

**12.03 hrs.**

**Title:** Regarding current situation in Ayodhya in the wake of Supreme Court Judgement on Ram Janama-bhumi-Babri Masjid Issue.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to make a statement on the Supreme Court's interim order yesterday on the Ayodhya issue.

At the outset, I wish to categorically and unambiguously state that the Government will implement the Court's order in letter and spirit. I had said this in the Lok Sabha on March 11 even before the Court had delivered its ruling. I reiterate it today.

I have said on numerous occasions, both in Parliament and outside, that the Ayodhya issue can be resolved either through a mutual agreement between the concerned parties or through a judicial verdict. The same was also restated by the Government through the President's Address to the two Houses of Parliament on February 25, 2002.

The Government has requested the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court to expeditiously give its verdict on the title suit in respect of the disputed site in Ayodhya. Simultaneously, in the past few weeks, I have received several organisations and individuals belonging to both Hindu and Muslim communities for a consultation on the Ayodhya issue. The Government is pleased that a dialogue process between representatives of the two communities has resumed. His Holiness Jagadguru Shankaracharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham held discussions with members of certain Muslim organisations and eminent Muslim individuals on a possible basis for an amicable and mutually acceptable resolution of the issue.

Although his efforts have so far not yielded the desired results, the Government believes that the dialogue between representatives of the two communities should continue. If negotiations do not produce a mutually agreeable resolution of the issue, both sides should abide by the court's verdict.

The Government received a letter from the *Ram Janmabhoomi Nyas* on March 8, 2002 requesting permission for performing a symbolic puja on March 15 on the acquired undisputed land in Ayodhya as a part of its hundred-day *Poomahuti Yagya*. The *Nyas* is a permanent lessee of 42 out of 67 acres of this acquired land, adjacent to the disputed site in Ayodhya. It is also the owner of an additional one acre, out of this acquired undisputed land.

Before the Government could decide on this matter, a write petition was filed in the Supreme Court by Shri Mohammed Aslam Bhure seeking, among other things, that the Court prohibit the Government from permitting the performance of puja on the acquired land. The Court listed the petition and application for various directions for hearing on March 13.

The Government then took the view that the decision to allow a puja or not would be in accordance with the orders that may be passed by the Supreme Court on March 13.

No affidavit or written submissions were filed on behalf of the Government. It was only after the conclusion of the petitioner's Counsel's arguments, on being asked by the Court, that the Attorney General submitted that, on his reading and interpretation of the Supreme Court's judgement in Farooqui's case in 1994, temporary use of the undisputed adjacent land for the purpose of performing puja was not, *per se*, prohibited and would not violate the *status quo* order passed by the Supreme Court as this *status quo* order was referable only to the disputed site and not to the undisputed acquired land.

The Government had made this point clear through the President's address to the two Houses of Parliament on February 25, 2002. I quote the relevant sentence: "The Government of India, being the statutory receiver, is duty bound to maintain the *status quo* at the disputed site in Ayodhya".

It is the Constitutional duty of the Attorney General to interpret a law or a judgement of the Court, when asked by the Court to do so. This is what the Attorney General did when the Supreme Court asked him yesterday if a symbolic puja on the undisputed acquired land in Ayodhya was permissible.

The Attorney General submitted that, even if the puja was not prohibited by any previous judgement or order of the Supreme Court, the same could be permitted only under well-defined conditions and strict restrictions, which, by way of illustration, he indicated for the Court's consideration. He further stressed that if any further safeguards and restrictions were considered necessary, the same could be imposed by the court.

The Court, however, expressed the view that no puja or religious activity of any kind should be permitted or allowed to take place on the 67 acres of land in village Kot Ramachandra, which is vested with the Central Government.

The Court made it clear that its order was an *interim* order and was subject to further orders, which may be passed in the pending writ petition.

It is clear from all this that the Government has kept its commitment of going by the order of the Supreme Court in the matter of a symbolic puja on the undisputed acquired land in Ayodhya on March 15.

I wish to assure the House that adequate preparations have been made to maintain law and order in Ayodhya and to ensure that the 13<sup>th</sup> March order of the Supreme Court is adhered to.

