

[Placed in Library See No - LT
2364/92]

**Memorandum of Understan between
the National Industrial Department
Corporation Ltd and the Deptl of
Heavy Industry for 1992-93 etc.**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (DEPARTMENT
OF HEAVY INDUSTRY AND DEPART-
MENT OF PUBLIC ENTERPRISES) (SHRI
P.K THUNGONON): I beg to lay on the
table a copy each of the following papers
(Hindi and English versions):-

- (1) Memorandum of Understanding
between the National Industrial
Development Corporation
Limited and the Department of
Heavy Industry, Ministry of
Industry, for the year 1992-93.
- (2) Memorandum of Understanding
between the Bharat Yatra
Nigam Limited and the Depart-
ment of Heavy Industry, Ministry
of Industry, for the year 1992 -93

[Placed om Library See No. LT
- 2366/92]

**Memorandum of understanding
between the Neyvell Lignite Corpo-
ration Ltd. and the Ministry of Coal
for 1992 -93**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (DEPARTMENT
OF HEAVY INDUSTRY AND DEPART-
MENT OF PUBLIC ENTERPRISES) (SHRI
P.K. THONGON): Sir, on behalf of Shri S.B.
Nyamagouda. I beg to lay on the table a
copy of the Memorandum of Understanding
(Hindi and English versions) between the
Neyvell Lignite Corporation Limited and the
Ministry of Coal for the year 1992-93.

[Placed in Library See No. LT -2367/
92]

**COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS'
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports

[English]

SHRI S. MALLIKARJUNAIAH
(Tumkur): Sir, I beg to present the Twelfth
and Thirteenth Reports (Hindi and English
versions) of the Committee on Private
Members' Bills and Resolutions.

14.05 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

**Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid
Dispute- CONTD.**

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we will take up
Discussion under Rule 193 on Ram Janma
Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute raised
by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury. Shri Syed
Shahabuddin may speak now.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN
(Kishaganj): Mr. Speaker Sir, the nation
has just emerged out of seventeen days of
agony, shock, sorrow, anger, pain and
tension which shook the very foundation of
the republic. Sir, we passed through
successive waves of hope and despair,
euphoria and frustration and finally, we all
heaved a sigh of relief. We have got a
breathe we have got the respite; I welcome
it. Sir, the Prime Minister did secure a
stoppage of the illegal construction on the
disputed site in Ayodhya. I do not know
whether it can be described as a tactical
retreat by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and
its allies or a tactical surrender by the
Government to the forces which chal-
lenged the very Constlution of the land,
defied the law, burnet the effigies of the
judges and tried to terrorism the judiciary
and the executive and raised war cries all
over the place. History will tell. The next

[Sh. Syed Shabuddin] three or four months will tell. But Sir, permit me to make a remark that negotiations with forces which had held the country to ransom almost touched the dignity of the nation. Sir, we have faced forces challenging the Constitution many a time in the history of the republic. We are facing them today in Punjab and in Jammu and Kashmir and we are using all the means at our disposal to maintain the dignity of our republic.

Sir I feel that in Ayodhya, we failed in our ego. The Government seems to have adopted a policy, for nearly two weeks, of evasion, inaction, dithering and diffidence and had sought one excuse after another, one alibi after another. The CCPA has met; the Home Minister is visiting Ayodhya; the High Court is deliberating; the NIC is going to meet. The State Government has been informing and has been sending assurances and of course, finally the Supreme Court is now engaged. But even after the Supreme Court made a clear-cut observation, it was said, "Well, it is only an observation and not an order." However, we can forgive all that. We can forget all that for the sake of peace in our society and for the sake of social harmony, if indeed, in the next three months, we can see the light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. Speaker Sir, we have come through a unique situation in our history. There was three-way confrontation, a confrontation between the Centre and the State, a confrontation between the executive and the judiciary and a confrontation unlike the other two, which I would welcome, between the secular forces on the one side and the chauvinist forces on the other side. This was the time to have affirmed the sanctity of the secular principles, there was time to affirm the will of the republic. And here, Sir, I feel that something was left done by the Government. I am hopeful the people have affirmed their sanity all over the country. There was hardly any excitement. We lived with bated breath. We were fearing what might happen. And Mr. Choudhary quoted

the *Pioneer* poll results. Ninety per cent of the Muslims of the country support the construction of a temple in Ayodhya and 80 per cent of the Hindus of our country do not want the mosque to be demolished or damaged in any way. This is the sanity of our people. It is on this sanity that we must build the castles of the future. The must give us hope and optimism that a reasonable solution can be found and an amicable settlement of solution can be reached. But I would only like to sound a note of caution for the Government. In the immortal words of late President Kennedy,

"Let us not fear to negotiate, but never negotiate out of fear." The Government should never negotiate with the forces which are challenging the Constitution of India, out of fear.

Sir, I would like to refer briefly to what the hon. Member from Varanasi Shri Dukshit has said here. I will not go into all the details; that will need a lot of time. But I am very happy that he has projected himself and the forces that he represents as law abiding force. That is precisely what we would like him to be and that is precisely what we would like him to do. The fact is, the idols are kept inside the masjid because of a status quo order. The Bhog Pooja by the Poojari go on inside the masjid because of *status quo* order of 1950. The public has access for *darshan* to the idols inside, on the basis of a court order. The Shilanyas was performed on the basis of a duly signed agreement, as has been reported, between the Government of the day and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad.

But why this selective acceptance of the law I do not understand! If you are a law abiding citizen, there should be no question about your accepting the final verdict of the court on the mayar question which is, the title to the property in dispute. So, you lap up and grab every favourable order and then say, "We shall accept the final verdict of the Supreme Court only if it is in our favour." I cannot understand this logic. Similarly, another hon. Member said, "it is for those who challenge us, to prove

where Ram was born." I think in all jurisprudence all over the world, it is the party which makes a claim, has to support it with evidence. They cannot throw the onus of the burden of proof on the other side. These are the deviations from the norm. That show a mind which does not accept the normal rules of the law and the normal procedure and banks itself only on arousing passions and sentiments and thus tries to win over or terrorise or pressurise people into acceptance. I would request Shri Dikshit not to be selective in his acceptance of the rule of the law.

Some questions have been raised here. It has been said that religion is like Gangs and it does not know any Constitution. But rivers all over the world obey human will. Sometimes a dam is put across, then sometimes a dyke is built and sometimes bundhs are constructed in order to channalise the flow. Therefore, I do not accept that in a Republic like ours, which is based on the a rule of law, religion can be totally above it. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMI (Baddaun): Why didn't you accept the court court verdict in the shan Bano care?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Speaker Sir, I am only that there are innumer old cases in our courts, where purely religious questions have been decided by the High courts, including as to who shall be the Mahant or who shall be a Shankaracharya, what should be the size of a pooja Laddoo, what should be the mark on the forehead of a ceremonial elephant and so on. Courts have ruled that matters of religion are not above law, but they have to be decided in accordance with the internal evidence of the religion. Therefore, such religious questions can be decided by the court and the court is the appropriate authority. It has to decide not on any other extraneous evidence but on the internal evidence of that religious school. That must be binding. Now, on

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute
Shah Bane Case, I had replied many time...

MR. SPEAKER: There are many others who want to speak. Please leave out Shah Bano Case and conclude.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Are right Sir, leave it.

I would like to know something about the statement of from the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has not mentioned the date of 9th July in his statement. I noted it for the third time. He did not mention it in his first statement of the 9th July; he also did not mention it in his reply to the No-Confidence Motion; he also did not mention it in this statement. I wonder whether it is matter of present policy and a deliberate policy of omission or sub-conscious lapse; I do not know. The world knows that something terrible happened on the 9th July; and the World has to take note of the fact that here is a Prime Minister who does not even mention the date of the terrible happening.

I am thankful to the Prime Minister for saying in a para of his statement that the mosque shall not be dismantled. I am happy that he is not referring to it as a dilapidated or as a disputed structure; he is referring to it as a masjid. This is precisely how the State Government had described it in their affidavit of 1950, which is part of the proceedings of the court, which forms the basic background of the case. The statement suggests that if negotiations fail – and I hope and pray they will not – all pending litigations shall be referred to one judicial authority.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): I am on a point of order. This is the second time that a Private Member was talking to the Official Gallery. He has left. Only three days ago, we drew the attention of the House and the Chair also that this was happening. Today also, I

[Sh. Syed Shabuddin]
stand up to draw the attention of the Chair that this is happening.

MR. SPEAKER: We will look into it.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: If a specific question is referred to a duly constituted judicial authority with the consent of the parties, it is a different matter. But, in a normal suit like the title suit, which is now pending before the special bench of the Allahabad High Court, in that case, any of the parties has a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The right of appeal is a valuable right; and I don't think that any party would like to be satisfied with the denial of the right of appeal.

Finally, the crux of the issue today is not the construction of the temple, as I said; it is a question of the location of the proposed temple. The NIC has given a clear-cut ruling; it reflects the consensus of the nation.

[Translation]

Let the temple be Contracted without demalition of the mosque

[English]

It implies that the present site plan of the VHP, which includes the Babri Masjid site is not acceptable to the nation, is against the consensus of the nation. The Prime Minister has lost Seven precious months; It is his duty now to call the VHP and request them, implead with them please for God's sake revise your site plan and bring it within the framework of the NIC's resolution. I can assure you that a settlement can be reached on this question within three days, no more than that is required. I can assure you on behalf of the Muslim community that if in the revised site Plan, any site which belongs to the Muslim community falls, the Muslim community will consider giving it away and denoting it for the larger cause of the nation.

Today, the Babri Masjid has become a symbol; it is not a religious question. I said it also the other day that it has become symbol of struggle on our secularism for democracy, for the values that this country stands for, for mutual co-existence and for the survival of the civilised society in our country.

I wish the Prime Minister Godspeed and I hope that within the next three-four months he will show us some light at the end of the tunnel.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIR AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (SHRI KAMALUDDIN AHMED): Mr. Speaker, Sir we are discussion this very serious matter which had, a few days back, thrown the entire nation into an atmosphere of despair. We have all heard just now the hon. Member, Syed Shahabuddin. I was not able to understand how he was drawing the parallels between the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and the situation in Punjab with this Ayodhya issue. His entire speech, to my understanding was full of paradoxes. He was quoting Kennedy. I do not know in what context Kennedy had said that and I do not think that that saying is relevant today. History, has given an opportunity to us today. The challenge, which was a very serious challenge, can be converted into an opportunity. If we seriously, sincerely and honestly sit and try to find a solution, I am hundred per cent sure, solution can be found. The way the whole issue had dragged on, the whole issue which did not assume any publicity or any seriousness before 1986-87 had all of a sudden become a very explosive issue. People who are responsible to make it serious, I do not think they are here, had done the greatest damage to this nation. Why I was submitting that this challenge can be converted into an opportunity, is that we have to remind ourselves.

I am not an intellectual, I am not a *Medhavi* but many hon. Members sitting in this House are definitely intellectuals. They

know the history of this nation. The only thing to which I want to draw your attention is that the entire people in this country are one.

If we look into the history of this country from the point of traceability, say for a period of 2000 or 3000 years, one basic fact we can understand is that all the people are one. The incoming of the religions was a subsequent matter. I do not think the entire Muslim population here, which is almost about 8 to 10 crores or whatever it is, came from Arab countries or any other country. 90 to 95 per cent of them have embraced this religion on this very soil. They have not come from outside and people belonging to different communities have accepted them.

The fact of the history is that a 'Jat', accepting a Muslim religion or Islamic religion, remained a 'Jat' even after accepting Muslims. The Brahmins who converted themselves into Islam have kept their identity intact. They never eschewed their name. Along with their names Bhattas, Choudhuryas and Kunwars, all these things remained the same.

What I submit is that the oneness of the people should not be forgotten. And when I say this, perhaps I am also including the entire sub-continent for that matter. The division of this country on the basis of religion was a political division and political division of this country has taken place umpteen times, not once. Umpteen times the Central Government has lost its authority because of various reasons. We have to remember the fact, during the period of Emperors and Kings. During Emperor Ashoka's time the Indian nation, the country as such, included Afghanistan also.

The authority of the Central Government whenever it was disintegrated, the country broke into many pieces.

But again, the oneness of the people integrated the entire country again, the

whole nation again. If our country had been divided in 1947 on the basis of religion, I humbly submit that that division was political and was on unnatural grounds. And that was proved in the war of 1970 when Bangladesh seceded from Pakistan.

Religion was no more a binding force. This fact of history we have to understand and I only respectfully request the hon. Members and this august House that this opportunity which has come to us in the shape of the Ayodhya issue, we must utilise as a matter to consolidate the people, to integrate the people. We can talk many things. The matter can be further complicated by just saying something irresponsibly. But this is not the time. This is the time that we sit.

I am sure, our Prime Minister to whom the entire nation has paid tributes, who has earned the admiration and appreciation of the entire country, is capable of solving this issue. I have no doubt about that. I have seen in my association with him for the last 33 years in my political life, that he has always worked and stood for the integration of areas, integration of the people and integration of all right thinking sections. To this problem also, though very very complicated, having many dimensions, I am sure, he will find solution. All that is needed is, he needs the cooperation of all of us and we should extend our cooperation not by complicating the problem.

I have seen some of the statements made in the Press. Perhaps it gives an impression that some people are not happy with the Prime Minister's success, the immediate success that he got, the way he defused the situation. Some people appeared so. At least I got that impression from their statements that they are not very happy. I am not finding fault with anybody.

All that I am requesting is this is the time when we must unite the people. i. Religion is a matter of personal faith and personal discipline. That should be kept aside. So far as our integral life is

[Sh. Kamaluddin Ahmed]
concerned so far as our national life is concerned, we have to work for that and we have to integrate this nation and we must emerge as a strong nation. All that the Prime Minister is doing is that. Even we have to find a solution according to our manifesto. We have to find a negotiated settlement.

Suppose the negotiations fail and we are not able to find a solution then matter is referred to the judicial authority and judicial judgment. All that he is doing is that even after their giving a judicial judgment also to make it acceptable, not to enforce the judgment. No court judgment can be enforced in a matter like this.

What I am submitting is that all his efforts are to make the judgment acceptable to the entire country and in this effort I humbly request you all that you kindly cooperate with the Prime Minister and give him the strength and make him strong enough to find a solution for this.

[Translation]

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH (Gorakhpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir the Prime Minister had a discussion with holy men, which I also shared.

Sir, I am sorry to say that the value of this discussion that took place in a cordial atmosphere comes to an end with the debate which has been raised in the House today in connection with this discussion. In the entire discussion there are two main issues.

The first thing is that where the Prime Minister is setting a time limit of 4 months, of course, he had said 4 months, but this time limit of four months does not suit us... Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh had taken time of 4 months, but even in ten months he did not try to solve this issue. So the Government should not insist on a time of four months, it should rather reduce it. We had said that the time of five months could be taken in case we see that the discussion

is going in the right direction... (Interruptions)... I know that you want to divert my attention by interrupting me. I would like to present facts before you about which there is lot of confusion. Sir, the Prime Minister had said that he would refer all the cases to a judge of the Supreme Court or a body of judges. The Prime Minister is sitting here, even he had mentioned the name of Chandra Shekharji and said that Chandra Shekhar Ji had taken an initiative in this direction and he had also said at the same time that Rajiv Gandhi ji had written a letter to Chandra Shekhar ji, which he had received. This House know that Chandra Shekharji had not talked of bringing all the cases before the Supreme Court. If this had been his intention, then perhaps he would not have asked for evidence from both the parties, because the evidence from both the parties have already been filed in the Court. He had asked both the parties to produce their respective evidence and that too on one point and on one issue. If it is proved on the basis of these evidences that any temple or structure has been broken down and a Masjid has been erected, then the Muslim brethren will take their claims back, and if it is proved from evidences, from the views of the specialists of the archaeological department or from the revenue record or by any other means that this structure has been made upon such a place where previously there was no structure, then the Hindus will give up their claims. The thought was very good. Such circumstances exist in the country that the entire nation is worried over this problem. We are absolutely convinced that this Masjid has been erected after breaking down the Ram-Janam Bhoomi temple and that is why Chandra Shekhar ji's formula was considered by us to be a rational formula but unfortunately he did not remain the Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister, Shri Rao Sahib made a mention of it, we thought that where Chandra Shekharji has left this work incomplete the Prime Minister will take some further action in this matter. I understand that this is a right way. Today, where our faith is attacked... (Interruptions)... as far as the question of faith is concerned, we

say that thousands of temples in this country have been broken down. Who can deny this, history is replete with this. We are not demanding those temples. Today, all traces have been wiped off and we have shown patience. Today we are demanding Ram-Janam-Bhoomi. There is some basis for the Vishwanath temple and the Krishna Janam-bhoomi temple, some logic is there, and we have faith here, you can yourself go to Ayodhya and see. When, the entire structure could have been changed there, then even different pillars could have been erected. The pillars of a temple have been erected there. Together with that, you will find nowhere in the entire world others' place of workshop at the door of any Masjid but in Ayodhya lord Ram's platform is there and the Hindu exercise patience and instead of going inside he makes offerings outside. Today, this is not anything new, in the Muslim period, since Akbara; times, all this is happening.

Sir, I would like to ask why these signs have been left. The same is the case with the Vishwanath temple. They could have changed the entire structure. You may go there and see a wall which has the signs of the Hindu temple, conch, bell and trident (Trishul) and you will find nowhere in the world a Nandi in front of the Masjid but even today there is a Nandi there. I would like to say that if this House wants Hindu-Muslim unity honestly, then these signs of humiliating Hindus, can never establish Hindu-Muslim unity. This was the mentality of the Muslim rulers that the pillars of the temple were kept there for reminding Hindus for thousands of years that they are cowards and that this Masjid has been erected after breaking down their temple. You know that in the Vishwanath temple too, only one wall is left which and the Nandi which has been kept there, have been kept there as proof just to remind the Hindus for hundreds of years of their humiliation and miserable condition. I would like to ask whether Hindu Muslim unity is possible in the country by keeping these signs there. Abedya Nath can sit, he can keep mum but can the crores of Hindus in this country feel

that they are also independent in this country when they see these signs of humiliation. Mere satisfaction of one, hunger is not independence. In the country in which, the religion, the culture and the temple of any caste is not respected, in that country no caste can ever be made independent. *(Interruptions)*

I say that there have been speeches regarding the protection of temples and mosques if these temples and mosques had been given due regard by these people, then there would have been no need to pass a Bill a few days back in this House to maintain status quo as on 15 August, 1947 in respect places of worship but the people who are today creating a hue and cry for the protection of the disputed Masjid, why have they not brought Kashmir within the purview of this Bill? Many temples have been demolished in Kashmir after 15 August, 1947. Is any regard not given to them since they happen to be the temples of Hindus? Has anyone asked to bring Kashmir within the purview of this Bill? Today, these broken temples in Kashmir are there to insult the Hindus, the Places of Worship Bill has not been enforced there because these people are followers of mosque. I would like to say that if you honestly want secularism, you will have to regard the temple and the mosque equally only then you can satisfy others.

I think that the efforts made by the Prime Minister in this matter are praiseworthy but the way he has got this issue discussed in the House and the way accusation are made here is not the way to solve the problem. I would like to tell the House that Hindu can never tolerate the sing of the Masjid on the temple...*(Interruption)* As far as the question of faith is concerned, I would like to say that...*(Interruptions)* We shall give proofs regarding our faith...*(Interruptions)*...

