

Institute that this was not really enough for self-reliance. The real test lies in our designing capacity, the real test lies in our machine tooling industry. Unless and until any country and of the size of ours can have indigenous capability for designing and tooling, that country is never self-reliant on the industrial front. And engineering industry envelopes that sector. What is your allotment for engineering industry? The revised estimate was Rs. 505 crores and the current allocation is Rs. 394 crores. We are afraid whether we are being led by the dictates of the International Monetary Fund. If we talk of self-reliance, these are the areas where public sector needed to intervene and you are reducing your allocation in these areas. This is true for many other areas. I would not go into that for lack of time. It is not only that. Can you imagine what you have done in the Budget? I will just give you your figures for some subsidies. Do you know that for KVIC, according to the revised estimate, you are spending Rs. 34 crores? What is anticipated next year? If you are interested in rural employment, then the programme of KVIC would be enlarged. Do you know how much you have allocated for this? Exactly the same amount—Rs. 34 crores. For the National Textile Corporation which produces janata cloth, subsidy for janata cloth that was Rs. 130 crores in the revised estimates, you have been very kind to add one crore of rupees to that. So already as the morning shows the day, in this year's Demands for Grants relating to your Ministry, you have started following the dictates of the International Monetary Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Private Members' Business is due to start at 3.30. Since Mr. Chatterjee is making

some very interesting points, if the House agrees we may extend the time by five minutes. The Private Members' Business has to last for two-and-a-half hours. Therefore, whenever it starts, it means extending the sitting by that much time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: I will continue on Monday before the Minister replies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, you will continue on Monday.

15.30

Resolution Re. Steps For Maintaining Status Quo Of Religious Shrines And Places Of Worship

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up further discussion on the Resolution regarding steps for maintaining *status quo* of religious shrines and places of worship moved by Shri Zainal Abedin on the 12th July, 1991.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): We are discussing the Private Members' Resolution moved by Shri Zainal Abedin, M. P., regarding Ram Janam Bhoomi Babri Masjid Dispute and maintaining *status quo* of all religious shrines and places of worship as they existed on August 15, 1947. This morning a Bill was introduced as a consequence of the election manifesto of the Congress Party and the proclamation made by the President. And taking in view the spirit of the Bill moved by Shri Zainal Abedin,

M. P., I request the hon. Member to consider the possibility of withdrawing this Bill at this stage because almost ten hours we have spent on discussing this Private Members' Resolution though it should have been over by two hours. The House was so kind and considerate to allow more time. We have taken almost nine hours and 48 minutes for the discussion. So, in the light of the ensuing Bill which is going to be debated, moved by Shri Chavanji this morning. I request the hon. Member to withdraw this Bill taking into consideration the initiative taken by the Government.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : I do not know what would be his response.(Interruptions).

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi) : Some of our members want to participate in the discussion. Therefore, discussion may kindly be continued.

[English]

SHRI ZAINAL ABEDIN (Jangipur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to thank the hon. Members of this august House for the keen interest and importance they have shown to my Resolution.(Interruptions)

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, he has made a request. He is to respond. But, there are some hon. Members who want to speak. If the debate is concluded or if there is a censure motion, you may allow him to reply. But, I do not know at what stage he is? Is he responding to the request? It should be made clear.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : I think it is the well established practice in the Private Members' Resolution.(Interruptions).

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : We want to speak on this subject. We were assured that we would be given opportunity to speak. Therefore, we may kindly be given a chance to speak on this subject.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is the position in case the mover wants to withdraw. Let us check that also.(Interruptions).

SHRI M. M. JACOB : The House has every right to decide. We are in the hands of the House. But, I only(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : First of all, Shri Zainal Abedin should give his views whether he wants to withdraw or not. If he wants to withdraw the Bill, then we will take the consensus of the House.(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : It is for the House to decide whether they want to discuss it further. If they do not want to discuss it further, then the hon. Minister will reply to the question and request the hon. Member to withdraw. First, we have to seek the consensus of the House whether they would like to stop the debate or they would like to continue the debate. If they would like to continue, then how much time should be allotted—one hour, half-an-hour, two hours?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is the sense of the House for withdrawal of this

Private Member's Resolution or for continuation ?

[*Translation*]

I mean to say whether the House wants to continue this discussion or wants to drop it now ?

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, please see the number of the speakers and allot the time accordingly.(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we were assured by the Chair that we would get time to speak. request that they should be given the time to speak.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Khurana Sanib, the House is supreme. If the House wants to drop this Resolution now, then the Speaker or the Chairman cannot say that it should be continued.

