

decision given by the Supreme Court atleast.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Banatwala Sahab has made a point. He said that 'Ha' and 'Ma' Hindi alphabates of 'Ham' stands for Hindu and Muslim respectively. If 'Ham' are united, no doubt the country will also remain united. A person living in this country be he/she a Hindu or Muslim or Christian or Sikh or Arya Samaji or Jain—is a citizen of this country. We pay him full regard. If they are united, the country is united. But this is not correct to say that if people of two different religions live together, country can not remain united. The country has remained united since time immemorable. The country was one when our muslim brethren were not living in this country and the country were not living in this country and the country has remained are when they are living in India. It will remain one in future also. It's unity does not depend on anybody's sweet will. We were one but I want to know as to why did his party allow the partition of the country in 1947? Why did not you stand up and say that we are one. We do want to part from each other. Do not divide us into two nations. My submission is that this country does not depend on the whims of two communities or two parties. Every country has got its own history and ours is also a very old history. Some people say that our history is five thousand years old and some say that it is five lakh years old. When as some others say that Mahabharat dates back to thousand years old period. Thus, the history of this country is very-very old. Think of these myriad of people who laid there lives for this country. Go through the annuals of Sikh history and you will find that they laid their lives while fighting against the Mughal Experors. Many people were bricked up alive. They have built this country. If a couple of people like you join hands with each other and claim that we are one and so is our country. Merely your saying so will not keep this country united.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I through you, want to say that we are secular because Hindus are in majority in this country. I want Shri Banatwala Sahab to let me know the name of even a single country where muslims are in majority but still that is a secular state. I think there is no such state. Only Hindustan is a country which is secular and not theocratic inspite the fact that Hindus are in majority in this country. No country is a secular state where muslims are in majority. All of them are a theocratic state. Therefore I want to say that secularism is in our blood. This country was never divided in the name of Hindu-Muslim, not it will be divided in the future also. I think you are well aware of the pathetic condition of Hindus in Pakistan. And you

are also aware of the condition of the muslims in Pakistan. Every muslim living in our country is a citizen of India and he is entitled for full respect. He has got the equally respectable status. There is no threat to his life. But in case somebody attempts to tear the tricolour of our country and celebrates the victory of Pakistan in a match against India then Shri Banatwala Ji we will never tolerate such things. Traitor is a traitor— be he Hindu or muslim or Christian or Sikh. A traitor has got no religion to follow. Likewise a patriot has also got no particular religion. The people whose loyalty is with this country and who are with this country, will be provided full protection but the people who are found indulging in anti-national activities have got no place in this country. We will not tolerate them at all. So please do not talk like this.

18.00 hrs.

Further, you have referred to the articles 369, 370 and 371. Banatwala Ji if you go through the constitution, it is written in beginning of that Chapter of Constitution that these are the transitional and temporary articles. If you want, I can read them out and explain the same. These are not permanent articles. These articles were provided for the time being.

Ultimately not have to bring everyone in the main stream. Therefore do not take the support of those transitional and temperary articles. By doing so, you can not oppose the introduction of a Uniform Civil Code.

I want to let you know that you have tried to oppose it by giving the example of Ambedkar.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : It is 6 o'clock now. The time allotted for this Private Member's Bill is already exhausted. There are three or four more speakers left. So, Shall we extent the time by one hour and then take it up next time ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

18.01 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha :-

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Vote on Account) B II, 1997 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th March, 1997 and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.
- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1997 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th March, 1997 and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.
- (iii) In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation Bill, 1997 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th March, 1997 and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill.
- (iv) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 21st March, 1997 agreed without any amendment to the Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1997 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th March, 1997."

18.02 hrs.

RE : AQUACULTURE AUTHORITY BILL

[English]

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (EXCLUDING THE DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND DAIRYING) (SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA) : Sir, the

Supreme Court has today stayed its order to demolish aquaculture farms etc. In view of that, I have informed the House and I am telling it again that I do not want to proceed with the consideration stage of the Bill. If a situation arises then we can think of it. We are giving enough time to the Supreme Court and we will see how they manage it.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : Sir, I have got the details of the Judgement of the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court has given the stay up to 30th April only. If the Bill cannot be passed, then, according to me, the Bill can be sent to a Select Committee. I will tell you why. The Rajya Sabha has passed it. If we send the Bill to a Select Committee, and accordingly I have given a Resolution also, then the Select Committee can scrutinise this Bill in detail and report back to the House in the first week of the next Session. So, the scrutiny of the Bill can be completed and if the Committee can apply its mind, it would be better. Otherwise, if it is not done, what will happen is—10th is the last date—that we have to consider it in a hurry. So, in order to avoid any hurry, if we appoint a Select Committee, that Select Committee can go through the Bill in the recess and report back to Parliament. That way, the Bill can be complete in all respects and it will be easy for the House also to pass it. The time which has been given by the Supreme Court should be utilised by us and do a perfect job. For doing that perfect job we should constitute a Select Committee.

Sir, Select Committee can also be of one House only. It can not be a Joint Select Committee in this case because the Rajya Sabha has already passed the Bill. If we have a Select Committee comprising the Members of Lok Sabha from the coastal States, then we can go through different States, study the problem, have a proper deliberation and we can come with the report in the first week of the next Session. That should be done. Accordingly, Sir, I have submitted the Resolution, and I appeal to the Government that if such a Committee is constituted, it will help because along with the aquaculture problem, there is also the serious problem of the traditional fishermen. The traditional fishermen have started opposing these aquaculture farms. Both these things have to be considered in an integrated way. The traditional fishermen have started their agitation. Earlier, the House could deliberate and we could unanimously arrive at the deep sea fishing policy last year. Similarly, on this aquaculture also, we can do the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER : I think you have made your point.

SHRI RAM NAIK : That is why, I suggest that