Sir, as far as the question of faith is concerned, no court can give a decision regarding matters pertaining to faith...*(Interruptions)*... It is not a contempt

Mahant Abeya Nath]

of court but no court can has any right to give its decision against any faith, that is why when we oppose the decision of the courts... (Interruptions) I want to say that the atmosphere which has been created here and the politic of accusation can never be conducive to a solution to the problem. These people do not want that the problem should be solved but we have stated that we want a solution to the problem. We postponed *kar seva* after accepting the Prime Minister's statement, had we wanted, we would not have done so, come what may, but we thought that some solution would emerge. If the Prime Minister of the country is saying, then quite decisively a solution will emerge, but I am sorry as nothing has come out. The Prime Minister may clarify on what basis Chandra Shekhar had suggested the way of compromise, had he not made a mention of it, all saints thought that the way Chandra Shekhar had called for: the proofs from both sides, it was certain that he may seek opinion of the judges of the Supreme Court. But when the issue of the judges of the Supreme Court was discussed nothing was said regarding the decision of any court, only the issue of taking help was discussed, so that the opinions of both sides should come. That is why I would like to say that our faith has a basis. Not only the Hindu and Christian and other historians but the most learned scholar of the Muslim world—Ail Miya's father wrote a book called "Islam in India", in which he has clearly written, that where 6-7 temples were demolished to construct a mosque, in Ayodhya the Ram_Janm-Bhoomi temple was demolished to construct a mosque. In the same way, Aurangzeb's granddaughter has made it clear and several Muslim hasitorians have written that the mosque has been constructed here after demolishing the temple. That is why we have this faith because the signs of the temple still exist there. If we are keen to solve this problem, if we desire Hindu-Muslim unity, we should work in a liberal way.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not blame the Muslims of today for this nor do I hold them

guilty but this is happening because of the misdoeds committed by Babur and Aurangzeb sereral years back. Had the Muslims of today understood the sentiments of the Hindus, no difficulty would have arison. After the creation of Pakistan many of our holy places and pilgrimages have gone to Pakistan, after a division on the basis of religion, the temples and places of honour of the Hindus are being insulted here in the same way as they were under the Muslim rule... (Interruptions)

I think you do not like what I am saying, that is why you are ringing the bell... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Actually everyone has co-operated with us or what has happened in our country during these 2-3 days. It is good that the Prime Minister initiated it and everyone cooperated. Some thing good can happen in the future because of this, keeping this in mind, if you talk, there will be the welfare of the country as well as there will be welfare of all of us... (Interruptions)

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH: I rose to give certain suggestions in this regard. I started my speech in a very cordial atmosphere.

MR. SPEAKER: This cordial atmosphere should not be spoiled.

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH: Had we any intention to spoil this atmosphere, we would not have agreed to the proposal of the hon. Prime Minister. We want that the hon. Prime minister should be given an opportunity. Since earlier other hon. Prime Ministers were also given a chance, why he too should not be given? We have yielded to you, with the hope that the discussion will be started in a cordial atmosphere. But the manner in which allegations are being made and sarcastic remarks are being passed it will not improve the situation. All the leaders of the whole country are present here, this is the high st body of the country and no problem will be solved by passing

sarcastic remarks in this manner. Today it was expected that the discussions will be held in a cordial atmosphere, but these persons think that the Hindus have no right to live with honour. As long as such people remain in these institutions this problem cannot be solved (*Interruptions*)

Unless the atmosphere is improved, this problem cannot be solved (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): When your leader Shri Indrajit Gupta was speaking, we were hearing him with great patience, but where our Saints are speaking you should also not interrupt them (*Interruptions*)

MAHANT ABEDYA NATH: I want to point to you as to how this problem can be solved. Merely changing history will not help. Just now Shri Antulay said that the Hindus and the Muslims were living in amity. He has forgotten the history. Why two sons of Govind Singh were buried alive in a wall? Why Guru Teg Bahadurji was assassinated? Was it a religious amity? The Government is altering history. I urge upon to forget the oddities of the past. The B.J.P. should also try to forget it... (*interruptions*) The hon. Prime Minister wanted three months' time. We are to say that we shall give the Government four months' time. But the problem can never be resolved, if it works with these persons who are habitual of passing sarcastic remarks. Those persons whom the Government has selected to assist in solving this problem, will add fuel to the fire. I conclude with these words and express my thanks.

MR. SPEAKER: We are trying to start the discussion in a very cordial manner. I understand that every person is speaking here with a few to find a way out to this problem. If we do not like certain things in a speech, we can leave it. I believe that except one or two persons all the members who are participating in this discussion are speaking very carefully. Others are re-

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute
 requested not to create any disturbance. Particularly Mr. Joshi you should not speak anything.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar may speak now. I hope you will bear in mind what I have said.

SHRI MANI SHAKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the agreement which the Government of India has reached with the forces of 'Hindutwa'. I am filled with appreciation over this agreement. At the same time I would be less than true to myself if I did not also confess that I am filled with apprehension.

I am filled with appreciation because quite palatable the kind of tension that was rising in this country in the last two weeks has been, to a very significant extent, allayed. I am filled with appreciation because a road has been opened. I am filled with appreciation because I do see light at the end of the tunnel. At the same time, Sir, I cannot hide my feelings of apprehension because this is not the first agreement that has been reached in recent years with the forces of 'Hindutva'. I hope this will be the first such agreement that is not broken by those forces.

However, Sir, my apprehensions have been stated somewhat by the statements that we have heard yesterday and today from certain *Sants, Sadhus, Swamis and Mahants* who have come here to bless this House.

What is this agreement? This is an agreement which is not on substance but an agreement... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): Sir, I have a point of order. My point of order is that while referring to some Members, hon. Member Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar has said that some *Sants* and *Mahants* have come to bless this House. I object to the words

[Sh. Ram Kapse]

'bless this House'. I think everybody here is a Member. He is working here in the capacity of a Member and not in any other capacity. So, such language does not help in any way for the solution of the problem. I strongly object to it and I request that it should be expunged from the records.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: Sir, I will withdraw my words. But I hope that my friends, the *Sants* and *Mehants* will not withdraw their blessings from me.

Sir, I want to put this agreement in perspective. This is not an agreement on substance. This is an agreement on procedures. On matters of substance, I, for one, am not asking the BJP to change its views. I have very serious disagreements with the Bharatiya Janata Party. I neither accept their view of our past, nor do I accept their view of our future. I do not accept their definitions of Indian civilisation and Indian culture; I do not accept what they conceive to be the soul of India and my concept of the nationhood of India is entirely different to theirs. As a decent human being I cannot agree with the Bharatiya Janata Party, but as a democrat, I defend their right to be different. It is the essence of democracy that if a point of view is validly held, that point of view can be expressed and that point of view can be pursued through the political and the democratic process. What I want to know is really the answer to the question that was implicit in the interjection of the gentleman who has just now raised a point of order. What I want to know is, as Members of Parliament and. I am talking about the narrow of the human that comes in here — I am not talking about the larger part of the human being that looks after the family, belongs to a religion. Belongs to a society when within the precincts of this House, we take an oath, which we swear in the name of God if we wish to or an oath which we merely solemnly pledge to uphold the Constitution and if there is a clash between such a pledge, such an oath and a private pledge or private oath, which is

the one that will prevail?

As Individuals, I respect, I deeply honour the right of anyone to take a *Saugandh* to take a promise; I respect the right of an individual to say *Hinu Raiv ki Savger the khate Hain; di mater to do whatever they wish to do.* I respect that right. At the same time, I want to know whether the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. L. K. Advani will confirm when he intervenes in the course of this discussion that in the event of there being a contradiction of any kind between the oath which we, as Members of Parliament, have taken to this Constitution and any personal oath that one might have taken for any purpose whatsoever outside this House, which of the two will prevail. I ask this, because almost all, perhaps all the Members of the Bharatiya Janata Party have come into this Parliament after telling the people "Hum Ram Ki Saugandh Khate Hain, Hum Mandir Wahin Bnayenge"

[English]

Sir, this is the litmus test whether, as a political party, BJP is in the mainstream of our democratic political life or whether they are adjuncts of *Sadhus*, *Sants* and *Mahants* whether in this Parliament or outside, because what we need to understand is, the speeches that are made in this House are not *pravachan*; they are *bhashan*. This is a home not for religion; this is a home for politics. This is the moment of truth for the Bharatiya Janata Party. (Interruptions) Is it a main line political party that believes in the institution of our democracy, which means, this Parliament, the Executive and the Judiciary? Does it believe in our Constitution or is it going to be an adjunct of the *Sadhus*, and *Sants*, the *Bigots* and *zealots*? Now, the Prime Minister has given the Bharatiya Janata Party an opportunity to prove that they are the former. I personally would greatly welcome it, if, on this occasion, the Bharatiya Janata Party would seize this opportunity and show to us that they are as much a part of the mainline of our politics as the Congress is or the Left Front is or the National Front is, by saying, so because none of us

have any doubt about this that our oath to the Constitution as Members of Parliament prevails over any personal oath that we might have taken. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK(Ahmedabad):
What was your manifesto in Mizoram? (*Interruption*)

[*Translation*]

SHRIMADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi):
You promised to make mizoram a christian state in your manifesto, what happened to that. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: It is my view that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the Bajrang Balis and the Sadhu Samagam have every right to deal with religion and hold their views on religion. I have absolutely no objection at all to a non-political organisation concerning itself with religion, concerning itself with relative merits of different religions. But this is an opportunity to discover the statesmanship of the Bhartiya Janata Party. I have no doubt in my mind about that the statesmanship that resides on the front Bench of the BJP. It is not always there in the rest of the Party. I want to know on this occasion, whether the Bhartiya Janata Party can rise above the narrow concerns of the Vishwa Hindu parishad, the Bajrang Balis and the Sadhu Samagam.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hope they will, and I fear they will not. So, let us treat this as the last chance, let us treat this as a great opportunity for all of us to be re-assured that when it comes to the Constitution, the BJP is as faithful to the Constitution as the rest of us are. Let us treat this as an opportunity to confirm to ourselves, when it comes to the rule of law, the BJP is as faithful to the concept and the principles of rule of law as the rest of us are. Let us treat this as an opportunity to be assured that if the court orders something, that order will be obeyed

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute
however much we might disagree with that. If a court's verdict is to be changed, we adopt only one of two procedures open to us in a democracy. One is to go back to the courts; the other is to come to the legislature.

If we are able to, as a result of the road that has been opened to us by the Prime Minister—negotiate a settlement, I would greatly welcome it. It would be a noble day whether in a month, whether in two months or three months or four months, if we are able to negotiate a settlement, any settlement that gets the approval of all the Parties concerned would automatically be acceptable.

If, however, we are unable to negotiate a settlement, I, for my part, will welcome a judgment. If such a judgment is made that the masjid is a mandir, if the court says that the masjid is a mandir and it should so remain, I would welcome that verdict, another. However, my question is, supposing the courts give a decision—will Bharatiya Janata Party, as a political party welcome as much as I will, a Supreme Court judgment that the masjid is a mandir—will they accept a verdict from the Supreme Court if such a verdict comes that the masjid, the Babri masjid must neither be desecrated—if you build a *Shikhar* over *gumbad*, it would be desecration; it will not be dismantled. Even if you remove it from that place and put it somewhere else, it is dismantling; and that it will not be destroyed. This is not D-Day but 3-Ds-Day neither desecration, nor dismantlement nor destruction. Let them say to me that whatever the judgment of the Supreme Court, they will accept it like I will accept it; and that if they disagree with the judgment, they will resort to only one of the two means that is available to us in a democracy. One is to appeal to the court to give another judgment and the other is to come to the Legislature.

When you come to this Legislature, it is not enough to win a majority in one state of the Union. You have to win the applause and the mandate of the people of India. The Bharatiya Janata Party has as much right to

[Sh. Mani Shankar Aiyar] contest as election as the Congress party has. They have as much right to win as we have to win. (*Interruptions*). But they and we have as much right to lose as they have shown the capacity to do.

I now come to my Conclusion, and I would therefore pray to my zealous colleagues to Just have patience for a moment. There is a word which is much favoured by the forces of Hindutva It is a word which in English is 'appeasement' and in Hindi ('tushtikaran'). I believe that the Government of India should enter into negotiations with the forces of Hindutva to arrive at a settlement. I do not believe the forces of Hindutva should be negotiated with in order to appease them. The forces of Hindutva have said that it is the first principle of India's nationhood that the, Muslims must not be appeased. I say it is the first principle of the Congress party that the BJP must not be appeased.

MR. SPEAKER: SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN, please be very short. I have many more Members wanting to speak.

SHRI P.G. Narayanan (Gobichettipalayam): Sir, I would like to say a few words on this issue of vital importance which is capable of rousing communal passions throughout the country and threatens the very fabric of national unity and integrity of the country. This issue of Ram Janamabhoomi-Babri Masjid should not be viewed in isolation. It should not be considered as a problem of two communities or two regions of a State in Our country.

This should be considered in the context of preserving the unity and integrity our country and maintenance of communal harmony and peace for the existence of our nation.

The UP Government has initiated certain actions in furtherance of an objective to put up temples. In this connection, BJP has been repeatedly saying that they have the mandate for constructing the temple at Ayodhya. The question is, in a secular democracy whether any political party can

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute get a mandate on a sensitive issue, that is, constructing a temple in a disputed area in violation of the Constitution. In my opinion, the Constitution cannot be allowed to be superseded by any mandate.

This issue, as it has evolved, has two aspects. The first was during the last few weeks, the developments at the disputed complex have been unfolding rapidly. The High Court in its judgment restrained the construction of the temple and other activities and the court also directed that if it was necessary to do construction on the land, prior permission has to be obtained from the court. When this matter came to the Supreme Courts in a writ petition, the Government of Uttar Pradesh assured the Supreme Court that the State Government was using all means at its command to ensure that an agreement is reached by all parties concerned so that the orders of the court are effectively implemented. But, at the same time, the UP Government, instead of owning the responsibility, expressed its inability to do anything and suggested that either the Home Minister or the Prime Minister should intervene and persuade the saints and Mahants to stop the work.

In order to uphold the principle of Constitutional propriety, the Centre would have been called upon to use force against the *Kar Sevaks*. But the hon. Prime Minister took the challenge and met the religious leaders concerned and persuaded them to stop further construction on the disputed or acquired land and offered to help resolve the dispute within a time-bound framework. This is precisely what the Prime Minister has succeeded in his doing. So, we are happy that by the efforts of the Prime Minister, the rule of law has now been upheld.

Sir, no blood has been shed. Violence has been avoided. The disputed structure remains intact. But it would however be wholly premature to assure that truce provides a sound basis for a durable solution of the dispute. This is another aspect. For one thing, the Vishwa Hindu Parishad leaders have agreed to shift the *Kar Seva* from the disputed land in the vicinity where it pro-

posed to start building a Lakshman Temple. For another, the leaders, despite repeated requests, are unwilling to reveal the entire plan for the Ram Temple with the result that doubts about its intentions persist.

As for the wider issue of finding a solution to the dispute, it needs to be made clear that there can be no question of any opposition to the building of a Ram Temple in Ayodhya, in an undisputed area. But at the same time, it needs to be made equally clear that there can be no question of pulling down or shifting or in any way damaging the Babri Masjid or not honouring the Judiciary's decision in respect of the Complex. And such an atmosphere can only be created if all parties to the dispute conduct themselves with wisdom and moderation.

Now, Sir, the question is to what extent the U.P. Government and the Government of India are going to solve this issue without offending the sentiments of both the Hindu and Muslim brethren. My only appeal is that we should not think in terms of majority view or a minority view or that we are under compulsion to honour any one view. In so far as our AIADMK Party is concerned, we will support any decision that respects the right of the minorities, acknowledges the freedom of the majority in this country to pursue its worship in a free and fair manner, and satisfies the aspirations of our people.

SHRICHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, the recent developments at Ayodhya between July 9 and July 26, the Prime Minister's statement on the agreement reported to have been entered into with the Saints, Sadhus of our country and also the views expressed by the VHP, some of the Members here and also by the Leader of the Opposition all went to prove that certain basic values and commitments of our nation are at stake. Unless this highest elected body of our country takes a firm position to defend those nationally-accepted basic principles, the country is going to be destroyed for all the time to come. But we have great faith in us. We have great faith in the future of our country. I hope that this House will

equally rise to the occasion and defend the nationally-accepted basic principles of our country and lead the country and the nation out of the crisis today. Those basic issues are: secularism; respect for the law; rule of the law and constitutional obligation on the Members elected to this great House.

In so far as the dispute on the Mandir-Masjid issue is concerned we have got our considered view that the solution has to be sought through negotiation, a negotiated settlement is the best at the present situation and all efforts are to be concentrated towards achieving that negotiated settlement. In case that does not happen to our misfortune, to the misfortune of the nation as a whole, the matter should be referred to the judicial decision and the judicial decision should be made binding on all the parties concerned. And in this case, I would request the Prime Minister that it is the position of the Government too. There is no difference of opinion on this count. But only request that I want to make on this point, at this point of time is that he should not allow himself to deflect from that position. He should firmly adhere to that position and see that the position is accepted by the nation. I am sorry that even after the reported agreement or understanding or accord, as you may say, reached with the representatives of the *Kar Sevaks*, certain discrepancies have appeared, have surfaced regarding the contents, terms and also in regard to interpretations of that. These discrepancies relate to, as has been pointed out, the time frame, nature of the judicial process, acceptability of the court verdict as binding. Unless these three, four issues are clarified or are made clear for the education of our people, I think, as some of the Members of this House have expressed their apprehensions, the situation may take a worse turn.

Therefore, in the interest of bringing out a reconciliation of idea, in the words of the Prime Minister, it is necessary that the Government and the Prime Minister make clear the Government's attitude regarding these discrepancies which I have mentioned, as for example, time frame-whether it is

[Sh. Chitta Bassu]

three months or four months. What will happen after that? Nature of judicial process—there are differences on this. (*Interruptions*) I will just take one or two minutes. Somebody said that the Prime Minister agreed on these terms....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not go into all these details. It is not necessary because what happens is that if you want to be too exact you would not reach any point. Please leave it. You cannot be too exact in Parliament or in the society on all these things. There has to be some room for this.

(*Interruption*)

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Anyway, these points, I feel, need clarification. What does he mean by a judicial authority? Does it mean the Supreme Court, a special bench of the Supreme Court or a bench of the judges or any other judicial forum or a special court? These points are to be clarified. The House, just need these clarifications.

I say that the Government has taken up or rather proposes to take the pick of the thread for negotiations with all the parties concerned on the basis of their experiences and of the two former Prime Minister of our country.

Lastly, in order to remove the confusion and apprehension whether the Government can persuade the Vishwa Hindu Parishad to take up a position which accepts the judicial judgment as the final analysis.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri V.S. Rao, to speak now. Shri Rao, you please complete your speech within five minutes because most of the parties are not entitled to the time and yet I am giving time.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Mr. Speaker, sir, thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words on this important matter and seek

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute
clarifications from the hon. the Prime Minister.

Sir, it happened never before in this House where this House could not transact its business for so many days because of an unprecedented situation that has occurred where a State Government had refused to implement the decision or direction of the High Court. It was not acting as per the provisions of the Constitution whereupon the Members were all agitated and we have ventilated our feelings. And we are happy that ultimately, the Prime Minister succeeded in bringing the construction activity to a halt. We would like to say that much delay had taken place in the sense that several National Integration Council meetings were held and this issue, altogether, was not a new issue. It is hanging in the air for the last two years or even more. The hon. the Prime Minister could have applied his mind and taken certain steps which could have avoided the present situation. But anyway, it is better late than never.

And all the more, we are also equally happy that no bloodshed has taken place. Sometimes, it so happens that when once bloodshed takes place, the tensions mount and reasoning and all other forms of proper thinking will be side-tracked and we may not be able to reach a better conclusion. So from that aspect, we are very happy and even in the sense that the Union Government has not taken any decision to dismiss the Government of Uttar Pradesh, which otherwise might have resulted in further building up of tensions in several parts of this country. From that aspect, we congratulate the Prime Minister and with your permission, we would like to thank the Justices of Allahabad High Court - Lucknow Bench - as well as the Supreme Court, who have given directions to preserve the secular character and the unity and integrity of this country. And through you, I would like to seek two clarifications from the hon. the Prime Minister.

Firstly, he has held discussions with the Sadhus. And just now, one hon. Member, who preceded me, was also present, who,

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute

participated in the discussions held with the hon. the Prime Minister. The hon. the Prime Minister said that when the negotiations do not result in a proper agreeable decision, then a judicial authority will be entrusted with this responsibility. Of course, for any right thinking person, there is no other alternative. We welcome it and we are for that. But I want to know from the hon. the Prime Minister, whether the Sadhus and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad who have taken up the construction in that acquired land site have agreed to accept the decision of the judicial authority. We have heard some Members. They were quoting some judgment of the Faizabad Court which had directed to unlock the doors. When it suits them, they are saying: "We are for the Court directions; we respect the Court decisions." But, at the same time, when it do not suits them, they say: "No, this cannot be given by a Court."

