. Shailendranath
Saran, Shri Daulat Ram	Sindal, Shri S.B.
Sartaj Singh, Shri	Silvera, Dr. C.
Sathe, Shri Vasant	Singam, Shri Basavapunnaiiah
Save, Shri Moreshwar	Singaravadivel, Shri S.
Sayeed, Shri P.M.	Singh, Shri Anand
Scindia, Shri Madhavrao	Singh Shri Dhanraj

Singh, Shri Dharmgaj

Singh, Shri Jagannath

Singh, Shri Lalit Vijay

Singh, Shri Lokendra

Singh, Prof. N. Tombi

Singh, Shri Ram Bahadur

Singh, Shri Radha Mohan

Singh, Shri Ramdas

Singh, Shri Sukhendra

Singh, Shri Uday Pratap

Singh, Deo, Shri A.N.

Sinha, Shrimat Usha

Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu

Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath

Soz, Prof. Saif-ud-din

Srinivasan, Shri C.

Subedar, Shri

Sukhbuns Kaur, Shrimati

Sultanpuri, Shri K.D.

Suman, Shri Ramji Lal

Sumbrui, Shri Bagun

Sundararaja, Shri N.

Sunil Dutt, Shri

Suryawanshi, Shri Narsingrao

Tarwala, Shri Amratlal Vallabhdas

Thakore, Shri Gabbhaji Mangaji

Thambi Durai, Dr.

Thomas, Prof. K.V.

Thomas, Shri P.C.

Thorat, Shri S.B.

Thungon, Shri P.K.

Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan

Tiwari, Shri Janardan

Uma Bharati, Kumari

Umbrey, Shri Laeta

Vaghela, Shri Shankersinh

Varma, Shri B. Rajaravi

Varma, Shri Dharmesh Prasad

Varma, Shri Ratilal Kalidas

Varma, Shri S.C.

Venkatesan, Shri P.R.S.

Venkatswamy, Shri G.

Verma, Shri Phool Chand

Verma, Shri R.L.P.

Verma, Shrimati Usha

Viswanatham, Dr.

Wadiyar, Shri Srikanta Datta Narasimha
Raja

Yadav, Shri Baleshwar

Yadav, Shri Chhotey Singh

minds the national interest.

Yadav, Shri Hukumdeo Narayan

Yadav, Shri Janardan

Yadava, Shri Ramjilal

Yadvendra Datt, Shri

Yazdani, Dr. Golam

Yuvraj, Shri

MR. SPEAKER : Subject to correction,*
the result of the division is .

Ayes : 142

Noes : 346

The motion was negatived

22.20 hrs.

OBSERVATION BY SPEAKER

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I must congratulate you all for the orderly debate today. The standard of the debate indeed was very high. Despite differences of opinion, approach and outlook, I have no doubt, hon. Members had kept uppermost in their

Today, the country is passing through a very difficult time. There are many problems facing us which need to be tackled. The need of the hour is that the country should remain united to face all the challenges and take the country on its journey to build a strong and prosperous India.

Hon. Members, I am sure, the House would join me unreservedly in appealing to all sections of our people to maintain peace and harmony and promote mutual trust and continue their struggle unitedly with a firm resolve to bring about a total revolution for a bright and prosperous India. Being the chosen representatives of the people belonging to this august House, all of us have to address ourselves most earnestly and sincerely to the task of nation building forgetting all our differences. We have to remind ourselves all the sufferings and sacrifice made by millions of our countrymen to achieve freedom from foreign yoke so that we do nothing which may jeopardise our freedom and dignity. This way alone we can redeem our debt to those martyrs and fulfil the dream of the father of the Nation. Thank you very much.

The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

22.25 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then Adjourned sine die.

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

Ayes : Sarvashri Sarju Prasad Saroj, Hari Kewal Prasad, Pratap Singh, Anwar Ahmed, Kirpal Singh, Sudhir Ray, Ibrahim, Sulaiman Sait, Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi and Simon Marandi

Noes : Sarvashri Manubhai Kotadia, Bega ram, Guman Mal Lodha, Pyarelal Khandelwal, Harmohan Dhawan, Debi Prasad Pal, H.C. Srikantaiah, Sanford Marak, Mankuram Sodi and Yashwantrao Patil.