I take this opportunity to appeal to all the political and non-political organisations across the country to co-operate with the Central Government as well as with respective State Governments to maintain peace and communal harmony.

**(Placed in Library, See No. LT 5159/2002)...(Interruptions)**

DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, you know in this House we do not have the convention to seek any clarifications on a statement. Whether you want to have a discussion on this or not is a separate matter and I cannot decide about that now. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Since this matter is very sensitive, some leaders of parties would be allowed to seek clarifications as a special case. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, let us hear Shri Jaipal Reddy dispassionately. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Mandal, please sit quietly. â€¦ *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Reddy, only small clarifications, please.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (MIRYALGUDA): Sir, the Prime Minister's statement, far from dispelling the clouds, has got our doubts compounded. ...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, I appeal to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to see that the order is restored. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Sir, if they behave like this and not allow us to make our submissions, we will also do the same thing. This is not the way to behave in the House. ...*(Interruptions)* Their own Prime Minister is asking for cooperation from others and their own party is preventing others from speaking! ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, on December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2000, we witnessed the slip of the famous mask of the Prime Minister. â€¦ *(Interruptions)* The Prime Minister had chosen to dump that alluring mask on the dung heap for ever.

DR. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (SOUTH DELHI): Sir, is it a clarification? He has to seek clarifications.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am supposed to react to Prime Minister's statement. ...*(Interruptions)* Sir, now we can see our Prime Minister in his pristine *Hindutva* glory. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Sir, the Minister is disturbing.â€¦ *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: Sir, how can you allow him to give a speech?â€¦ *(Interruptions)*

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): Sir, they should decide whether they would allow the House to continue. What is going on here? ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Yesterday, in our considered view, the Prime Minister played ..\* on the nation. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): Sir, he should withdraw that word.â€¦ *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Reddy, you please ask your clarification. ...*(Interruptions)*

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI VAIKO : Sir, he should withdraw that word. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, how can he say that? ...*(Interruptions)* He cannot say that. He will have to withdraw his words. ...*(Interruptions)* How can he say that?...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, he will have to withdraw those words...*(Interruptions)* How dare he say that?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO : He should withdraw those words and apologise ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As a special case, I have allowed clarifications, but no one is allowing anybody to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO : He should apologise first...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: - Hon. Members, I request you all to please go to your seats. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : He should withdraw those words.â€¦! *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please go to your seats. I will ask him. ...*(Interruptions)*

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (वैशाली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह देश के साथ धोखा-धड़ी है। माफी प्रधानमंत्री मांगे! (व्यवधान)

SHRI VAIKO : He should withdraw those words, and apologise.â€¦! *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If there is anything objectionable, I will not allow. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VAIKO : Let him apologise...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will you please go back to your seats? I have to say something. pp *(Interruptions)*

श्री शिवराज सिंह चौहान (विदिशा) : जयपाल रेड्डी जी माफी मांगे, नहीं तो हाउस नहीं चलेगा।! (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Will you please go back to your seats?â€¦! *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 2.00 p.m.

**12.23 hrs**

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Fourteen of the Clock

**14.00 hrs**

***The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Fourteen of the Clock.***

***(Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)***

***...*(Interruptions)****

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You go to your place. I will say something. You allow me to say something. If you go to your place, I will ask him. You just go to your places. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Vaiko, if there is anything unparliamentary, I will expunge it. ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री प्रियरंजन दासमुंशी (रायगंज) : माफी मांगने की कोई बात नहीं है। अगर कुछ अनपार्लियामेंट्री है तो वह रिकार्ड से निकाला जा सकता है। ज़बर्दस्ती से कुछ नहीं होगा। â€¦! (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you go to your place, I will say something. I will ask him. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You resume your seats. I will ask him. You go back to your seats. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will look into the records and if it is unparliamentary, I will treat it accordingly. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If it is unparliamentary, I will expunge it. You please go to your seats. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you go back to your seats, I would say what I want to say. If you do not go back to your seats, how can I say something? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on 15<sup>th</sup> March, 2002.

**14.05 hrs**

*Friday, March*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock  
on Fr 15, 2002/Phalguna 24, 1923 (Saka).