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Rao, that is understood, please leave it and come to the point. There are many other Members and the leaders have to speak, and the Prime minister has to reply. You need not dwell upon that point at such a length. Let us understand whether the judicial decision will be accepted or not, and that is the question. So, please leave that now.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: That is a very important matter. Otherwise, these exercises have taken place earlier also. And with all due respect, I would like to say that some hon. leaders from the BJP, at one point of time, have also agreed on the Committee of communal harmony. They also agreed to refer the matter to the Court but later, for some reasons, they have opted out from that decision. So this is a very crucial matter. What I want to know from the hon. Prime Minister is what is the action he is going to take to find a solution.

SHRI DATTATRAYA BANDARU (Secunderabad): I am on a point of order Sir,

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

It is not necessary. There is no point of order. I will ask the provision which has been flouted or violated. So please sit down.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: I have a second clarification to seek from the hon. Prime Minister. It is actually the VHP which has taken up the construction. The VHP General Secretary was saying that the construction of the platform will be a permanent structure and they are going ahead, they are proceeding with the original plan where the sanctum sanctorum will come in the Babri Masjid, which obviously indicates their plans to demolish the Babri Masjid and construction of the sanctum sanctorum of the Rama Temple there.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Please conclude now. All these points have already been covered.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: I want to have a categorical clarification from the hon. Prime Minister whether he has discussed this important aspect also with the Sadhus or other religious leaders who had met him. I would like to assure him that our party, the Telugam Desam Party will extend its fullest cooperation to him and to all such persons as take up this ominous task of arriving at a consensus to resolve this issue amicably without hurting the feelings of any community.

But even in this very House some Members were saying that they are again going to take up the issue after three or four months. I appeal to them that time is not the criterion. It is the nation, the people, the feeling of brotherhood and the communal harmony that is all the more important than mere three or four months' time. Even if it takes one year, let us wait and arrive at a solution.

Today because of this issue the minds of youth in particular are getting poisoned. Some of them are getting very much agitated and a division is taking place. So I appeal to

[Sh. Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde] the friends in the BJP, VHP and other organisations to give whatever time that is required in resolving this issue.

A friend from the BJP was telling that in olden days it was a temple. I would like to ask them that whereas it is also a fact that in good olden days some Hindu religious leaders demolished the Buddhist Aramams, whether they are going to demolish all the Hindu temples there and construct the Buddhist Aramams today. I also ask them that in good olden days people belonging to the upper castes were not permitting Harijans and Girijans to educate themselves and were not allowing them to come into villages with *chappals*, they were not allowing them to take drinking water from the wells; so if anyone were to say today that their grandfathers and forefathers have done like that now he will beat them up today; whether they are going to accept it. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Rao, now please take your seat. Shri Inderjit will speak now.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Let us go forward, let us not look backward. Let us create conditions conducive enough for all of us to go as one people. Thank you.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR (Mangalore): I am on a point of order Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Which rule has been violated, which provision has been violated? I do not want this kind of interruptions.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: He taken the name of the General Secretary of the VHP. It should not go on record.

MR. SPEAKER: I will see. I accept your point of order.

15.25 hours

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): Mr. Speaker, Sir, almost 45 years ago, India gained its independence after a long and hard struggle. Our people, led magnificently

by Mahatma Gandhi, firmly rejected Jinnah's two nation theory and set out to create a strong, united, secular and casteless India. But where is India today? We are more disintegrated today than in 1947; we are more communal today than in 1947; we are more caste-ridden today than in 1947. What has gone wrong? We need to pause and ponder. We need to do some honest heart-searching, to use Bapu's favourite phrase.

All of us are willy-nilly responsible for bringing our beloved motherland to its present sorry pass. No one can escape responsibility, not even those who loudly claim to be the high priests of secularism. Sadly, little has been done by the powers-that-be these past four decades and more to combat communalism. Why back on April 3, 1948, India's Provisional Parliament, the Constituent Assembly (Legislative,) unanimously adopted a resolution to eliminate communalism from India's body politic. The resolution was moved by Shri Ananthasayanam Ayanagar, who later become the second Speaker of this august House. It was supported by Jawaharlal Nehru, Shyama Prasad Mukherji, Giani Gurmukh Sing Musafir, Prof. N. G. Ranga and Tajammal Hasan. Tragically, however, the resolution moved two months after the Mahatma's assassination, has not been implemented to this day.

Consequently, things have gone from bad to worse. In fact, the Ram Janambhoomi-babari Masjid dispute today symbolises the renewed malady. In my view, it is the latest and frightening symptom of the deepening communal virus. I am therefore happy that the Prime Minister has successfully halted the drift towards disaster. Shri Narasimha Rao deserves the grateful thanks of all our people for having defused the crisis through patience and firmness and most importantly through much needed statesmanship. I must also compliment him for having withstood persistent pressures from all sides and having refused to go in for virtually a second "Operation Blue Star", an operation which, if undertaken, would have been even more unfortunate, even more destructive, even more diabolical.

We cannot and must not forget India's basic ethos of non-violence, a creed which enabled us to win our independence without firing a shot. We must not also forget the basic ethos of a parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy, as you Sir are aware, is a civilised form of Government based on discussion, debate and consensus. I am therefore happy to see the Prime Minister stick firmly to the path of discussion and consensus for resolving the many challenges facing our country. I was pleased to see him tell friends informally at the meeting of the National Integration Council,

"It is very well for you to suggest a dismissal of the Up Government or a take over of the disputed land. But what is after that? We will still have to secure compliance of the Court's order".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must in all fairness also compliment the Sants and the Sadhus for having responded to the Prime Minister's appeal. True, many friends here are very angry with the Sadhus and the Sants. True also, the Sadhus and the Sants and their VHP pushed the country to the brink of disaster. Nevertheless, we cannot overlook the fact that India was able to pull back from the brink because the Sadhus and the Sants eventually agreed to bow to the Supreme Court's order. I shudder to think what would have happened if they had not accepted the Prime Minister's appeal that they should extend full respect to the country's highest *mandir* of justice, even as they sought to build a temple to the greater glory of *Bhagwan Ram*.

The question now before us is this. *where do we go from here?* I fully support the Prime Minister's decision to seek an amicable solution of the problem. Personally, Sir, I strongly feel that an amicable solution is not impossible, given the required determination and goodwill on all sides. We are not the only country to face such problems. Others have come face to face with such problems and found agreed solutions. I have in my own way, tried to study similar problems elsewhere. In April, 1990, for in-

stance, I visited Istanbul, once the scene of a bitter controversy over its famous Cathedral of Santa Sophia which was converted into a mosque some 900 years after it was founded.

Kemal Ataturk, the builder of modern Turkey, took the earliest opportunity to end a great wrong done by the Turks to Constantinople's of Santa Sophia, which had been the centre of the Grek Orthodox Church for nine hundred years. In the fifteenth century the Osmanli Turks conquered Constantinople and the unrivalled Cathedral was converted into the mosque: *Apa Suphea*. All the inscriptions and mosaics of the Cathedral were covered with mud and plaster. Lines from the Holy Quran in Arabic were then inscribed on its walls and the Cathedral given an Arabic look. But in 1935, The *Apa Suphea* was no more a *masjid*. Quietly, the hojas and the mullahs were sent to the other mosques. Experts were called in from the US and Germany and the Cathedral restored to its glory as the greatest achievement of the Byzantine Art. Santa Sophia was made a museum and has continued to be so. Jawaharlal Nehru seemed ever so right as I walked around the Cathedral. He wrote in 1935: "*Apa Suphea, in a way, went back again to the Christian era and that on the orders of Kemal Ataturk.*"

This is not to suggest, even remotely, that the disputed Ram-Janmabhoomi temple and the Babari Masjid be converted into a national museum. Any such step should be taken only with the full consent and agreement of the Sants, the Sathus and the Hindus at large. However, we can also take inspiration from the approach adopted to such problems in the Arab world. True, there is no Hindu-Muslim problem there. The Arabs in Saudi Arabia, for instance, do not even allow the Hindus to build temporary temples. But they do come up time and again face to face with problems concerning the location or relocation of mosques for a variety of reasons.

In February last, I made it a point to visit Cairo to seek guidance and light in regard to

[Sh. Inderjit]

our problem from Egypt's Grand Mufti, His Eminence, Dr. Mohammed Sayed Tantavi, as also from top experts at Cairo's world-famous university of Al-Azhar. All I can say at this stage is that my talks in Cairo were most interesting and useful, as were my visits to Baghdad, Najef and Karbala in the summer of 1990 and some years earlier to Saudi Arabia. I have no doubt that interaction with the top authorities in the Islamic world could be useful in evolving an agreed solution without violating the Shariat and other Islamic injunctions. The Arab world is following the controversy with interest. Nothing would make them happier than an amicable solution of the problems.

I shall now conclude. I am personally convinced that it should not be beyond human ingenuity to work out a solution which is acceptable and honourable to all sides. But this will be possible only if we are prepared to shed our deep prejudice and pathological animus against each other. We must strive for this forthwith and, to use an old-time-worn cliché, leave no stone unturned. The Prime Minister, who has shown himself to be a true statesman, can be counted upon to find such a solution. All of us should, therefore, extend to him every help and cooperation. We have had enough of reckless self-serving communal politics, rather communal politics. We must now strive for the best available option. Let us put our country before self, party and community before it is too late.

[Translation]

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL (Godda): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Ayodhya issue is being discussed in the House. We have got an opportunity to hear the opinions of all the great leaders of the country. This issue this problem is political one, but its political solution would not be found in one year. Today all the political parties, of the country including the ruling one, are giving evidence of political insolvency. The political persons could not find a political solution, now they are resorting to the assistance of Sadhus. Certainly the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the Bharatiya Janata Party and the Rashtriya

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute

Swayam Sewak Sangh have disturbed the peaceful atmosphere of the country. These issues have been discussed in the National Integration Council for one year and it is repeatedly being told by the Prime Minister that every body should accept the High Court and the Supreme Court verdicts. You are aware of the High Court and the Supreme Court verdicts, despite that an even after stopping the Karsewa, statement has been made on the part of the Sadhus and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad that the Courts orders will not be obeyed and they will resolve this problem through mutual agreement. It is not clear what sort of compromise that will be. The nature of this compromise is sometimes given in newspapers. It is said that they claim that they have been given mandate for temple construction. I want to say that this temple issue is now not merely a religious issue. It has become political issue now. They have become the victims of the last that if they can come in power in this State in the name of temple they can do so in the Centre also. Such views and thoughts have cropped up in their minds. They are becoming effective also and therefore today they are constructing temple. It has appeared in the newspapers that they will not demolish the mosque, but they will construct the temple and the mosque will remain in the middle. They will construct temple all around and encircle the mosque. (*Interruptions*) If they cover the area from upside also, and they will not demolish the mosque, what will be the importance of the mosque? In such a situation, how the minorities will enter the mosque? We would like to submit to them that they are very much concerned about the well-being of the Hindus living in this country, but they are not bothered about the Hindus living abroad. They should also think their welfare. We fully endorse the clear-cut views expressed by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that unless and until we stop politicking in the name of temple, mosque and Gurudwara, we will not be able to solve any problem. We feel satisfied with his statement but how would we be able to solve this problem.

Today, this temple-mosque dispute is causing much pain to the people of Jharkhand. There are various problems in

this country as Kashmir, problem, Punjab problem, Bodo problem and Jharkhand problem. whenever we assemble here to solve the Jharkhand issue, mandir-Masjid conflict always comes in the way. Ayodhya problem has become an epileptic attack. Government suppresses it for three to four months by adopting some temporary measure. What steps are being taken by the Head of the country to find a permanent solution of this problem? The people of this country want to know, those steps. This problem has been faced by many of the previous Prime-Ministers of the country. Shri Chandra Shekhar had been facing this problem and now Shri Rao is facing the same problem. It is to be seen whether he can solve this problem or not during his tenure..(Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, why do you feel so anxious, these people do not want anything else in the country I am just going to conclude. Now ayodhya issue has been raised to suppress the Harshad Mehta case and we have heard that an amount of Hundred crore has changed hands in an effort to suppress the Harshad Mehta case..(Interruptions) All this is being done to help to start Kar-seva in Ayodhya and to divert attention from Harshad Mehta case. These people do not feel concerned about the water shortage or developmental works or supply fertilizers to farmers. They are only concerned with the issue of Mandir or Masjid.

In reality, they do not want Mandir or Masjid, they are only concerned with grabbling of power as they have done in Uttar Pradesh and now they want to grab power at the Centre. They do not want Mandir, Hon. Prime Minister, we are with you. Therefore we would like that you must take stringent measures without any fear this regard; otherwise the country would be in danger.

I conclude with these words.

[English]

SHRI IMCHALEMBA (Nagaland): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to express my feeling that after months of deliberations and heated

debate, finally we seem to be arriving on a right track to find a lasting solution to the complex and burning issue of Ayodhya.

I would like to say that for every thing there is a right moment. What we have seen is that moment is now coming. Sir, very often we find that being mortals with weak minds, we do not have sufficient patience and because of that we cannot wait for such a right time and we become agitated and restless and then we try to blame each other. But in view of the latest changes which are taking place during the last few days and after the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister in this House, I think every party will have to have a rethinking and recast the whole issue once again in order to arrive at an amicable and lasting solution to this Ayodhya problem.

In a secular country like India, I feel there is no other option except to follow a secular path to bring a solution to a problem like this. Keeping that in view, the National Integration Council and also the Parliamentary Delegation, of which I was a member, have stressed on two very important points, viz. to exercise restraint and also the need to find out an amicable solution. These are the two points which were stressed by the NIC as also the Parliamentary Delegation's report. In fact, the NIC has appealed to every one, including the political parties, religious leaders, the media and various other organisations to desist from words or action which might inflame communal feelings in the country. These are the guidelines on which we should try to find a solution to this problem.

The Parliamentary Delegation which visited Ayodhya has also mentioned in its Report that although the Ram Janmabhoomi-Babri Masjid issue has become a subject matter of litigation, it would not be proper to view entirely from the technical point of view to find a solution to this problem.

The Parliamentary Delegation which visited Ayodhya has come with an observation in its Report. Now, what I want to say is

[Sh. Imchalemba]

this. Such a secular approach can only provide the right answer to this complicated problem which will pave the way for peace and amicable solution to the Ayodhya issue which we need today.

Sir, in view of that, I feel, it is necessary that all political parties and all forces which consider themselves secular in character and adhere themselves to the secular ideals should not only identify themselves with the secular approach but also show their willing cooperation to bring about a peaceful solution to this Ayodhya issue. Such a stand will not only vindicate their stand but will also prove that the nation is capable of rising above petty and parochial feelings. When the nation's interest is in vogue, it is capable of rising higher and also capable of seeing beyond and take decisions in the nation's interest.

Therefore, what I want to say is this. The nation, today, needs a solution which is reciprocal, which is mutually accommodative and just. If I want to have everything and do not have a feeling for others, I think such an attitude should not be there. It has to be mutually accommodative. That spirit has to come and only under that spirit, we can bring about a solution. That is why, I feel it is wrong to think and speak whose right is greater. I think that is besides that point. If we go on saying, encouraging and justifying one for the other's right, the dispute will continue, it would linger on. It is time we cease to speak about rights.

Sir, we have learnt from history that about rights. always faced crises, whenever there have been fights between two right causes. Humanity has never faced difficulties or crises whenever there was fights between right and wrong. It has faced crises when there was fight between two right causes.

Sir, let us not turn this Ayodhya issue into a matter of fight between two rights but I think, we have to be accommodative and let us not take this Ayodhya issue on par with

other court cases. It is something more than that. Let us not new it like a normal court case, But something much more than that. Let us not entirely depend on court for a solution. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a really a very good speech.

[Translation]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister whatever doubts have been expressed by the hon. Members in connection with the Agreement, should be clarified by the Prime Minister. I would like to submit one thing in the House and would praise the clear-cut views expressed by Shri Antulay, the former Chief Minister of Maharashtra. He has clearly stated that this problem cannot be settled finally in the court. It is not at all possible that all the Hindus or Muslims may accept the verdict of the Court. With this clear-cut expression. I would like to submit that the problem should be solved through some agreement. All the concerned people whether in the Parliament or outside will extent their maximum cooperation in solving this issue.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, many things have been said in the House. Since there is shortage of time, I would like to raise a few questions and then sit down, so that the hon. Prime Minister may reply then in his speech. It has been very emphatically said here that the saints and the BJP were not ready to accept the verdict of the Court, and provisions of the Constitution; and they were not following law an order. That is why such a dangerous situation arose. Throughout the country in ten-twenty days.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister if there had been no precedents when the requests have been made on behalf of the state Government and the Central Government to review the verdicts of the Court in respect of those cases in which the feelings and faith of the millions of people of the country are involved. I would

like to quote some examples here. Recently the Karnataka Government has promulgated an ordinance revoking the verdict of the Court in regard to the Kaveri water dispute. Even after that newspapers are still publishing the news that the public agitation against the Court verdict is still continuing in Karnataka and the people of Tamil Nadu are not getting any benefit of the decision of Kaba Tribunal. Sir, I would like to ask one more question particularly from my colleagues coming from West Bengal who were speaking very freely in favour of the Court verdict. Chand mal Chopra had filed a writ petition in Calcutta High Court challenging certain portions of Quran. The writ petition had been admitted by the lady judge. Afterwards Jyoti Basu said these words in the Assembly.

[English]

The Chief Minister, Mr. Jyoti Basu," it wrote, "today (May 9 Telegraph) described the writ petition filed in the Calcutta High Court challenging certain portions of the Quran a 'despicable act.'" Mr. Basu who was replying to the Forward Block MLA, also felt that the court should have dismissed the petition outright as the subject matter pertains to religion."

MR. SPEAKER: Come to the point. We don't want you to reply to all the points made. We want to hear your point of view; your point of view for us is more important than their views.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: It further states as follows:

"I have also told the advocate general to talk to the Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court in this regard, 'Mr. Basu added."

[Translation]

SHRI INDIRAJIT GUPTA : Communicated that the verdict of the court had been re-speeched:

MR. SPEAKER: We want original from you, not from others.

SHRIGUMAN MAL LODHA: This is the affidavit of Mr. Timir Haran Sen Gupta, Deputy Secretary, Home Department, Government of West Bengal.

MR. SPEAKER: You please leave it aside.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: I want to quote only a few lines.

[Translation]

After that SHRI ASHOK SEN: was said unindicially in the right. Sir, I would like to quote a few lines from the reply filed by the Govt. Advocate in the Court.

[English]

On page 148, it reads as follows:

"I further state that as the Holy Quran is a Divine Book, no earthly power can sit upon judgement on it and no court of law has jurisdiction to adjudicate it.

I submit that this Hon'ble Court has not jurisdiction to pronounce a judgement on the Quran, the Holy Scripture of the Muslims all over the world, each and every word of which, according to the Islamic belief, is unalterable."

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, even the court has also given its ruling that it would not in any way interfere in the religious affairs. I would like to say that a controversy has been going for long about the exact place birth of Lord Rama or whether birth place is known or not? It is said that the Court will decide the issue. Simultaneously, it is also said that the court cannot take any decision in respect of Quran or religion. I would like to know if court cannot give any verdict in respect of Muslim religion then how it can take any decision in respect of Hindu Religion.

[Sh. Imchalemba]

Through you, I would like to submit that this Question has been raised not for the first time but for the second time in our Calcutta High Court...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: There are umpteen rulings from both the sides. We do not have to refer to these.

[Translation]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: Shri Scindia is present here. Is it not a fact that when the judgement on Privy Purse came Congress said about the three judges of that bench of the Supreme Court *.... *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: No, this will not go on record. This is not going on record. This is not forming part of the proceedings. Please leave that aside.

[Translation]

SHRIGUMAN MAL LODHA: I would like to make only one point. First constitution amendment in the history was introduced by Pt Jawahar Lal Nehru in Motilal versus State of Uttar Pradesh case which was against nationalisation and thus the Court's decision was over ruled by the Government. He said at that time-

[English]

Judges sitting in Ivory Tower cannot over rule the wishes of crores of people.

[Translation]

After that all the amendments were made to over rule the decisions of Supreme Court. In America in political and social fields...*(Interruptions)* When Roosevelt's New Deal Policy of Nationalisation was not

* Not recorded

accepted then the concerned judge said that he did not accept such decisions...*(Interruptions)* I would like to request that Judiciary has its own field, But people's sentiments and policees cannot affect it. I would like to say that when Shri Narain Dutt Tiwari was the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh a sunni grave in a colony of Varanasi was shifted to a colony of Shiyas...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am not allowing this. Now, you shall have to conclude. It is not necessary. All these things are not necessary. Please understand that we are sitting here, realising the difficulties which are faced by the entire nation and all the parties. We should rather like to have your considered views as to how we can solve this problem.

[Translation]

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: I mentioned this point only to show that such situations do come in the history of country. It is good that it was discussed to reach a solution through compromise. I was one of the members of that committee which held meetings during the regime of Shri Chandra Shekhar. The discussion was held in cordial atmosphere. Our Prime Minister wants to maintain that cordial atmosphere in future also. That committee met on 4.12.1990. I would like to refer to two lines from the discussion that was held in that meeting...*(Interruptions)*

Shri Chandra Shekhar said that only it should be decided whether there existed a temple which was demolished by Babbar and a Masjid was constructed. It is essential for the reason that eleven suits and six writs were pending in courts in which thousands of questions are needed to be replied and four hundred witnesses are needed to be examined and all this cannot be done even in four hundred years. So the fundamental question is whether there was any temple at that

site which was demolished to construct a Masjid by Babar. This question was referred to the committee. I would like that Prime Minister should also restrict this compromise talk only to this point. I would also like to say that Navals District Gazetteer was presented during the negotiations which read:

[English]

"In 1528 A.D., Barbar came to Ayodhya and halted a week. He destroyed the ancient temple and on its site built a mosque, still known as Babar's mosque."

MR. SPEAKER: We are not receiving any evidence here.

[Translation]

Sir, I will read out what Shri Sharad Pawar said during the discussion on this issue.

[English]

"At this Shri Sharad Pawar asked whether there was any mention in the official Gazettes or not. Mr. Jilani admitted that in British official Gazettes it has been mentioned. Shri Shekhawat suggested that official gazettes were based on facts. But Shri Azam Khan claimed that this problem was the cretain of the Britishers to divide the society."

[Translation]

Sir, I would like to request that the hon. Prime Minister should restrict this talk to this point only. He will receive all the cooperation and help from both sides. It will not be proper to say there that the B.J.P. or the saints neither respected Constitution and court nor they observed Law. The B.J.P. is ready to extend its full cooperation in maintaining the cordial atmosphere that is building up on this issue. The Hon. Prime Minister should solve this issue taking the benefit of this cooperation.

[English]

SHRIMATIMALINIBHATTACHARAYA (Jadavpur): Sir, thank you. my heart is full, but I shall be very brief.

MR. SPEAKER: You are capable of saying so many things in a short time.

SHRIMATIMALINIBHATTACHARAYA : Sir, some Members have thanked the Prime Minister for defusing the tension in the country and for having worked out some kind of a relief to the nation. I would like to thank Mahant Abedya Nath and Shri Guman Mal Lodha for reminding us with their fiery speeches how fragile this relief is and how unsound are the foundations on which this is based.

Relief, Sir, is a relative term, not an absolute term. Our Prime Minister's recipe for relief seems to be this that first of all you allow a situation to be aggravated until it reaches intolerable heights and then you allow some small respite, and then that seems to be a great relief.

The question that I would like to ask to this House and to the Prime Minister is, why was there no action from the Government at any earlier stage. At the moment when the disputed land was being handed over, at the moment when certain structures were being demolished, why did not the Government take any action?

Subsequently on April 27th, when the Bommai Committee report was submitted made the prevarications of the U.P. Government amply clear, but even after that no action whatsoever was taken by the Government. That would have been the time to stall this dangerous work, this provocative work, that had been started on that disputed site; but nothing was done. I do not know whether it is a case of

[Translation]

Smaran-Smaran twaraha-trawaha

[Smt. Malini Bhattacharaya]
[English]

Was the hon. Prime Minister thinking of the Minister that he lost at Devos, that the Minister he lost over the scam, and therefore, he has turned to stone like Jagannath at Puri, that he could not take any action?

Even after the 9th of July, nothing was done. The N.I.C. meeting was called at a time when it was bound to be a failure. We would like to know what prevented them earlier.

Secondly, Sir, I want to know..(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We should rather like to know what can be done.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: I will come to that. But, Sir, we are seeking clarifications from the Prime Minister also.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave that aside. I gave you the time because I thought that you are going to suggest some good things.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: There is difference between what the Prime Minister has said and what our friends on that side have said as to the time limit, three months and four months. I would like to know why our BJP friends are continually saying that three months is the limit. Is it because of the Kartik Festival, which is due to fall during that time and because at that time a large number of pilgrims, innocent people most of them, would gather? Are they going to be used for the cannon fodder by the Hindu fundamentalists? Is that the reason? Why three months limit is being stipulated? I want to know whether the Government would agree to this.

Sir, it has also been stated that while the Prime Minister sees these four months as required for presentation of materials to an apex judicial body, it has been said by hon. Members on that side that the three months is seen as an absolute deadline and after

that it has been said the undertaking given to the Prime Minister would not be held as binding. Would they ultimately agree to the judicial decision? That is the other question which has been raised. From what Mr. Chinmayanand has said what Mr. Dixit has said, it seems to be very uncertain whether they are going to agree to the judicial decision at all.

There other point that I would like to raise is that whether work on that disputed site has been really discontinued. There is a report in *The Times of India* that in spite of Kar seva having been shifted elsewhere, on that structure, *Chabutra* as it is called, master craftsman- this is VHP's statement is U.P - are going to work on that *Chabutra*. If that is true, that means, the work has not been stopped. Also in today's *Dainik Jagran* there is a report that there is one mahanta who is sitting on the top of *Chabutra* and singing 24 hours *Hanuman Chalisa*, thus trying to give a kind of sanctity to a structure, which is illegal, which is entirely illegal...(Interruptions) Although they have shifted kar seva from the disputed site, are they not actually moving from all sides toward the so called sanctum sanctorum?

When the Prime Minister wants to build a temple without demolishing the mosque, the question that arises is, where is that temple going to be built because that has not been specified in the statement of the Prime Minister. So, Sir, I want to know, how can the Prime Minister in his statement say that the confrontationist attitude has been avoided. Rather it is demonstrated that by defiance of court order and the Constitution, you can do anything that you like. By this confrontationist tactics in fact they have completed the first phase of their construction. And while this crisis was on, rumors of blood-bath were rife; if this work is stopped, there is going to be blood-bath all over the country, riots all over the country. We do not know whether riots would have indeed happened if any action had been taken but the rumors were there. Where did these rumors come from? By creating this atmosphere of terror, by creating this Atmosphere of fear, they have

succeeded in completing the first phase of their work and, therefore, I do not think that the confrontationist attitude has been avoided at all, rather I think that there has been capitulation to this confrontationist attitude.

Finally, I would say that the right atmosphere for an amicable settlement which the Prime Minister has talked of in his statement cannot come so long as this fear of provocative action on the disputed area remains. A choice that is taken in fear is not a choice at all. It is a coercion and so long as this fear remains, amicable settlement is out of the question. At the end of 3-4 months, some people will again jump into the disputed area and create same fear of blood-bath and fear of riots. So long as that fear is there, negotiated settlement and amicable settlement cannot be reached.

In fact, both Hindus and Muslims are being coerced in accepting a situation which is made out to be inevitable and there is no choice for any of them. There is a forcible manipulation of opinions. So, the first thing is to ensure that incursions or possibility of incursions in the disputed area is stopped once and for all. It is in this sphere that we expect the Government's action.

AN. HON. MEMBER: How?

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA: We are prepared to discuss that with you. Why do not you sit with us?

when this fear is removed and positive action is taken, only they can negotiations for an amicable settlement start. With these works, I conclude.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Era Anbarasu, you are a very forceful speaker. I would like to hear your melodious speech today..(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: What is going on there on the back benches, Please sit down. It is

not a good thing, please, you take your seat.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): He is saying a very good thing.

MR. SPEAKER: O.K., we will listen him later on.

[English]

SHRI ANBARASU ERA (Madras Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the advanced countries are discussing about technological developments in various fields, we are fighting for a mosque and mandir. I am really very much pained that the entire nation seems to be bogged down to a controversy of this nature. No developing country can afford to get lost in such barren controversies. The entire world is laughing at us. At any cost it is high time that we should put an end to the seatarian issue.

However, I congratulate the Prime Minister for his sagacity he displayed in handling such a crucial issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi Babari Masjid dispute. Our Prime Minister is no more a politician. He had risen to the height of the scholarly Statesman by averting a major blood-shed and communal riot by calling the *Sdhus* and *Mahants* for negotiations. His timely action in halting Kar-seva deserves to be applauded and appreciated. His commitment to uphold the rule of law, sanctity for judiciary and commitment to secularism and democracy is commendable. His statement is manifest and he does not believe in any confrontationist attitude. His approach for negotiated settlement will definitely provide a meaningful and purposeful solution to put an end to this vexed problem.

Here I would rather prefer to touch the feet of Mahant Abedya Nath. I heard his speech when he said that thousands of temples were destroyed by Mohd. Gajni and others. But, we will continue to revive those temples. This is not the place...(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: You give your own views. You do not have to reply to others points.

Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute

[Sh. Anbarasu Era]

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: I request all my friends to tolerate me for a minute.

If we go back to the history, the Aryans came to India and drove away the Dravadians. Now if all the Dravadians join together and they want to drive the Aryans away, are they prepared to go out? This is my question. This is not a wise question, I know that. Therefore, I touch the feet of the hon. Members and say that let us not go back to the ancient history. But this problem will not stop with this one Mandir and Masjid, this is a continuing process. I know the sinister attitude of the BJP. BJP wants to survive over Mandir and the Janata Dal wants to survive over Mandal. The Left Parties are left out by the people because of their non-committal attitude over the national issues. Therefore, I want to appeal to all the Members here: "Touch your conscience, touch your heart and mind and let us come together on such national issue to find a lasting solution.

Some Members were agitated that the U.P. Government...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: You have made very good points. You have made the final and the best point. Now you should please take you seat.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: Sir, dismissing the U.P. Government will not solve the problem. Our Prime Minister showed exemplary patience and for this patience and sagacity that he has shown in solving the issue, he will definitely be setting an example to the future Prime Ministers.

The BJP leaders shall be picking up this issue of Ram Mandir on the eve of the Parliament session or whenever there is an election, Janata Dal will pick up the Mandal issue on the eve of the Parliament session, and the Left parties will pick up the Bofors issues on the eve of the Parliament Session. Therefore, people should understand the sinister motive of these political parties, Nobody is prepared to discuss the common

man's problems here. By constructing one temple, are they going to provide employment to those thousands and millions of people who are suffering in this country for want of employment, proper food and proper basic amenities? By protecting one mosque, are they going to eradicate poverty from this country or are they going to provide basic amenities to the suffering masses of this country? Therefore, let us not waste our time in this sectorial issue. My point is let us all join together.

MR. SPEAKER: You should appreciate our patience also.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: We should have a spirit of sacrifice, whether it is Hindus or whether it is Muslims. I remember an incident that took place in Andhra Pradesh when the famous canal...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Anbarasu Ji, leave it for some other occasion. Now please take your seat.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: When the Nagarjuna Sagar Dam was constructed, the people found a very precious relic which was associated with the Buddhist religion. Therefore, the people belonging to Buddhist religion in those days, agitated that this dam should not be constructed. This is a historical evidence. All the Buddhists in Andhra Pradesh joined together and agitated. But thanks to the wisdom of the people of Andhra Pradesh. They preferred to have the dam rather than the Buddhist temple. We want such decisions here. Whether Hindus or Muslims, we should be prepared to sacrifice the mosque, we should be prepared to sacrifice the mandir. It is for the national cause, it is for the good of the nation. We should come forward to sacrifice anything.

I shall cite another example...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing you. You have to take you seat..

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Anbarasu, please understand that you have been given time out of turn. Please conclude.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: Sir, with only one point I conclude my speech. I ask a question. If the O.N.G.C. people strike an oil bed beneath that mosque or mandir, will they or will they not come forward to sacrifice the mandir or mosque to take the oil for the benefit of the country? Just imagine. We should have that sort of spirit. We should be prepared to sacrifice for the good of the nation. *(Interruptions)* I will tell one thing. Our Prime Minister is a scholarly statesman. Do not think because he is patient and keeping quiet - and do not conclude that it is his weakness. I know that he will rise to the occasion. He has got that capacity. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Anbarasu, if you do not stop now, I will say that the matter will not go on record.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: Sir, with a bit of honour, I conclude now. I think our Prime Minister will not mistake me if I compare him to the leader **

(Interruptions)

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I think I will decide whether it will go on record or not.

SHRI ANBARASU ERA: Our Prime Minister knows how to tame the political** of this country. *(Interruptions)* Let us not be hypocrites. Let us come out and let us find out a lasting solution. Let us discuss in this august House how to eradicate poverty, how to provide employment to the teeming millions of this country and how to build a peaceful and plentiful India and to build a modern India. Thank you. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to request Shri Somnath Chatterjee to speak now. After him Shri V.P. Singh and later Shri Advaniji

will speak. And then I shall be asking the Prime Minister to reply. Expunged as ordered by the chair.

(Interruptions)

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM (Inner Manipur): Sir, why are you so unfair to me? Why I am not given an opportunity to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: Every Member does not have a right to speak.

SHRI YAMIA SINGH YUMNAM: I have been requesting all the time. You have been rejecting my questions. I have asked for permission to speak so many times. You have refused me. I feel very much of it. Please allow me to express my views.

MR. SPEAKER: O.K. you make a few good points. You please speak for five minutes only.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI (Jhansi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I should also be given at least two minutes time. My name is also there before you.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Please take your seat. I have given ample time to everyone. Therefore, you should please be seated.

[English]

SHRI YAMIA SINGH YUMNAM: Sir, it is very difficult to speak under such limitation of time. However, I will speak.

When I wanted to speak on the No Confidence Motion, you had not permitted me. When I wanted to speak on a Bill I was not permitted. I have been submitting my name so many times *(Interruptions)* I am making a concrete proposal to this august House. I would like to suggest that this disputed structure should be kept as a symbol of historical

[Sh. Yaima Singh Yumnam]

monument, as a symbol of our secularism national integration and democracy. I am making this proposal after hearing in this House, for the last so many days, the speeches and deliberations. I have also been hearing the speeches and deliberations in the National Integration Council meetings. I am a Member of that Committee. I have been giving my rapt attention and hearing all the leaders. I kept quiet on all those occasions. Uptil now, I have not opened my mouth. When I was made a member of the delegation to Ayodhya led by Bommajji, I was reluctant to accept that offer, because I am a Ram bhakta. I was afraid because I must be prejudiced to go there. Still, I went there; I have seen the place and I visited the area.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us know what you feel and what you can suggest. Please come out with that point now.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: After seeing the structure, I have changed a lot. Earlier, I thought that this temple must be constructed there. But, I have changed after considering all those factors after hearing so many arguments and after sitting hours together in the National Integration Council. I have attended the NIC meeting twice.

MR. SPEAKER: We are eager to hear your point of view. Please come out with that. The time is very limited.

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM: When you are prepared to hear so many lengthy speeches, why do you not spare only five minutes to hear my speech?

Sir, I am making this proposal after hearing so much on this issue, for the sake of secularism in this country, for the sake of national integration. I propose that this disputed area must be made a 'no man's land' and at a place which is equi-distant from this place, two structures may be allowed to be constructed, one for the Ram Temple and one for the Masjid. For this, I know that a lot of sacrifice must be made by all the parties involved in the dispute.

Sir, Gandhiji laid down his life for the sake of secularism and for maintaining communal harmony in the country. Why should we not be prepared to sacrifice for the same purpose? It is my considered view that if we allow this to continue for so many years, we must be facing another partition of this country. The world is changing so fast. In Russia and East European countries there are so many changes. Earlier, there was a partition in our country as a result of which Pakistan came and later from that, Bangladesh came. So, if we allow this issue to continue like this, there may be another partition of the country.

Sir, in Manipur, before the people embraced Hinduisim, so many structures were there and the people worshipped their deities therein when the Maharajas embraced Hinduism many temples were constructed by destructing them. Now, if the Babari Masjid structure is destroyed, then in many places like Manipur, there will be problems and it will create a bad situation there.

So, I request this House to consider all these things along with my proposals. With the limitations, I cannot speak further. Lastly, I appreciate the steps taken by the hon. Prime Minister to solve this issue.

[Translation]

ACHARYA VISHWANATH DAS SHASTRI (SULTANPUR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a discussion on the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi Babari Masjid has been going on since yesterday. A lot has already been heard about it. I would like to be very brief in my submission before this august House. I would conclude my speech within five minutes as directed by you. First of all I would like to submit that the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi which is also being presented as the issue of Ram Janama Bhoomi versus Babari Masjid should be solved in totality, not in parts or phases. Secondly, while considering the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi, we have to cast away the notion that this issue is one of temple and mosque. The issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi is not the issue of

temple mosque, it is the issue of the sentiments of the general public of India.

The sentiment of the whole public of India is concerned with the birth place of Lord Rama. I originally belong to Ayodhya. I have been with all faith receiving ambrosia and Prasad from what you call the disputed structure ever since I came of age. The tradition of receiving ambrosia (Charnamrit) through grille had been there in practice till February 1, 1986 and the court accepting the Ram Janm Bhoomi as Ram Janama Bhoomi ordered to open the lock on February 1, 1986. Before that in 1950 the court declaring the Ram Janam Bhoomi as Ram Janama Bhoomi ordered that Hindus can go in for darshan which is continuing till today.

Any number of temples can be constructed and they can be demolished. Mosques and temples have been demolished for the purpose construction of dams and widening of roads. There is a proof that mosquest have not only been demolished in India but also in Islamic countries. Temple and mosque is a different issue but the testimony of the fact that it is the birth place of Lord Ram is that almost three crore men come every years to pay obeisance on the eve of fairs of Chaitra Ramnavmi, Shrawan and Kartik Purnima with the belief that the Ram Janama Bhoomi is the birth place of Lord Ram...(Interruptions) It is established. It can therefore, not be belied cannot be manipulated.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I may be permitted to ask two things in this august House. The entire Christian world believes that Jesus Christ was born of a virgin. Can a court establish it? It is the matter of their faith, belief and conviction. This cannot be an issue of a court. One of the mosques of Kashmir enshrines hair of the prophet Mohammad. It is a matter of belief and faith of the Islamic world. This can also not be made an issue of the court. Similarly, Ram Janam Bhoomi is a matter of faith and belief of Hindus. This cannot be made an issue of the court.

I would like to submit one thing in this August House. It is a step most welcome that an initiative was taken by the Hon. Prime Minister. A peculiar dispute regarding time, say three months, four months, three and a half months has arisen. Saints state in Ayodhya that a period of three months has been south while the Hon. Prime Minister says that it is four months. A period of four months proved fatal for the previous Prime Minister. I fear if the same is repeated. I, however, do not want this. I would like to submit humbly and solemnly that this issue cannot be solved by conflict and clash. Peace cannot be established in any country with on going clash between two classes. This is an issue of the whole country. A friend has said today that it is a political issue, but this is not at all a political issue.

In the capacity of a worker of the Bharatiya Janata party and by virtue of a member of this House, I would like to submit that the Bharatiya Janata party does not want to make the Ram Janam Bhoomi a political issue. Bharatiya Janata party may have as many as 10 such issues for playing politics. The Ram Janam Bhoomi should not be made a battle field of politics. The Government has also tried to make it a game of politics which is proved by its present behaviour. The same was done last time on the part of the Congress Party. It was asserted that they would get the temple constructed as they have allowed the foundation laying. They, latter on, also included the issue of temple construction in the election manifesto repeatedly. The temple should be constructed there and...(Interruptions) it has been stated by the Government, you should read your election manifesto respectfully. The Ram Janma Bhoomi is the birth place of Ram. Any dispute about it should immediately be stopped. If we think colly we will find that there can be a consensus on this issue outside the preview of the court and that would be the only solution to this crisis. I appeal that we would honestly sit together with clam and composed mind to find a solution to the problem.

With this appeal I conclude.

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]
[English]

However, something has been achieved and we are happy that the work has stopped and there is some respite now.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to deal with the issues that have been raised already. I wish the hon. Prime Minister all the best in his efforts to arrive at a negotiated settlement. But he must keep in mind the seriousness of the situation that is prevailing now and how far we can take things for granted in arriving at a settlement because the people with whom he will negotiate do not seem to have any open mind at all in the matter which is causing great concern to us.

I am not going into our objections to the inaction. At one time, it seemed it is steadied inaction on the part of the Government. 18-19 days were allowed for the work to continue. The Prime Minister did not react to that in any manner whatsoever.

I do not find the Home Minister at all during this debate. He is conspicuous by his disappearance from the his seat.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M.M. JACOB): I am here.

SHRISOMNATHCHATTERJEE: O! You are there. That is all right.

We are told that "the Government is taking decision. CCPA is meeting. "But nothing came out. Very vital time was allowed lapse and during this period, an elected Government, in a calculated manner, arranged for people to gather there with a view to obstruct the implementation of the court order and a frenzy was created.

That was our objection. This dithering, this delay on the part of the Government, created a situation which almost reached explosive proportions and the whole country was, as I said the other day, really sitting on a powder keg. There was going to be a great risk of a holocaust in this country.

But it is necessary that we must have an introspection of the way of functioning of this Government. We felt that there was no functioning Government in this country for 18-19 days and things were allowed to drift in a dangerous direction. Now two things have appeared from the Prime Minister's statement. The first part is a clear admission of the situation that one State Government was deliberately defying court's orders. The excuse was given that "we are unable to control the situation there." That is, the UP Government was unable to get the site vacated. Does it not raise very serious questions? We were told that this area was acquired by the Government of Uttar Pradesh for correcting tourist complex. The Government of Uttar Pradesh had become in law and in fact were entitled to be in possession of this site. How work was allowed to be carried on in this site by some agency which is not the Government agency? This question is not being answered by anybody who has spoken on behalf of BJP of Vishwa Hindhu Parishad. How this Government of Uttar Pradesh allowed an area of land which was occupied or acquired very consciously for the purpose of setting up a tourist complex, to be taken over by VHP or Bajrang Dal or BJP and work was allowed to be carried out there in defiance of the court's orders?

The Government is coming and saying: "We do not know. Now, we cannot control. We are sorry." I had informed the hon. Home Minister. I got a message from Ms Subhashini Ali. She said: "Ever now not many people are there. But our information is that they are trying to gather people there and overnight they will be doing it." I had informed the Home Minister. He said: "I have got my Intelligence Service." That was all. From 300 people, you have got 3000.4000 and 5000 people there. When the question of acquisition of that land came up, I do not know why the Government did not agree to that. That would have maintained the *status quo*. We made it very clear that the acqul-

sition of the land was not for the Central Government ultimately taking it over for its own purpose; wait for the adjudication being properly made either by way of a negotiated settlement or by a judicial determination and hand it over to whoever is entitled to it. That was our request on behalf of the entire Opposition except the BJP. We said that. We met the hon. Prime Minister. He also said that all Parties would be consulted. But that was not done. What did the U.P. Government do? that was the seriousness of the situation. The point is that of the constitutionally-elected Government using people as *shikandis* for the purpose of violating the Court's orders. This is their commitment. There is no denying the fact now. There is nothing kept hide and seek. Nothing is hidden. They have openly said that the Temple will be built and built at that spot, nobody in the world has the power to determine otherwise; there is no question of any adjudication; judiciary has no authority. I felt that when he was speaking, Shri Guman Mal Lodha was very happy having retired from the Bench because the whole tenor of his speech was that court orders need not be followed. That was the whole tenor of his speech. He was giving examples where court's orders have not been followed to justify the violation of the court's orders here. The position is this. I would like the Prime Minister to kindly ponder over this. Is the issue today Temple versus Mosque? Or, is the issue today: the maintenance of both the Temple and the Mosque? I would like the hon. Prime Minister to kindly make it very very clear. I appreciate his statement which was made earlier that at no circumstances the Mosque will be allowed to be dismantled or touched or damaged. I take it includes all. But what is being said here openly, repeatedly on behalf of the spokesmen of the BJP? We are waiting for Shri Lal K. Advani to give his views. The only question is: Temple will be there or Mosque will be there? The Mosque will remain or the Temple will be built? It is not the question of both surviving there; both subsisting there; the harmony and peace is maintained; national unity is maintained; national integrity is maintained. That is not, according to them, the issue.

What we find to be their approach in this matter? Nothing is kept secret, One of the Sadhus Sant Acharya Dharmender said this and according to him the area around Ramjanmabhoomi is not bound by any man-made Constitution, laws, rules or court's orders; the law here is the law of Ram Lala and we, the Hindus, will decide what is to be done here for him... " No repudiation till today is found. The hon. Member of Faizabad said: "We do not care about any laws or court verdicts, Might is the only law for the *Ram Bhaktas*." No repudiation of this. These are dangerous doctrines. They say that so far as that area of the land is concerned, in India, no law applies, no Constitution applies. The hon. Member of Parliament belonging to the BJP coming from that area is saying: "It is our might." (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Sir, I am on a point of order. It is an allegation made against the Member of this House. A notice should be given to him.

SHRI SOMANATH CHATTERJEE: What is the allegation? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK: He has alleged that that Member will not obey any orders of the Court. This is an allegation made on his behalf. This is a direct allegation made on him. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): If it is an allegation and it has appeared in the journal, you can refer it to the Privileges Committee. He has quoted from the Journal. (*Interruptions*)

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Basudeb Acharia, first of all, you please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK: Rules are very clear that if an allegation is to be made...

MR. SPEAKER: What is the allegation?

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

SHRI RAM NAIK: Allegation is 'he has said so'. He has been quoted. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Is it your stand that he has not said so?

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: How do we know *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Why cannot you deny that he has not said so? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK: We will deny that. *(Interruptions)* if you want to say anything in this House, you have to give notice. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat and let me decide about it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: It is under the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Under which rule you are referring?

SHRI RAM NAIK: I have got the book. I will find out and tell you. In the meanwhile, let it go. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This issue is very important and I request the hon. Members on this side that if they have an answer let them answer it. The Leader of the Opposition will speak. Let him deny that my understanding is wrong. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: SOMNATHJI, if I have understood it correctly, all the Members who are objecting to this statement of yours, think that the court's order should be followed and if you say that somebody has said that we will not follow the court order, they say it is defamatory. It is good thing. You please continue.

SHRI SOMANATH CHATTERJEE: deeply appreciate. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh): Your ruling should be accepted. *(Interruptions)*

SHRISOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Therefore, if there are some in that party who do not agree that the judicial verdict should be followed let them be exposed so that we know the mainstream of BJP....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK: It is Rule 353. The rule says about the procedure regarding allegation against any person.

It says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member again any person unless the member has given adequate advance notice to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply:

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation."

It is not only pertaining to Ministers. So....

MR. SPEAKER: I uphold this point of order which you have raised. I take it that you say that the court order should be accepted..

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: No, no. that is not the point *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Chatterjee, technically, he appears to be correct. But then the sense of it we can take.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Our appeal to everybody in the House and to the people in the country is that if negotiated settlement is not possible, for which every effort should be made, then judicial verdict should be accepted. Let them say 'yes or no'. If they say that, we stop here and now.

MR. SPEAKER: By implications they have said 'yes'.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Let us not go into this discussion further. Why are they not saying this? That is the trouble.
(Interruptions)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): He is referring to a Member who is not present in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your problem? I have given the ruling. Why are you standing up?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now senior Member of this House are speaking. I would request you to show the courtesy to them and also to us.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Hon. Member from Varanasi said yesterday rightly that there are several orders of court which justify certain action being taken for pooja etc. etc. Now so long it suits them they accept the judicial order. But here the effort is being made, a conscious effort is being made, it was said here, to give instance of defiance of court's orders in the past as if that would justify in future the defiance of court orders. Therefore, this was an issue, I thought nobody would come to, nobody would try to

show "oh! there are examples." Supposing there are bad examples, should we follow that bad example here? We did oppose the reversal of Shah Bano's judgment by a legislative process. We did object to every line; we opposed saying that you wrongly did it. But that does not justify that an order of a court will be consciously violated by a Government. And that is what I feel. This has been a mere tactical stand on behalf of the BJP government and the BJP because they want to save their Government. This temporary retreat is only for that. I request the hon. Prime Minister, to be extremely careful on this because this time limit they wanted for a respite. How to utilise it? Sadhus and Sants, many of whom are sitting here in the BJP benches, they also represent the BJP; they represent the Bajrand Dal and what Dal, I do not know, inside the party. Therefore, here, they agreed with the Prime Minister that they are going out and build a Lakshman temple - where it is, we do not know-but, at the moment, they are not doing anything and giving you three months or four months. They are very allergic to four months; they are so much concerned about the tenure of the V.P Singh's Government. And then they say may be five months or three months or three and a half months but, Mr. Prime Minister, you must agree within this period, to allow the temple to be built. Have they an open mind? I am again putting this question. Will the discussion be on a clean slate or with positions taken by the BJP or the VHP?

Sir, this is a very important issue. What will you discuss Mr. Prime Minister? I am sure, you are not going to discuss on this. Please be specific on this. Are you going to discuss whether this Masjid will remain or not remain there? We cannot agree to that proposition. There cannot be any discussion on the continuance of the Mosque or not. The only thing is how to build there, maintaining the Mosque. And let them have a temple to their heart's desire, although, we have not got the site plan. In spite of repeated requests, we do not have the site plan of what they are going to construct, and how big will the temple be.

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

Therefore, Sir, these are matters which have to be borne in mind. And I request the Prime Minister not to be oblivious of the fact, not to suffer from any euphoria. There should not be any euphoria. You have to beware of your friends there. Somebody called you a "circus master"; you have to beware of your friends facing you as you have to beware of your friends sitting behind you. How they are going to utilise you, nobody knows and you do not know.

Sir, I will request the hon. Prime Minister and I also wish to bring to your kind notice what is being said in this country by responsible people, who are given today a good deal of importance in our national life. The General Secretary of the VHP says: "Ask the Muslims to give away their rights, if they have any and have good relations with Hindus. Now, on this question, they have to agree; if they do not agree, they will be forced to agree."

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Somnath, we do not quote magazines.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: This is an important statement made on an issue which is agitating the entire country.

MR. SPEAKER: But we do not quote the magazines.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Then how to refer to these statements?

MR. SPEAKER: You can say it in your own words.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Well, Sir, I say that the General Secretary of the VHP has said to the effect that the Court itself is violating the Constitution. He has said to the effect that Court is adjudicating something which it cannot. He has said to the effect that

according to the Constitution, it cannot adjudicate the faith of the people; so, if the Courts are violating the Constitution, we care tuppence for these Courts.

Sir, this is a Solmen statement made by an organization's representative, with whose other representatives, the hon. Prime Minister is confabulating for days together and he hopes to come to a settlement with them. If you can change their hearts, well and good. But our apprehension is that the tactical approach which now has been taken by the BJP and the BJP Government is only to save their Government. They were apprehensive of losing their Government. This tactical retreat is only to raise the frenzy more and more. People are being told today from the floor of this House that three months are enough, thereafter we shall take the law into our own hands. We do not care for the judicial verdict.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Nobody has said like that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: That is the effect of the Statement.

SHRI RAM NAIK: What a speech of harmony! Who said that here? Nobody has said that. We have been listening to the speeches. A senior person, the leader of a party is unnecessarily provoking the people. This is not creating harmony.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I would request Advaniji when he will speak after me to clarify it. Let him say that my understanding is wrong, I would be very happy. Let him say that I shall be very very happy. They have said I have understood their speeches wrongly. Therefore if after three months or three and a half or five months negotiations do not result in a settlement acceptable to all, then rightly the Prime Minister has emphasized that it has to be decided by the Court.

One very important in the Prime Minister's statement is; I hope I can quote the Prime Minister's statement - "I expressed my belief that this exercise at Government level could be expedited and completed within 4 months time men, s leaving the matter before the court; all the cases will be brought here. "I found agreement on this approach." But I find there is no reciprocation. According to the Prime Minister's understanding the other side agreed to this; but we have not found that approach. Therefore it is very very vital. Why I am insisting on this and repetition this is because somebody has to accept a decision of somebody else. If it is a joint effort, a joint decision, acceptable decision, nothing better than that and we have been advocating for that for days and months and years together. If that is not possible unfortunately, though I want it to succeed, then how will that issue be resolved? It can only be done through court. All these efforts have been made from that side of the BJP to say, will courts cannot decide that matter; it is a matter of *Janadesh*; it is a question of mandate, it has to be done; we shall do it. Therefore it is mandate versus the constitution. It is a mandate versus faith. This is mandated and faith, both together according to them.

Therefore we request the hon. Prime Minister to be extremely careful. Let him not repeat the mistake which he made in the recent past of allowing things to almost beyond control. Letting the grass grow under the feet in a situation like this only for the purpose of arriving at a consensus will only give them more elbow room and they will try to organise themselves more for the purpose of we know what their object is. Very clearly they have mentioned their object.

I do not wish to take further time. I request the hon. Prime Minister to make it very clear. We would have been extremely happy if the Prime Minister has arranged for maintenance of *status quo* by all means of that area until a decision is arrived at through negotiations or through courts verdict. How do you assure the maintenance of the *status quo* there? We had requested the Government of India to take over that land not for the

purpose of arrogating to take over that land not for the purpose of arrogating to the Central Government purposes, but we said take over that land, so that ultimately whoever is entitled to it will get its possession as it is today and no alteration is made.

Sir, a huge platform has been built - a concrete platform, a permanent structure - in violation of the order of the court. For what purpose was it constructed? What will the tourists do there? A whole jumbo is there; 120 feet x 120 feet huge platform, a concrete platform, a pukka platform has been built. For what purpose? What will happen so far as that platform is concerned? Who will use it during this period? For what purpose will it be used? We would like to know whether it is part of the temple which they propose to build. (*Interruptions*) I would request the hon. Prime Minister to assure the House and the country that he will take all necessary steps to maintain the *status quo* in all respects. Whatever construction has been done, it has been done against our wishes. But no further construction in any manner, no manner of use of that property, should be permitted, which may not be in keeping with the ultimate objective of arriving at a negotiated settlement or arriving at a negotiated settlement or arriving at a decision by judicial process. Therefore, we would request the hon. Prime Minister to make it clear. Let nobody have any illusion that they can play about with the people of this country, with the unity and integrity of this country, taking advantage of any inaction or drift on the part of the Central Government which has a special responsibility in this case.

We shall support you in all your endeavours so long as they are will-directed endeavours. Do not try to compromise with the forces of fundamentalism, do not try to come to an arrangement with those people who will not see the reason and openly say, "We shall have it or not".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this very important discussion that we were having since yesterday, we have some reservations about the

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

Prime Minister's statement. But we wish him all the best and assure him of full cooperation so long as he does no compromise the unity and integrity of the country, does not surrender to forces of reaction and fundamentalism. Thank you.

[Translation]

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was not very eager to speak. Shri Sharad Yadav and Shri Shahabuddin have already spoken on behalf of our party and Shri Viswanath Pratap Singh is to speak. A debate regarding the future of India has been going on in this House for two days. That day today is a historic day. I am speaking with your permission. I would like to thank all those who have participated in this debate. I am thankful to them for their wise and considerate speech. I would like to remind all the hon. Members, it is good that the hon. Prime Minister is also sitting here, that we are going to celebrate Golden Jubilee of the quit India Movement of the year 1942. I would like to submit that our House and the people outside the House are waiting to know the Hon. Prime Minister's reply and decision is taken by the House on a very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was thinking since morning about what I wrote to you. I would like to give one or two examples from the contemporary history of India and I would request the Nation and this House that all the parties here should rise above their party lines and take a decision in the interest of the future of this country, and in order to maintain our Nationalism and Indian-ness.

Mr. Speaker, sir, with great anguish I would say under the leadership of the father of the nation Mahatma Gandhi a war was fought to end imperialism in oppressed Asian, African countries and to deliver people from the imperialism of the white people, but I cannot forgive our elder leaders for their inability to bring our country together. I was a student then. Our country was divided on the basis of religion. Such a serious blunder

was committed at that time and yet there was no revolt against that. People opposing the partition did not go to jail our leader Subhas Chandra Bose was wading a war with his Ajad Hindi Army during 1941-42 outside India. Today I would like to remind this House the names of three persons. Since Shri Lodha has told about his link with Shri Subhash Chandra Bose so I am mentioning names of those three persons - Shri Sahgal, Sri Shah Nawaj Khan and Shri Bhillon. A case was against all the three people was registered in the military court. All these three names are the symbol of nationalism. But I do not want to name those persons in the House who went astray. That nationalism and Indian-ness have been forgotten and they have been presented in a different form. So when we have witnessed the partition and when we have experienced the pang of it, I would humbly like to submit through you one thing before the whole Houses and that is we should be ready to accept the judgement of the Supreme Court as a symbol of Indianism and as a symbol of the supreme authority of our constitution even when the judgement is passed in the last phase of negotiation.

When everyone says that there is no other alternative, can't we, the Parliamentaries arrive at a consensus on this issue? Finally, will the verdict given only by the High Court or Supreme Court be acceptable? Because the Court verdict is the symbol of nationalism and symbol of our Constitution Court verdict and the protection of Constitution are synonymous. Can't we take a decision to that effect in the House? Actually, it is the question of our nationalism, Deliberately or unintentionally the world is eager to know whether we recognise the Babri Masjid or not. It has become a national symbol and we have to protect it we have to construct the synonymous. Can't we take a decision to that effect in the House? Actually, it is the question of our nationalism. Deliberately or unintentionally the world is eager to know whether we recognise the Babri Masjid or not. It has become a national symbol and we have to protect it we have to construct the temple without causing any damage to the mosque. It has become a symbol of our

nationalism. Can't we arrive at a consensus on this issue? In fact, there was some hesitation to honour the court verdict.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I got up to speak with your kind permission. I shall make only two submissions. Gandhiji sacrificed his life for the sake of communal harmony, secondly, it was the result of the struggle made by Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose and Gandhiji against the British Government at the time of National movement that we got a nationhood and are enjoying its benefits till now. Now the question is whether we will lose the country we obtained after a struggle of one thousand years? After a span of about one and a half thousand years we succeeded in getting India as a nation. As such for the sake of the Country. I would like to tell my fellow members of the House that we should rise above the party politics and look towards nationalism. I was very distressed yesterday when the hon. Member who spoke after Sharadji, made a reference to Konark and Khajuraho in this connection but to Taj Mahal Though Sharadji made. I was distressed for that is Taj Mahal not part of the composite culture of the country? Therefore, my submission is that if we develop such a psyche we cannot love and respect the country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had promised you that I would not take much time, I am just going to conclude. It is a very important matter. It is question of life and death for the people of this country. In this connection would like to quote Shakespeare who says:

[English]

"To be or not to be is the question."

[Translation]

Therefore my submission is that when this is the situation, we should rise above party politics to take a decision on in the interest of the nation, With these words I concluded.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH
(Fatehpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon.

Members of the House expressed their views in a very impressive manner in a peaceful atmosphere yesterday as well as today. Of Course there were some exchanges at the end. I feel that it is the opportune time for us to end this discussion at the earliest. It should not remain as a topic of discussion only, rather a solution to the problem must be found out in the country.

Sir, I would not like to make a lengthy speech today though there is no restriction on it. Because sometimes too much of grief causes anger. Moreover, the events that took place during the last 15 days have shaken all of us throwing a challenge to our basic principles — whether it is the judiciary, the Government or the Parliament. Therefore, our primary concern today is not to concentrate on the points of discussion; There has already been exhaustive discussion and many other opportunities will be there in future. But the most important thing is what would be the way out to a solution to this problem.

The Ram Janam Bhoomi - Babri Masjid problem is a nectar if it is solved amicably and fire if it is not solved. We should make efforts to see that it does not prove to be a fire and should prove to be nectar. This country has to live long and it will certainly live. Hence we should try our best to turn it into nectar. No other way out is left. I am confident that the people of this country as well the hon. Members of the House have the required farsightedness, courage and patience to find a way out to this problem.

Sir, not only me, but also most of us have faith in this country. Ours is a land that unites the people. It still retains its power to unite the people. People still have confidence in one another. I have faith in them. But that confidence is not reflected in the discussions we hold. Therefore, that confidence is the only hope for us. That is why my belief has been that there is something that keeps our country united. I would not like to go into the details but the need of the hour is to create a favourable atmosphere. It was seen in the opinion poll that the very psyche

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]
and action of the country believe in unity and integrity. I am confident that all people want a solution to the people.

We may have difference of views but we should not have difference of mind. It is our responsibility to see that despite difference of views, we remain united in all respects. Today, it is not the question as to which party managed the affairs of the country properly. We can discuss these things at our own party circles. The question is how can we protect the country unitedly.

Other countries are also looking towards us to see whether we can keep our country united or not. I am sure that we are all united at heart and have the same feeling. We want India to remain united and prove before the world that we are capable of solving such a sensitive problem. Today we stand at a cross road. Where our decision may change the curse of the history of this country. Therefore, we should not indulge our selves in hitted exchanges. This is the golden opportunity for us to solve this problem.

Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, you have solved a number of Problems. But people complain that a lot remains to be done. You may also have some complaints but you should leave aside those complaints and address yourself to this burning issue. You got adequate time, perhaps three, four or five months which I do not know. Four months are considered in auspicious. It is a borrowed time you have been successful in many such borrowings, I wish that you will also be successful in this borrowing. *(Interruptions)*

They had also given us borrowed time. I am talking of my practical experience in the matter. But you have more hopes. Mandal issue had not been raised when I was given four months' time. It was raised inbetween. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi) : You were given ten months' time.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

It was also a borrowed time. So it could not be solved. The problem would have been solved immediately had the Mandal issue not been raised. *(Interruptions)*

Now the Hon. Prime minister has been given four months time and he is more hopeful to solve the problem. We are also hopeful that the problem would be solved within these four months.

At that time also I had received some indications. The hon. Prime Minister must be aware that most of the Members of the House had given me active cooperation. Atalji, I do not hesitate to accept this. Shri Yunus Saleem is present here. He tried his best. The religious leaders, Shankara char-yas and learned muslims make efforts to solve the problem. However, I as well as shared ji said that the Mandal issue was also entangled with it in one form or the other. It is true that we had to pay for it but we have no regrets. When rockets are launched, the rockets extinguish but the satellite come to the orbit. Similarly, though we were wipe out, the satellite of social justice come to its orbit.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have made sacrifices and our example is cited. You are warned that you may not warn you the bate of Mr. V.P. Singh. You have already been warned several time that V.P. Government had been thrown away. Though it is correct that we have been removed from power yet it was not our remove all, it was our sacrifice like a seed. Sacrificing ourselves we have produced pant and tree of social justice. All the hon. Members have mentioned the feelings of the hon. Prime Minister. May be he would not have stated all the things. I know that the hon. Prime Minister can't say all the things on all the occasions but some times he is bound to say something. As a result of his saying, this is th State of affaires. Dixit ji is present there. He met the saints there and the saints authorised him to place their feelings in the House and to settle it within three months. Now they say with referance to your statement that instead of solving it, you have made it complicated. We do not knows if it is

solved or made complicated. So, please throw some light whether it is solved or it has been made complicated. We are unable to understand as to what has happened within one or two days. What is the difference between your understanding and Saints' understanding? What is all this going on? This situation as put us in a Predicament as to what is all this going on? This situation has put us in a predicament as to what will be the result of it in future? The saints claim that they did not have any talk about the court but you have referred to Court or the Judicial authority in your statement. May be you could not define the judicial authority; but the difference is clear. In my opinion whatever the deference in understanding is there. We should remove it immediately through negotiations, instead of making comments on it. We should try to promote this understanding on the basis of equality and we will be satisfied if you achieve success in this process.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, besides it our suggestion is that a comprehensive initiative should also be taken. It appears that you had taken the initiative should also be taken. It appears that you had taken the initiative and held talks with the some group, you had talked to them earlier also but no new initiative has been taken to hold talks with the minorities group. I hope that formal talks will also be held with them. Even if we combine all the parties and all the organisations, collectively they all can not be more important than our country. There are some other influential people in our society. Our religious guides called Gurus are there. I hope that they will also adopt a constructive approach towards it. The scholars of this country will also adopt a positive view on it. I believe that you will value these scholars and religious guides in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have not only put this discussion on the right line but have also given a direction to it and have provided a good leadership to it. Therefore I will try to put my suggestions within the same frame only. No doubt, it is our achievement. We have not taken to our differences rather we have followed the way of consensus; and on the

basis of it, we have moved forward in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my opinion the resolution of N.I.C. is a great achievement. Some people I do not agree with me but I take it as a great achievement.

I wish that all the political parties including B.J.P., Leftists, Janta Dal and T.D.P. etc. should take part in it and give a direction to it and then on the basis of that direction, the country may be moved forward. We request all of you to agree to the N.I.C. resolution. It would be a great success, if the House also puts its seal in one way or the other on the unanimously passed resolution of the N.I.C. meeting unanimously, it should be a very good start if the use also adopt sit with the same spirit.

During the election period, wide publicity was given that the temple should be constructed at Ayodhya but the mosque should remain in fact. 80% of the countrymen were in favour of this decision. This is not only our opinion but this is the opinion of this country also. There is not much difference but there are two issues which separate us. One issue is as to where the temple should be constructed and the other major issue is as to who will finally decide it. The problems generate from here. The focus of debate is on this point and it is dragging many fundamental things. I understand that should be thought over by us seriously. Let us decide as to what will be the unanimous decision of various parties.

I want to say one more thing as to what should be the shape of the final decision. I do not want to comment of it just one. It may have any shape. We have to decide it with full regard. We have to obey the decision of the Court. We have to decide it with mutual coordination. Before a decision taken, it would be far better to be a solution of the problem found out with mutual consent. It will make things much easier. To maintain the mutual understanding, we will urge upon you to think over it also. If such an assurance is given, the faith will be firm and a good atmo-

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]
phere will be created. We will be happy that we have solved the problem. I think that the hon prime Minister will take initiative and he will give us an assurance in this regard .

We want to submit one thing to Shri Advaniji and Atal ji . Now it is being stated that the decision of the Court will ultimately be final. It is some thing which can be trusted upon. We give this argument that if it is not decided by mutual consent then the court will ultimately decide it. I think that this is the only point where we have basic deference. The site can be decided later on and if we may not be able to decide later on and if we may not be able to decide even the site, then where will we go for the decision. These are inter linked issues which should either by mutual consent or be decided by the court because in that case we have no alternative to get these issues decided. These are the basic differences in our views. You claim that the things related to faith and religion cannot be decided in the court. Besides it, you also say that the verdicts of the court have come several times but those could not be implemented on administrative grounds. Please do not raise this controversy during the course of this discussion. It is your responsibility as to how to run the country. Today this responsibility is yours and tomorrow it may shift to others and all of them may be trapped into trouble on this issue. Do not take it as an issue related to present only, it is an issue related to future as well. This issue is directly linked with the running of the administration of the country. All should co-operate collectively and think as to how the country should be run. No doubt the faith is final the conscience is final and there is the uniqueness in decision, but, if the country and the administration are to be run and if there is clash of faiths, then no faith is supposed to be considered lower than the other one. There is no categorisation of the faiths and the priorities of the faiths have not been prescribed. If there is the class between two faiths and there seems to be no way out to remove these clashes then we all including the Hon. Prime Minister will have to sit together and find out a way to run the country.

As regards the faith, we do not go for the faiths of the Hindus and the Muslims only. I quote an example that there is the temple of Sakshi Gopal, we are not giving arguments just to deny the existence of that temple. The faith of the priest of the Sakshi Gopal temple was that the temple should remain there only. The Shankaracharya of Dwarika had given a statement that[Interruptions.... we will talk about it later on, the Shankaracharya had stated that the temple should not be there. If the faith is there in the temple Sakshi Gopal, then it should be there. It created the clash between the Hindu faiths. What is to be done in this case, how to tackle it and who will decide it? In these circumstances, how you or anybody can run the country? As a result of this clash, one faith has to knock the doors of the court against the other faith. Naturally, the priest of Sakshi Gopal temple had to go to the court. If we try to find out the way of avoiding the clash between these faiths, perhaps we may find out the way.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Mr. Speaker Sir, with your permission. I would like to point out that as far as I know the priest of the Sakshi Gopal temple did not go to the court but he was doing Kar-sewa, which was going on there and he was in the front line of Kar sevaks. I would like to request Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh while stating the things, he should not ignore the facts.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: All right, you have corrected me. Perhaps it may be wrong, but whatever I came to know from the newspaper, I was stating the same but it can be an example. It is not like this but it can be like this. I correct myself, it is good that you have given me correct information. Then I understand that in it[Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down for two minutes.

[Interruptions]

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI (Darbhanga): Till now we were silent [Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: Please listen; it is not good. It is beyond decorum.....

[Interruptions]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh) : The decorum will not last long like this *[Interruptions]*

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. You need not talk with each other while sitting. I am giving the ruling in this regard.

[Interruptions]

MR. SPEAKER: You are disturbing very much. You too please sit down. You are also doing the same thing. The aim with which we had tried to start the discussion here and a number of good suggestion.....*[Interruptions]*

SHRI MOHAMMAD ALI ASHRAF FATMI: In this way nobody can speak here *[Interruptions]*

MR. SPEAKER: Look, there is no need for you to get agitated. A very good speech is going on, and good suggestions are coming in. Kindly listen to them, and you should keep in mind that you will not disturb him by talking on his behalf, time and again.....*[Interruptions]*

MR. SPEAKER: You may sit down. Look, there should be no side talks.

[Interruptions]

SHRIVISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my submission is that we should sit together on a national level to resolve any conflict of belief to pave the way for the country's progress. It is the responsibility of every body and it involves common national interest. I believe that we have to find a solution within the constitutional framework. If there is any deficiency in the constitution, it shall have to be removed. Whatever is enshrined in the constitution is being attacked, and even the Supreme Court is not being spared. We pass a law here and it is rejected there. We may come under discus-

sion, a discussion on the parties may be held and people discuss the executive, but even now, if the citizens have faith in any institution that will uphold their rights, it is the judiciary. How will we find the way out of all these conflicts impose a question mark on that point? It is my conviction that it shall not be good to impose a question mark on the faith which these courts have inspired? If we have done so it is bad and of course examples of such instances in the past may be there; should we pursue such examples, what shall be its ultimate result? Will this union continue to exist or not, there can be success or failure on one point. If we go on the path of violation drawing upon some past instances, will there be unity, we shall have to think with almost seriousness on this point rising above party lines. Mr. Prime Minister with all honesty, we have to find a solution to the tangle which has led to confrontation between the people of two faiths. We have to consider as to how to save the country. We have to hold an honest discussion on this. You may make convention, you may not enact a law, the country can be run on the basis of conventions and traditions. Ram Janam Bhoomi controversy has got to be solved. It is the responsibility of all of us to see that the country makes progress. We are busy in improving the past history, all the same we have to create history. It may not be that while improving upon and going through the pages of past history, we become oblivious of the coming events. This will be a national blunder.

I would like to submit another point. Atalji has said that bloodshed has been avoided. I agree that a sigh of relief has been heaved, but it must be realised that if peace is restored after suppressing one's better feelings, the pent-up feeling may erupt later on much more violent torn. The question is not of blood shed, it is of running the country. If this argument can prevent bloodshed, it is a question of preventing the same and how the bloodshed can be saved, for that all of us should sit together, some solution will emerge, it shall not emerge merely through such discussions.

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

I would request the hon. Prime Minister and everyone is expecting that he should certainly say something today. He should tell us something at least if not everything but he should tell us something. When Krishna ate clay and Yashoda asked whether he had eaten mud, he said that he had not eaten clay "Maham bhakshyati Vaanam" he said. Then Balram said that he had eaten clay then Krishna said that how could he tell a lie to his brother. He told Mata Yashoda to open his mouth to see, in the same way, you may also open your mouth a little and reveal something to us.....[Interruptions].

THE PRIME MINISTER (Shri P.V.Narasimha Rao): That was something between the mother and the son....[Interruptions] If you call me your son, I shall tell you a lot.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: It was not simply a matter of mother and son, it was also a matter of brothers, and Dikshit ji was also a witness, that Krishna had eaten clay, by way of saying something to the saints there, but besides that[Interruptions]....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Who is Balram? [Interruptions]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Mr. Jakhari is sitting here.....[Interruptions] Jakhari ji will be displeased....[Interruption]

MR. SPEAKER: Really we shall have to see who is Yashoda.....[Interruptions]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Sir, when Krishna opened his mouth, the entire cosmos could be seen. Then Yashoda had a realisation. If he opens his mouth and shows complete information with us, we may also feel enlightened. At present there may be doubt in our minds....[Interruptions]..

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Does Vishwanath need any more realization?....[Interruptions]

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Atal ji, it has been said about Vishwanathji that he was never born, there is no controversy about his birth place. When he appears, he appears in person and leaves only after he destroys everyone....[Interruptions] Shankar has another characteristic, ghosts, snakes and scorpions live with him, but all these are symbols. He lives with all those who are suppressed, downtrodden, and social outcasts. That is why, only Shankar and none else is the source of all creation...[Interruptions].

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): He gives a boon to Bhasmasur as well. And Vishnu is realistic and whenever he was incarnate, he did so to protect the realities, that is why he did not marry Saraswati instead he married Lakshmi who has a very old relation with power. Mada chakra Lakshmi...."Shankar ji who smokes Dhatura is different from everyone else. However, let us take another aspect.

A Member of your party said that you will be come the ring master of the circus, all right. The ring master has one virtue when the ring master gets his whip fierce lions and tigers stand up on the stool it would be better you do the job of a ring master not always but occasionally only when the need arises. Question is not where he has gone, but who is holding the reins of the horse, whether it is the rider or the horseman. you are the rider and all of us are horsemen. we serve the nation and the horse.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Who is the horse ?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH : The country is the horse, we ate horsemen, we are serving the country.

A question mark is attached to this. I would like to tell one thing to Advani ji and Atal ji. They should also ponder over it. They also had been to Lucknow, I too had been the, by the same train....(Interruptions)....

We went there in the same train and there were people to greet both of us. I read in the news papers that the police averted a confrontation between both of us, I am not aware there was possibility both of us, I am not the news papers have their own ways to write something. There should be no clash anywhere, but a serious situation arose there, when I talked to the minority groups there was agony in their minds. Our brothers from the minority community said that why should they fight a case, they should withdraw the case. They think that they will not get justice. They feel that even if the court verdict is in their favour the Government will not implement it and there by deny justice to them. I do not know what actually happens but they are upset and disappointed. This mental state is not good for any person irrespective of the class he belongs to. We will hope that the Government will remove the apprehensions from their minds. The court is the last resort. We do not want to go to the court or any authority. Something should come out of this discussion. Shri Shahabbudin also has mentioned certain areas of flexibility. It is a good thing if there is flexibility and mutual understanding something can work out. So far as extending our helping hand to an agreeable solution is concerned we feel that the terms and conditions should be decided first and that can be done through mutual discussion. Shri Sharadji mentioned about the N.I.C. resolution also. If the Government wants the discussion to be fruitful we should whole heartedly support the N.I.C. resolution. Certain positive things would come up which would try to resolve this vexed problem. But the hon. prime Minister will have to take initiative in this direction. We can extend our co-operation but the initiative has to be taken by the hon. Prime Minister.

I would like to highlight one thing here, which may not be relevant at the moment. A consciousness of nationalism should emerge out of this discussion. Neither his House cannot decide it nor any law or a resolution can impose it on the people. As this issue is being debated among the common people it is reflected here. Shri Sharadji and Shri Chinmayanandji here expressed their views

about the shape of our national consciousness. They hold different view is associated with the Hindu sentiment and the other is associated with the Muslim sentiments. He is of the opinion that as the majority is in its favor the nation will be strong and the minorities will be protected. This is the view of your party and you have taken a categorical stand on it. We believe in certain values of the freedom struggle and want them to uphold. That alone can be the bedrock of this consciousness. It is a matter of faith. We believe that history should not be repeated. Is there no real blood-shed on the pages of history and should we be prospered to shed blood as it happened in the past? neither the Ganges has that much of water to wash off the blood that would be shed nor any place of worship can provide peace and solace in those circumstances.

one of our colleagues asked us to peep into the history of thousands of years back. He has created a controversy. He said that long back the tribals ruled here. But when the Aryans came here, they became dacoits and since then they have been 'robbers'. These people later became backward classes and downtrodden. I do not agree. I do not want to be dragged in this controversy. But if this caste-discrimination continues it would lead to agitation even though there might be no agitation, at the moment. Therefore we should discuss it seriously.

There is one thing more. I am not well-versed in the principles of religion. But I am born in a Hindu family. My parents have brought me up. They taught me Hindu religion, but they never taught me Hindu-polarisation. I am of the view that Hindu-polarisation and Hindu religion are two different things. The Hindu religion is adopted elements. It is said that the Hindu religion is meant for the welfare of everybody Sarvabhoot 'Hitaye'. Similarly, we believe in the will-being of all. 'Sarve che Sukhen' We have a tradition of religious tolerance. One should not forget that there were eight 'Brahma-resins' in the court of the king Dasharatha. One of them was Jabal who was an atheist. The father of Lord Rama had an atheist out of Eight Brahma

rishis It has been at radiation in our country. We did not drive him out. This is a shining example of tolerance. One must also remember that while Lord Rama was leaving Ayodhya, Jabal too had pleaded him to stay back even though he was an atheist. If we believe in the tradition of religion we must learn some thing from this example. It has also been said, "Sarvadevam namaskarah Keshawam pratigachhati." We believe that all prayers offered are meant for the Almighty. This is also a matter of faith. If you raise the issue of Hinduism it should be debated.

I know that every religion is based on certain principles. When the issue is raked up this debate is obvious. When all prayers are addressed to the same Almighty, why is there a dispute about places of worship? Yesterday Shri Sharad was constrained to point out in anguish that we should not be proud of many things in society. I admit that there are so many things in our culture, thoughts and philosophy of which we should be proud and the world also has acknowledged it. Shri Sharad told that our philosophy has universal adoptability. Our creation of society is susceptible to disintegration. We have to accept it. We are suffering and Shri Sharad has rightly remarked that the realisation sometimes is very bitter. I would like to narrate an-experience. Though today the Ayodhya issue is being discussed, nobody is discussing the Maharishi Balmike temple at Panckuan Road in New Delhi I had gone there recently. In front of the temple there is a room where Gandhiji had once stayed for sometime. Many things which make us remember Gandhiji are preserved there. Mr. Prime Minister Sir., do you know what is happening today in front of the Balmiki temple in Delhi? It has become a dumping ground for the garbage. This is what the society has done. I am narrating their sufferings. If Balmiki is a human being he has to carry the night soil on his head and even though he is deified, garbage and dirt would continue to be thrown on him. But this is not being discussed here. (Interruptions) This is one aspect of the issue. I do not mention the pain they have expressed. I do not change

any person. I quote Tulsidas. He said that birth as a human being is difficult and if there is discrimination life would become all the more difficult and miserable. Let there be a discussion on it. This is one aspect. Lord Rama being a human being cannot isolate himself from humanity. Tulsidas has said: "Vyapak brahma niranjan nirguna vigat vinod jc aaj prem bhagwatiwas kaushalya goad" He is the Supreme being but out of love he is in the lap of Kaushalya. He is the manifestation of the omnipotent (Brahma) He never bore ill will or conflict against anyone. There is need to keep that image intact 'in the lap of Kaushalya' (Interruptions) About Ramrajya Tulsidas has said, "Sab nar karahin paras-per preeti, chalahin sawadhama nirat sudh'niti" The subjects love each other and therefore had mutual respect for religion. There was freedom to chose their own religion during those times..(Interruptions) How such Ramrajya was attained? Ram destroyed the golden Lanka. This has to be understood in the right perspective. But today those having gold rule the country. If someone brings five kilograms of gold he too rules here. The rule of gold is yet to come to an end. This is the Government of capitalists. But who were instrumental in destroying the golden Lanka and in attaining this success? The monkeys, bears etc were with Lord Rama. This is symbolic. They represent the downtrodden and backwards. Even Rama defeated Ravana with the help of Mandal. This is a very old concept.

SHRI MADAL LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Rama did not allow immolation of children. No child immolate during the period of Rama.

SHRIVISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Whoever got victory, he had to take their support. Kansa was killed with the help of Yadavas.

Now I would like to conclude. I want to put up those issues which have been ignored. Shri Advani is in the favour of religion. Tulsidas has described..(Interruptions) you should go through the message of Tulsidas. One day you too will be compelled to admit

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

that what Tulsi has written is true. Let us discuss it. "*Koi Kheti na kisan ko, bhikhari ko na bheekh bhaye wanik ko na wanekee, na chakar ko chakiri jeevikariheen do manush kahen ek-ekan kehan jai bha*". The condition is almost similar to this today. Discussion should be held on it. This issue has been ignored. Today farmers do not have engagement beggars do not have alms, businessmen do not have their business and job-seekers do not have any job. This is the fate of you today ' *Jeevikaviheen kog soche ek-ekan kahan jai*"

It means an unemployed person is asking another one where to go and what to do. Therefore, this aspect also should be considered. But the Government ignores it. I would conclude after submitting one more point. When Bhisham Pitamah was asked about his decision to favour Druyodhan and why did he decide to favour Duryodhan, he answered, "Arthasya Pursho Daso". It means that the man is the slave of money. "Dasya no Arthasya Koye". It means that the money is not the slave of anybody. Hon. Prime Minister we are getting financial assistance from abroad. There should be discussion on this issue too. I would like to inform the concerned people that if we continue to follow this policy, we would have to pay a heavy price. This is a path leading to confrontation. It is rightly said that the river Gangas does not change itself. Though the banks of Gangas are not changed yet the steam always remains new and ultimately it falls in the sea. The wave of though in the country will always continue to flow and this wave will ultimately mix up with the ocean of public, which is tis ultimate object. We can find out the way by mixing our thoughts with the ocean of people. With these words, I congratulate you a lot.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I would like to express my happiness that the conflict has been averted. In fact everybody has expressed satisfaction and happiness formally but it appeared from the speeches that some were unhappy that the conflict has ben

averted. They had incited and made determined effort and even stalled the proceedings of the House for day together to press for the dismissal of the state Government. There was a time when our friends used to say that they were not particular about invoking Article 356 and only wanted acquisition of land. But there was stage when they said that they have changed their stand. On the one hand I am happy that the conflict has been averted on the other hand I am unhappy as to why the situation was brought to such a pass where the conflict seemed inevitable? I do not blame them, but the Government. This Government has completed one year of its tenure and it was not unaware that every election is fought on one issue or the other.

Mr. Speaker, Sir even during the 1977 elections the country was facing serious problem of poverty. There were other problems also besides unemployment and every party declared in its manifesto that if it came to power ti would do this thing and that thing to solve these problems. But then a unanimous decision was taken that the voters should be exhorted to vote for and against Emergency. Those who favoured it should vote the Congress and those who were against it should vote the opposition. In this way the issue of Emergency became a decisive issue during that election. In the 1980 elections the bickerings and infighting in the Janata Party became an issue. This does not mean that poverty or illiteracy were no more a problem. Then came the 1984 elections. The Congress party had made many promises in the election manifesto and so had all other parties but what influenced the voters was the assassination of Shrimati Indra Gandhi and her assassination became the decisive factor.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the 1989 elections, Bofors issue became the decisive factor.. The leader of Janata Dal Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh came out victorious and became the Prime Minister. At that time also all the problems were there and all the parties had mentioned them in their election

manifestos but the electorate found the Bofors issue most crucial. At that time it was said, which Defence deal has been struck without getting commission and when have people associated with such deals not got commission? If some people have got commission what is wrong in it? why is a hue and cry being raised? The entire proceedings of investigation were stalled and the opposition members resigned. A fresh election was conducted and Bofors became the crucial issue. We drew a conclusion that the masses will never tolerate corruption at high places. Similarly, during the 1991 elections Ayodhya issue became the decisive factor. You may say.....(Interruptions)

There might be a difference of opinion but when I say it repeatedly, I say it because we are accountable to the masses, the way Vishwanath Pratap Singh was accountable for the investigation regarding Bofors, it did not appear to Shri Chandra Shekhar that it was his accountability to pursue the investigation, so he made a statement that it is the job of a sub-Inspector and he will do it. But as Vishwanath Pratap Singh was accountable he pursued the matter. He reached a point but he could not reach the root. The hon. Prime Minister had given an assurance that he would reach the root but he has not been able to do so till now. He has not even been able to trace the lawyer who handed over a letter to Shri Madhav Singh Solanki.

The Government is no more interested in it and we also do not want to pursue it in view of legal complications. I am referring to this because I feel that had Shri Narasimha Rao made this statement last year which he made today, things would have been quite different. I am only referring to the authoritative part. Had he said that he would take up the matter from the point it was left by the previous Governments the situation would not have reached such a pass. Will this not send wrong signal to the masses? Will they not feel that the Government does not act unless it is pressurised and the situation is worsened. Is it right? We may level any

number of changes on the Uttar Pradesh Government, for inciting the people and violating the laws, but I would like to congratulate the Uttar Pradesh Government for abiding by the laws, not violating the court's verdict and at the same time not forgetting the mandate..(Interruptions) You may certainly get angry but I am happy that they have been able to meet the target. It took some time and lot of hard work. The Rajmata had to go to Ayodhya to persuade the saints and when the saints insisted whether the Prime Minister would help in this matter, we told them to come to Delhi and hold a meeting with the Prime Minister. We agreed that the Courts verdict should be followed but merely saying that the Uttar Pradesh Government wants us to abide by it, will not serve the purpose and we are also not satisfied by this reply. We want some progress on this issue. We have already said that the prime Minister should take up the matter from the point it was left by the previous Governments. But I have a complaint. I had personally met the prime Minister and told him that during the tenure of Rajiv Gandhi, Shri Buta Singh was looking after this matter. This issue was raised during Rajiv Gandhi's time also. Later when Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh came to power, he had to tackle this problem. Then Shri Chandra Shekhar came to power. I had said earlier also that whatever progress has been made on this issue has been made during Shri Chandra Shekhar's time and I repeat it once again today. Two important aspects were dealt with. Both the parties- who had sharp contradictory views- the members of Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Babri Masjid Action Committee were brought to the negotiating table. Many meetings were held. They were also told to give representations and documents in black and white after consulting experts. The documents were presented and exchanged and both the parties were told to register objections and comments etc. if any on these documents. This was also done.

(English)

This entire exercise went on for some time.

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

[*Translation*]

I do not want to draw myself into a controversy. A Document was presented which said that Lord Rama was not born in Ayodhya but in Afghanistan. There was another paper which said he was born in Nepal and still another one which said he was born in Egypt. But at this moment. I do not want to go into these details. I would like to say that what is important is to bring both the parties to the negotiating table, exchange documents and take a decision which is agreeable to both the parties. The hon. Prime Minister is present here. I would like to know from him whether this matter was also discussed because when I went through the statement I was surprised. On the one hand he said and I quote:

(*English*)

"I also told them, " 'them' means the religious leaders who met him," that once the work is stopped, I would revive the efforts initiated by the previous Governments that had remained unfinished...."

[*Translation*]

I come to the conclusion from this that he would take up the matter from the point it was left by Shri Chandrashekhar.

(*English*)

"The purpose of this exercise is to bring about an amicable settlement through negotiations..."

[*Translation*]

"In case it becomes necessary, the litigation pending in various Courts on the subject could be consolidated and considered by one judicial authority, whose decision will be binding on all parties. This would require a fairly elaborate exercise at Government level and appropriate submissions to the Courts for their consideration. I expressed

my belief that this exercise at Government level could be expedited and completed within 4 months time. I found agreement on this approach..."

[*Translation*]

Vajpayee ji, Dr. Joshi ji and I had held talks with the saint when they returned after having a meeting with him. We have been meeting even after that. Moreover, just before coming here to speak I called Mahant ji and asked him whether such a thing happened there about which it has been said that.

(*English*)

There was an understanding, "I found agreement on this approach..."

[*Translation*]

Because I hold this opinion and Shri Somnath ji will correctly interpret it-

(*English*)

I have not said that this entire matter is not justiciable. No. I have only said that there are certain aspects in this which are not justiciable.

[*Translation*]

When I say this it is not based on my own assumptions. Here is the Bommai-Report and along with it there is also a copy of the decision of the Allahabad High Court dated 7th November, 1989. The last lines of the decision of the Allahabad High Court is -

(*English*)

"It is doubtful that some of the questions involved in the suit are soluble by judicial process."

[*Translation*]

What does it mean? There are many such issues about which the court itself

states that these issues cannot be solved by judicial process. In this regard I agree with Shri Antule ji that now this issue has taken such a turn and page number of people are so much involved in it that no one can definitely say that how the decision of the Court would be implemented.

I may say that

(English)

Litigation is no solution to this problem.

[Translation]

There is one more thing renowned advocate of the Supreme Court has said the day before yesterday and Shri Somnath ji will also confirm it, that he has seen all those suits that are lying pending with the Allahabad High Court. He has also seen the list of witnesses attached with those suits. He has further said that he has seen the list of only 250 witnesses and if only those 250 witnesses are called in the supreme Court and one bench of the Supreme Court is asked to see only this issue daily from morning to evening, even then it will not take less than two to three years in resolving it under the present Civil procedure code and the legal system. In the mean time some more issues may come up. I was surprised to hear as to why did the hon. Prime Minister bear great importance. This was never discussed with the saints. The only point which was discussed with the saints was that the matter should be discussed from the point where it was left by Shri Chandra Shekhar ji and at that time Chandra Shekhar ji and his Government was being supported by your party. I am happy to learn that the view adopted by Shri Chandra Shekhar ji was endorsed in writing by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in a letter in which he wrote that efforts should be made to know only one thing whether there was ever a temple on the site which is called as Ram-Janam Bhoomi and where today a structure of mosque is standing, and the Court and judges should confine themselves to this point only. And if this point is proved, the place should be handed over to the

Hindus for the construction of their temple. They initiated talks by adopting this views and the members of the Babri Masjid Action Committee came for a dialogue accepting this very point of view.

If this approach is adopted today, then the problem cannot be solved and secondly, there will be many matters for decision for which everybody will have to be contacted and everybody will have the right to speak. If the Court takes up the issue whether Lord Rama was born here or not, it just cannot take any such decision. Somebody says that he was born in Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would therefore say that a totally wrong nation is created whenever there is a reference to the Court and whenever anything is said about the Bhartiya Janata Party in this regard. Shri Manishankar Aiyar ji asked me a straight question as to what would I do constitution taken in this House and the oath of the Constitution taken in this House and the oath that we take in the public outside? I would like to emphasise that my and our party's allegiance to the Constitution is unquestionable. There is no question of clash between the two. Everybody has allegiance towards his family, one has the allegiance for the institution he works in. If someone is asked as to what would he do in case there is a clash between his allegiance towards his Communist Party and that towards the Constitution. Certainly the allegiance to the constitution is above all, but the point is who will be benefited by this nation that is being created throughout the country by asking such questions?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Chandra Shekhar ji who is not present here at the moment said that there should be a talk in clear terms. I am of the opinion that there should be a clear talk and Shri Indrajit ji has said that I talk very cleverly others also do I would therefore make request to all those who can talk in clear terms that they should give clear replies. Shri Shuleman Sait who is present here said in the House yesterday, and in our reply you have quoted it also and I quote Shri Suleman ji—

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]
(English)

I am very happy that a question has been asked about the mosque. The Prime Minister in his statement has given full guarantee for the protection of mosque. He also said this in the NIC meeting. He also said that in the Congress party manifesto, a guarantee has been given for the complete protection of the mosque. I quote:

"Congress is for the construction of temple without dismantling any mosque."

[Translation]

He is satisfied with it but he is not fully satisfied.

(English)

He does not say the disputed structure but he says, 'Mosque' protection of mosque means not protection of structure but it means that later on the idols will be removed and moque will be restored.

[Translation]

He has said it in a very clear terms. I would like that the hon. Prime Minister and others may also speak in clear terms. Allegations of violation, contempt and disobedience of the court are made against us today, I am of the opinion that this dispute has taken place only due to the formation of the Babri Action Committee which came into existence to oppose the order of the court. I would not cite more examples to what is going on in Ayodhya, I think all other examples were unnecessary. I agree with those who say that the Uttar Pradesh Government would disobey the court order only because some other Government has also done the same believe it would not do that but, I would also like to warn that the feelings of the public of the country which have just been referred to by Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh should be taken into consideration as whole. Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh has mentioned only about the minorities. I say that we should

be concerned about the whole country rather than only discribing the mental state of the minorities. When they are told that a mosque in calculats was constructed in violation of the law and without the permission of the corporation and the court ordered to demolish the extra structure, then the Government of that state stated that it would become a law and order problem for them. I am not accusing them, I say that it is their right. It is their right to say to the Government that they should be given relaxation because it is a matter of law and order problem and High Court granted the relaxation.

Now, if the entire country comes to know about it, they will say that in that matter it was done but in this matter, the High Court says that it should be demolished. What will be its consequence? Will it be good?

They were complaining as to why did the centre not acquire the disputed land, even though it had even thought of dismissing the state Government. They did not acquire it because they knew that the Uttar Pradesh Government was earnestly making all efforts; that they were facing difficulties and that the acquisition of the land would mean a repetition of the operation Blue Star, which they did not want. I feel that they acted wisely and prudently. The U.P government used to tell us that we ourselves should ask the centre to acquire the land as it would relieve their headache. However, we did not approve of the idea. After all, this was the responsibility of the Government too should fulfil its responsibilities.

At the meeting of the National Integration Council, the State Chief Minister, Shri Kalyan Singh made it amply clear that his Government will implement the court orders and make efforts to get it implemented, but for this he was not prepared to open fire on the saints assembled there, as the previous Government did on October 30 or November 2, He also made it clear that he was prepared to accept any punishment given by the National Integration Council for his stand... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI KAMAL CHAUDHARY (Hoshiarpur): It is more on an eye-wash. (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): In fact it is they who vitiating the country's atmosphere... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to Shri Indrajit Gupta for drawing our attention to the fact that this issue may have its repercussions not only in this country but abroad also. He expressed his concern over the possible reaction this issue might have on the Hindus and their temples in Bangladesh. I am glad to know that he is concerned about the Hindus and their temples in Bangladesh. I would have felt happy had he and those in other political parties expressed the same concern when temples were destroyed in Annatnag and two lakh Hindus forced to flee the valley.

The double standards being followed today in this country is giving rise to many difficulties. Had all the political parties in this country passed a Resolution. (*Interruption*)

Two lakh Kashmiri Hindus are running from pillar to post. Mr. Prime Minister, you are present in the House. I request you to do the thing that your predecessors didn't do. Please visit these migrants and have a look at their miserable condition. please visit the camps in Jammu and Delhi to understand their plight. Our entire media is pre-occupied with the Ayodhya issue. Newspapers and periodicals are replete with articles pertaining to the Ayodhya issue and political parties and the people have nothing else to talk on, but Ayodhya, as if the issue has become some ghost, even though it is a fact that it is not a dispute between a temple and a mosque. You won't agree with me, but I have said time and again.

[English]

That this is not a dispute between a

temple and a mosque. This is a dispute between a temple and a non-mosque.

[Translation]

There existed a Mosque, but not today. The structure is that of a Mosque but do they keep idols inside a mosque? Do they keep the idol of Lord Ram in Mosques?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we take strong objection to it. He is using abusing words, sitting besides us. This won't do (*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Shahabuddin, you should not have used that word.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Which word Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: You have a refined diction also.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I reprimand you for using those words.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You going beyond the limits.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Shahabuddin, you should have realised that we were discussing this matter very very carefully. It was not necessary for you to use the words like the ones you used. I know that you have a refined diction; you could have used a better word, But I do not know why you are doing it.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I only wanted a clarification from Advaniji that were the Government of UP acquired the

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

land for tourism purposes, after the 'acquisition the Government must have taken the possession also. How was the possession made over to VHP, Bajrang Dal and others?

Secondly, with regard to the mosque in Calcutta which you have referred to, only a portion of it was held to be outside the sanctioned plan, not the entire mosque. Of course, I have no personal knowledge, I will find out. Not that the entire mosque was illegal.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): You know fully well that Muslims were prying in that mosque right from 1428, for 450 years. How did those idols come inside? Then you must also know that the UP government had fitted an affidavit saying that the idols have been placed surreptitiously and wrongfully dead of night. This is a fact. We never placed the idols. Idols were placed by some mischief makers and because of that the Government forced us and the law court forced us not to pray there. We did not give up prayers ourselves deliberately. Our claims exist and once the idols are removed we will start praying over there.

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Okay he has at least clarified that they want to remove those idols. The gentleman who spoke here also agrees to it. Imagine there is an idol placed there today as per the orders of the court. The High Courts has also upheld that decision... (Interruptions).. Listen, if you wish I am prepared to read out.. (Interruptions)

[English]

Now, I cannot argue, Sir.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, It was not just an opinion of the Court. Rather, the court had ordered that the Puja will continue. It had decided that the doors would be opened. It was not our decision. No Vishwa Hindu

Parishad had forcibly.... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): When did the Allahabad High Court pass the order? The idols were kept there, inside the Mosque. When was the order passed and by which Court? (Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: In 1950, the District Court... (Interruptions)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: The issue of idol was not decided so far (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir I don't want to go at length into the history of this issue. The court has gone to the extent of saying that as per the affidavits place before the Faizabad District court, no one has offered Namaz or Puja at that place since 1936...

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Namaz was offered there till December 22, 1949. Pandit Nehru has written a letter to Pandit Pant in this regard.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: But I don't say 1936. I say that in 1949, while they say that idols were placed there and when in 1950, the court held that Namaz was not being offered there since 1936. If that statement is untrue, then those who appeal in the name of court day in day out, say that the court had made an incorrect observation and, therefore, what I am saying is also incorrect. But the court has held that uninterrupted Puja will continue to be performed from 1950 onwards and that no one will offer Namaz there. Since then, i.e. after 1950, not a single Muslim had gone to that place. This is totally correct.

English

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : This is correct. (Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: This is correct and now I wish.

[Translation]

Now you also accept that as per the court orders, no Namaz was offered there after 1950. Since 1950, idol worship has been taking place there continuously and the doors were unlocked by court orders. We did not open it and that court order was challenged in the High Court. It was challenged in the High Court... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: The High Court of Allahabad had given the stay order and that is pending. (Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I wish Shri Somnathji could enlighten them on the legal point at least because he has been advising me. I am aware of the legal points. (Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: I respectfully submit that you will not say anything that is contrary to the facts. I have studied the whole case. I know that the order was passed by the District Judge of the Faizabad Court. A Writ Petition has been filed before the Allahabad High Court's Lucknow Bench. That Writ Petition is still pending; when that application was filed before the Allahabad High Court, the *status quo* order was passed that no further improvement or change will be made in that building.

(Interruption)

(Translation)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The doors were opened. It was done during the tenure of the Congress Government and an allegation was made against the Judge who passed this order that he had done it at the behest of a Minister holding office at that time. I had met that Judge and he told me that he has

never seen even the face of the said Minister. This is what he has said against whom an allegation was made.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We didn't say so.

[English]

The Hindus had gone to the Court for the purpose of opening the temple and the *Puja* has been performed under the Court order; and that very Court has said that no further construction will be made.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I understand, they said, "No further construction, and not no further *Puja*".

(Interruptions)

SHRI SIMNATH CHATTERJEE: Why was the construction not stopped? That is the issue.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I will tell you.

[Translation]

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, a misunderstanding is coming to the fore continuously, when I listened to Maliniji she did also mention it but Somnathji did not make this error because he knows that the acquired land-

[English]

It is not disputed territory. The disputed territory is the structure. (Interruptions) I am not yielding, Sir, (Interruptions) You have your own viewpoint. You have stated it. So far as I am concerned, I draw distinction between the two.

SHIRIMATIGEETA MUKHERJEE: Sir, I want to seek a clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: This will be the last clarification that you will ask from Mr. Advani. (Interruptions)

SHIRIMATIGEETA MUKHERJEE: You

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

said that the issue is not mosque or *mandir*. It is not mosque because there is no prayer. May I ask you in all humility: How many *mandirs* are there in our country where no prayer is there? Do you think that those are not *mandirs*?

[Translation]

SHRILAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is some difference between the land measuring 2.77 acres which was acquired by U.P. Government and the land which is below the structure. The writ-petition, which is at present pending in the Supreme Court or which is being heard in Allahabad High Court, is related to the 2.77 acre acquired land. I remember that at the time of acquiring the land, it was considered as to why the entire land should not be acquired. It was also discussed that the government should acquire the entire land i.e. the land on which the structure of mosque is there and the land on which the idol of Ramlala exists, as had been done by the previous Government—the V.P. Government. But it was decided deliberately after a great deal of thought that the U.P. Government may not create bitterness as all the Muslims of India have an apprehension about the structure of mosque and not about the rest of the land. So it should not be acquired rather it should be protected. They continued to keep the word they gave at the meeting of the National Integration Council to protect the mosque and took utmost care to protect it. The remaining part of the land was acquired which had a site for Shilanyas.. (Interruptions) I would like to inform you that it was acquired to facilitate the pilgrims...(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tourism...(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is correct, for tourism and for pilgrims...(Interruptions)..you do not know, perhaps those people know it, when an affidavit was filed in the Court about

tourism and about pilgrim traffic. Similarly, another affidavit was filed by the U.P. Government stating that the Government accepts this place as the birth-place of Lord Rama and the temple has to be constructed there. I think the construction of temple will also promote tourism and that is why this has been done..(Interruptions)..

[English]

SHRISOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Then the Government should have constructed the temple. How is the Government land made over to this organisation?

SHRILAL K. ADVANI: I will tell you. We could have taken a lead from free India's first Government because that Government, under the chairmanship of Mr. Nehru, decided to construct the Somnath Temple. (Interruptions) The earlier temple had been destroyed. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Not only our Government has done so but the Nehru Government also did it. When Sardar Balabhai Patel took the decision, Mahatma Gandhi gave his blessings to the move but said that it would not be proper that the temple should be constructed by the Government and suggested that a trust should be formed..(Interruptions) and the same trust should construct the temple.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: If we take these two things separately...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: The court has said that it will not be transferred.

[Translation]

SHRILAL K. ADVANI: Now I have given reply to all of your queries. I think you are all satisfied. Mr. Speaker Sir, through you I would like to submit that when the saints called on me, there was no point of 2.77 acre of land in their mind. So far as the matter of 2.77 acre of land is concerned, I hope, as the Supreme Court has indicated and perhaps it may call for all the relevant petitions from the Allahabad High Court. The U.P. Government has already filed such a petition in the Court. It will be much better if the decision comes out soon. But as per our discussion and your statement, the matter is related with the structure where a mosque existed earlier and where idols of Ramlala are placed. I have got a very strange experience about it during the last few days. I have a Christian friend. He is a publisher. I requested him to go there and to see with his own eyes, and to make his own conclusion. He went there. Now he has returned. He asks three questions to every person who meets him in this regard. He asks whether they are aware of Babri Masjid. If they say yes, he asks his questions. The first question is-how many minarets are there? He gives options whether there are 2, 4 or 6. The second question is how many people offer Namaz there daily? Whether 10, 50, 100 or more. All people give the wrong figures. When he says that there is no minaret in Ayodhya and none has offered any Namaz there for 40-42 years. Then the people ask, why is this dispute then? He further adds that no Muslim resides within the radius of 2 Kms. of this structure. Then the people repeat the same question. Why then all this controversy?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was hearing Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar very attentively. I have a strong objection to the statements made here, and the publicity made by the Government also in this regard. It is projected throughout the country through the Government media that the temple supporters want to construct the temple by demolishing the mosque. Its consequences will go against us in the country as well as in the entire world. If we give the facts...(Interruptions) May be

there is a court order and that court order will be wrong. But nobody offered Namaz there for the last 40 years by the court order.

[English]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHAT-TACHAARYA: Sir, Mr. Advani said that the disputed area is not a disputed area. Now he proceeds to argue that the disputed structure is not a disputed structure.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Maliniji, I am sorry, I am not yielding.

[Translation]

I totally disagree with your notion of fundamentalism. What you call the Hindu fundamentalism in fact, not Hindu fundamentalism..(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is narrow-mindedness, it is communalism. As casteism brings in narrow-mindedness, similarly communalism also brings in narrow mindedness. Mind you, there is a difference. I know the definition of fundamentalism. That is why I am saying that there is no fundamentalism in India. There are so many ways of worship in India and if one more way is added to all these ways, nobody may ever have any objection to it.

But there is a psyche, a majority psyche. The country which was divided on Hindu - Muslim basis and after partition Pakistan declared itself an Islamic nation but this country did not declare itself a religious nation...(Interruptions)

[English]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF): Please hear with me. (Interruptions) It should not go on record. Please don't say this to us.

[Translation]

India belongs to all of us. You cannot divide it. The people who were in favour of

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

Pakistan have already left. We were not in favour of Pakistan...*(InterruptionS)*

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Katihar): Who had fought against the Britishers, you or we? Please tell me, who were jailed, you or we?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: At that time we were too young but what did the people do who are sitting beside you?

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: When we were fighting for freedom, we were against the creation of Pakistan.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That was very good.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): What did the Muslim League do which is with the Congress now?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): That Muslim League and this Muslim League are two different parties...*(InterruptionS)*

[English]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have not said anything wrong. You may disagree with it.

[Translation]

You have absolute right to disagree with me, but I agree that in spite of the fact that India was divided on Hindu-Muslim basis and in spite of the fact that Pakistan declared itself an Islamic State, India condemned the idea of a State based on religion and did not accept the religious State and declared itself a secular State. The reason behind it is that this country is having majority of Hindus. Had India not been a Hindu majority country or had it been a Muslim Majority country, it would also have been an Islamic or a religious country. Not long ago Bangladesh was formed with our help, and in the beginning it was a secular State, but after 15 years it became an Islamic State.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel pride that the State tradition of India and its traditional politics do not permit a religious State, instead they permit a secular State.

Just now Shri V.P. Singh has said rightly. He was quoting from the age of Dashrath. During those days person like Jawal was also regarded a Brahma Rishi. Although he was an athiest, he was included among the royal counsellors. In this country every person is given due respect whether he is athiest or an athiest like Jawal. Great innovator Charwak, who propounded the theory of "Yawat Jeevet sukham Jeevet, rinam kritwa ghritam piwet, bhashmi bhootasya dehasya, punragamanam Kutah" has also been regarded a saint. This is the tradition of India. It is not our tradition as Shri Shahabuddin has demanded the resignation of Vice-Chancellor of Jamia-Milia who said that it was wrong to impose ban. It is not our tradition. And if they want to make such tradition a part of our tradition, then I would say that ours is not a tradition of intolerance.

Therefore, I conclude with the submission to think about what to do in future as they have laid emphasis on it. I would like that first of all the doubt in the minds of the saints with whom talks were held should be cleared because there is a contradiction in this statement. On the one hand, it has been stated in the statement that I will proceed from the point which the previous Governments had left. According to Shri Rajiv Gandhi's letter and the announcement made by Shri Chandra Shekhar this dispute was confined to a point whether a temple existed there or not. If it is proved that there was a temple, in that case it will be handed over to them.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since there has been a lot of discussion on the Constitution, I would suggest one thing. The method they have mentioned in it is not the only method left in the Constitution. It has said that all the cases pending in Allahabad High Court should be brought here and then a decision should be taken with regard to these cases. As I have tried to tell you that it will take years together and even then the issue will remain

unresolved. It will be in the interest of my party and not in the interest of the country. That is why I am telling everybody not to raise this issue again and again and why do they want to do a favour to our party. It seems that these parties will not feel contented until the Bharatiya Janata Party comes to power at the Centre on the Mandir plank. There is, I believe, only one way to resolve this issue and that is to make use of Article 143 and to go ahead from the point Shri Chandra Shekhar and Shri Rajiv Gandhi had left.

[English]

"Article 143 says that: "It is the power of the President to consult the Supreme Court. If at any time it appears to the President that a question of law or fact has arisen or is likely to arise, which is of such a nature and of such public importance that it is expedient to obtain the opinion of the Supreme Court upon it, he may refer the question to that Court for consideration and the Court may, after such hearing as it thinks fit, report to the President for its opinion thereon."

Whatever it is, but this is the question. It can be referred under Article 143 to the Supreme Court for opinion and once that opinion is obtained.

[Translation]

After that there are two methods to resolve this issue as everybody says so - negotiation or court verdict. I think that in this matter

[English]

Litigation is not necessary. Yes, negotiation is the answer.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM:
Who started litigation?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, negotiation is the answer. If negotiation do not succeed, then the other course is litigation.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Is there any precondition?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, I am not putting any pre-condition. It is for the Prime Minister to conclude negotiations which he had started. The next step in litigation.

[Translation]

I have mentioned Shri Chandra Shekhar and Shri Rajiv Gandhi. When I talk about legislation, I am reminded of Shri V.P. Singh.

[English]

SHRI V.P. SINGH was the person who towards the end of his tenure and towards the end of Rath Yatra thought about this.

[Translation]

And said, let us now enact the legislation.

[English]

He passed an ordinance and subsequently, under pressure he withdrew that Ordinance and created a record in the Indian History.

[Translation]

An ordinance was promulgated and was repealed the same day. All the Members sitting here, except our party, are party to this legislation, about which no discussion was held at all. No effort has ever been made for finding an amicable settlement. My party raised the issue of Ayodhya only, but the Vishwa Hindu Parishad raised the issue of three places namely, Kashi, Mathura and Ayodhya. I do not want to name any person but one of the Congress Members sitting here, who asks us as to why do we not discuss Kashi, told me that he had visited Kashi. He was full of rage after seeing the situation there....(Interruptions) But the Bharatiya Janata Party did not raise any

[Sh. Lal K. Advani]

other issue except that of Ayodhya. Regarding other temples and mosques of the country the Government has enacted a legislation to the effect that the status quo will be maintained in respect of temples and mosques of India as on 15 August 1947. It has been stated in that law that any case pending in the court in this regard will be treated as cancelled. All right, I will not complain about it because your party got mandate for that. But I oppose it, I cannot complain about it, because you have got mandate and it has been written in your party manifesto. The way I talk of the mandate, you oppose it, please don't oppose it. (*Interruptions*)

19.00 hrs.

But I will certainly say that at that stage no negotiation succeeds and no other way out is left then. Whatever action the Government thinks suitable by making a reference, it should come to Parliament and enact a suitable legislation to take that suitable action. It is a practical suggestion. Let the hon. Prime Minister proceed further in this direction otherwise all these things, which have been mentioned, will prove baseless and most of the Members sitting here will derive pleasure out of it. Had the Government of Uttar Pradesh been dismissed by Government, they would have enjoyed the fruits of that dismissal. (*Interruptions*) Now, there is some disappointment. Not only this, it is there among some Members sitting there (*Interruptions*) The direction in which the circumstances have taken a turn is the right direction. I hope the Government will bear its responsibility in this matter. On the behalf of my party and my colleagues I assure that we will leave no stone unturned.

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Speaker, Sir, 28 hon. Members have participated in this debate very enlightening, very instructive. I had asked for it; I had agreed that we should have a full discussion. So, I must say that I

have been greatly benefited by whatever happened during the debate.

What we wanted to go into detail during negotiations has perhaps come out here in a different form; and I have a little better idea of what are the grey areas which need to be carefully approached.

This revelation would have come during the negotiations. Now, this debate has, to some extent, shortened the process and the time frame of the negotiations. I am very very grateful to every hon. Member of this House who has participated in this discussion.

I made a statement on a limited point. The limited point was that I took upon myself the task of getting the *Kar Seva* stopped. If it had not stopped the ways I wanted or the way the whole country wanted, this settlement of the issue would have been stopped; it would have been diverted to a different channel in a different direction. So, that limited task of getting this stopped made me invite these *sadhus*. They were good enough to come; and what I have stated in my statement is what transpired there. If there has been any misinterpretation, misunderstanding, apart from the fact that there is enough time to get the matter sorted out, I would like to say that I am very clear in my mind that every word that is contained in this statement represents what transpired at the meeting.

I made it very clear to them that my first task would be to pick up the threads of what Shri Chandra Shekhar did and the previous Government did. I still stand by it. I have already started that process. In a day or two I am going to open a cell in the Prime Minister's Office to get all the paper work done. Because we find that the exercise that was done, resulted in a lot of documentation being exchanged. But today, I am not quite in a position to say that all those documents are available. So I will have to collect the documents from wherever they are, from whomsoever I could collect them, reconstruct the case and they are not the end of the story. It is quite possible that there may

be other documents, other evidence that may be available and that evidence may be equally relevant. So I would have to do an exercise and that is the exercise which I promise to complete within four months - It is whether three months or three and half months or four months - I have explained it in the other House, where they seem to have some reservation about that four month period. I said, "why are you so particular about that four month period? Make it ten days less. I do not mind." One of them said, it could be five months.

So, the flexibility which was there, both in spirit and in word, while we were talking, if it has been marred, if it has been sort of gone back upon later in any form, I would say that that was not really the intended thing. They were not very particular about a particular date, nor was I. The idea was that this exercise should be completed. But that again is not the end of the story. Because, if necessary, when I say if necessary, it obviously means that if that exercise does not really result in an amicable solution, if it does not, according to the Congress manifesto, if it does not, then what is the next step? The next step which I very clearly stated was to take recourse to the process of adjudication, the process of disposal by a single authority.

I had no authority to say at that moment of time nor even now, whether it has to be the Supreme Court. One single authority, I said. I did not say the Supreme Court because I have not gone to the Supreme Court, I have not made any submission to the Supreme Court and it is too premature for me to say which court it will be or which authority it will be. I only said an authority. Then it also transpired that when we were talking about this stage, I said in this case if the authority is seized of the matter, I am in no position to dictate within what time-frame that authority should give the final verdict. The *Sadhus* immediately agreed but they said, can you at least not request them, request that authority to dispose of as quickly as possible. I said, yes, every litigant has the right to do that, every party has the right to do that. In fact, I

am not a party still in the Supreme Court. But still we could request the court or the authority as the case may be to expedite the matter because this is very important and urgent. I am quite clear in my mind that the Supreme Court and the High Court are both of the same view, that there is an urgency, there is a special characteristic of this matter. Therefore, they have been dealing with the matter from day to day with the urgency that it deserves. Therefore, there is no contradiction at all and I am quite sure in my mind because I am now telling you what exactly happened. What I said, what they said, it cannot be anything but what has been contained in this. But we will not go into this.

* All the arguments on all sides seem to have come. This gives me great hope. When you are on the first stage of negotiations, I will not be surprised, I should not be surprised, no one should be surprised, if each of the parties takes the utmost stand.

That is how we begin negotiations. Then there is a climb down, there is a give and take, there is a process, in that process we ultimately come to a GCM or an LCM. This is the process. Anywhere in negotiations, no one starts with a concession. That is never done.

So, today after this debate, I find that all Members, all sections of the House and all opinions, in regard to this matter have come out in their utmost form. I feel hopeful that at the end of four months or three months and twenty five days, this will not be the situation.

Meanwhile, we will do the other exercise. While we are discussing, while negotiations are going on, as it has happened during yesterday and today we will be able to demarcate the areas which could be the issues before that authority. We need not go into, whether one case is to go, or two cases are to go, or whether there are 240 witnesses or 520 witnesses. The point is that the entire litigation is inter-connected, according to my understanding. Otherwise, it would not have been there. Whether it is in court A or court B there is an inter-connec-

tion. If there is something which can be detached, we will certainly detach it. But if I seek adjudication in one case and it becomes infructuous because of another case pending at the same time, where do I end?

Therefore, there is a case for consolidating such matters, those parts of the litigation which really yield the desired result. I cannot do it piecemeal but I can do it piecemeal only when we are negotiating.

Chandra Shekharji started a process. I will pick it up. We will go ahead. If that really fructifies. I do not have to start the next process at all. I will stop there, come to Parliament and say that this is what has happened and everybody will be happy.

Since day before yesterday, since the day on which I made this statement I have been meeting representatives of organisations. Babri Masjid Action Committee representatives I have met; Babri Masjid Coordination Committee I have met; I have met individuals. Tonight, if it had not been so late, — may be even now — I will be meeting some more representatives who are coming. I have requested that the religious leaders may be requested, may be persuaded to talk to me so that I could understand the religious aspect of it. If I have talked to the Sadhus, I am equally prepared — in fact equally eager — to talk to the religious leaders, Muslim religious leaders, Islamic religious leaders, so that I could understand their point of view.

So, I am starting with a clean slate. I am certainly going to involve others. It is not a question of my doing and somebody cooperating with me. I have told Vishwanathji, I have told Advaniji; I have told everyone that this is an effort in which everyone would have to be involved. It is not a solo performance at all and the temptation of making such a matter a solo performance is very dangerous. Because no one wants to be rid, deprived of the credit. If something does not happen, of course, the Government is the whipping boy. That is okay. That is the result. That is the logic of being in Government. But

I have my own confidence that this is resolvable. It can be resolved.

So, I have taken all contingencies in view. Those contingencies would have to be prepared properly, carefully. Somnathji has said, "Be very careful". Yes, I will be very careful. No problem.

I am not really notorious — as notorious as some Members think — for rashness. In fact the charge has been that I am too circumspect. I think, in this matter, Sir, to err on the side of circumspection, it is a wiser decision than on the other side. It is for the world to judge; it is for the country to judge. So, I would only say this. I am starting with the blessings of Parliament and I think with the support, express or implied, of millions of people in this country on what may be considered an exercise, which this time shall not fail because if it fails I shudder to think of putting even that 'if', uttering that 'if'. This time it will succeed. Last time, maybe they did not have enough time and so on. We know where the matter came to a grinding point. Now we will have to take it up from there. And if there are any other implications, other complications, we will have to go into them. There is no doubt about that. Beyond this, there is no clarification, which I can possibly give now at this moment. Everyone who has been asking for clarifications, every hon. Member knows fully well that this is no stage for further clarifications because when you are hearing across the floor here arguments being so vociferously bandied about, what kind of clarifications do you expect from me? This philosophical, *Ramayan, Mahabarat*, what is it that we did not have discussed here? I am very sorry. Thulsidas also.....(Interruptions) I did not know that this House is full of Ram bhakts and all that. So, let us stop this kind of discussion. Whatever has come out has come out. If some very important matter has come out, it is to the effect that this subject itself is not as simple as it looks. It is bound with many other things, litigation plus the need for goodwill, which has perhaps not been emphasised enough. I feel that there is a way. We have to muster the will. I am sure that in spite of all the cross

talk that took place, all sections of the House and, therefore, all sections of the nation have now decided to exhibit the will to find the way.

Individually when I spoke to leaders, I was more than delighted to find that each one of them made a personal commitment, apart from party commitment, that he would work along with me, we will all work together. Of course in Parliament that kind of commitment cannot be made because we have our own reasons. So, we have to go on quoting anyone whom we like in any *sandarbh*, any context that suits us. That is okay. But the point is that I am very greatly encouraged by what I heard individually from Members, from the *sants* and what I heard from the representatives of the organisations so far. I am sure that this trend will continue. This has been a trend-setter. A new trend has come into the country. It is true that there could be different opinions. Nevertheless the trend seems to be that we must find an amicable solution. And if this trend continues no political party is going to gain anything out of going against this trend. I have no doubt about that. Here I see, both parties being so selfless. Advaniji says, why do you make us sit in Delhi. And he says that they are actually pushing you and here. I am sorry. Neither you can push them nor they can push you. The people have much better wisdom than that. So, when it comes to that we do not have to really exchange these things. Let us begin this and I wish that whatever time we have really stipulated, if the effort is fruitful, if it is on the point of fructification, I have no doubt that either the Sadhus or anyone else will grudge another ten days to me or another one month to me because this force of circumstances, the impact of success itself will show it—because nothing succeeds like success. So, this is what I would like to submit to the House and I am again grateful to the hon. Members for whatever suggestions they have given. I will not be in a position to answer the questions. I know that the questions need to be answered.

This is what it means. The outcome of the debate is that there are many questions that need to be answered. There are many

grey areas into which one has to go and a very elaborative exercise needs to be done. We have started doing it. Therefore, we will... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

Work is to be done at a very slow pace, but along with it, it is not to be done so speedily so hard that we hurt ourselves. That is not correct.

[*English*]

SHRIMATIMALINIBHATTACHARAYA (Jadavpur): Has the Government ensured that the construction work has really stopped?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I know that this is one of the important matters. I think, Advaniji also should take note of it. Because stoppage of work is absolutely essential for anything to continue, anything to do. Stoppage has been achieved. Now, there should be no tinkering with that. I am sure, I will be able to persuade and I do not know whether there is anything going against this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): How will the platform be used?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will go into that whether it is a platform or whether it is a temple. Who has called it a platform? Who has called it a temple? You have raised all the points. Why do you expect me to answer at this point of time? Thank you very much for raising the points in any case. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say that the discussion was really very very responsible and enlightening? Congratulations to all the leaders of all the parties and the hon. Members and thanks to other Members who heard the speeches patiently.

SHRI EBRAHIMSULAIMAN SAIT: May God bless our Prime Ministers' efforts to solve this problem.