[*Translation*]

Please tell me what do you want.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria) : Mr. Chirman, Sir, a Bill has been brought in this regard. This Bill has been introduced by the Government to end its embarrassment. It did not want to give this credit to Private Members by allowing them to bring it as a Private Member's Bill. We have the same intention. Since we would get an opportunity to discuss that Bill, this debate should be stopped and we should be given the opportunity to discuss the main point, i.e. the Government Bill.

[*English*]

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh) : Mr. Chairman, we have discussed enough. Now there are other important Resolutions also. Therefore, we are in favour of stopping the debate on this Resolution.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling) : Mr. Chairman, I support the view of Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav. I think we have had enough discussion on this and we can stop it now.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Rosera) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am in favour of the opinion that the Members, who have not been able to speak now will get an opportunity at the time when discussion on the Bill, which the Government is likely to bring, would take place. Therefore, the colleagues who want to speak now would get an opportunity to speak and we will also speak then.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gandhi Nagar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would request that some of our party members want to speak. They should be allowed to do so. Then the Mover will reply to this debate and next resolution will be moved. Two of our Members want to speak last time also. I told them not to speak assuring them that they would get an opportunity next time. I would request that they should be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : How much time you suggest to be extended for the discussion on this Bill ?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have time till 5.30 p. m. While keeping it in mind that the next resolution is to be moved for con-

sideration, you should extend the time for this debate. The aim is that the Mover may give his reply and the resolution is withdrawn and the next resolution is also moved. We have no objection to it.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Well, the sense of the House now appears to be to drop this Resolution, but since Advaniji has assured some of his Members that they will be allowed to speak.(Interruptions)....

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is 3.45 p.m. now. I propose that this Resolution should be discussed upto 4.45 p. m. Please say if you all agree.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not wish to stifle any discussion as such. But this Resolution has already been discussed for nine hours and hon. Members of Mr. Advani's party have spoken. There are large number of names. My party Members also wish to speak. Then how can selectively some Members will be allowed to speak ? It has to continue then. Only two Members of a party cannot be allowed. Then others also will like to speak. Then there will be no end to it. Kindly see the language of this Resolution.

Sir, it says :

"This house urges upon the Government to take early steps to peacefully settle the dispute regarding the shrine at Ayodhya and to enact suitable legislation...."

That is separate. So far as Ayodhya part is concerned, that is the policy of the Government. Is it yes or no ?

SHRI M. M. JACOB : Yes.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : So far as the maintenance of status quo is concerned, they have already brought the Bill on which we had discussion and which has been introduced. Therefore, to avoid duplication, I take it that they will bring the Bill as soon as possible for passing. So far as we are concerned, instead of only one Party being allowed to speak, others may also be allowed to speak. (Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : If the discussion is there, everybody will have to speak. Will there be a guillotine at 4.45 p.m. ?

AN HON. MEMBER : How can there be guillotine ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I therefore am submitting that with the leave of the Chair and the leave of the House we can withdraw the Resolution. (Interruptions)

Our member is asking for the leave of the House. In view of the position that is prevailing today, the Government stands with regard to both Ayodhya and the status quo and I do not think the other friends wish to take the time of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Gentlemen, the position as at present is like this. The time taken so far on this discussion is 9 hours and 48 minutes. Members from the following parties have spoken so far :

BJP	3
Janata Dal	3
CPI(M)	3
Congress	5
CPI	1
Telugu Desam	1

Siv Sena 1
Muslim League 1

That is the position at present. Now it is upto the House. If you want to discontinue this and take up the next one or you want to extend it by another one hour, is upto you. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : This is not a prestige issue. But I would like to tell Shri Somnathji that such thing has never happened.*(Interruptions)*..... The hon. Chairman has proposed that we can continue this discussion upto 4.45 p. m. I only wanted to say that two of our party members should speak and members from all the parties also speak. The position is not like that as has been stated by the hon. Chairman. Shri Shahabuddin has said that members from both the ruling and opposition parties should speak and therefore the hon. Chairman has proposed.....*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am agreeing with the leader of the Opposition Shri Advaniji whom I respect very much.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, you have given the ruling that it may continue upto 4.45 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have not given any ruling. I have proposed it on the basis of sense of the House.*(Interruptions)*....

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The sense of the House was requested. If everybody

is agreeable, then this discussion will continue till 4.45 p. m. and at 4.45 p. m. the Minister will reply and then we can take up the withdrawal and the next Resolution.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : What time the Minister will reply ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Minister will reply at 4.45 p. m. Will it be alright Shri Jacob ?

SHRI M. M. JACOB : Yes Sir.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : We want that the second Resolution also should be taken up earlier. I request that let one Member from BJP, one Member from Left and one from the ruling party speak. We may finish by 4.25 p. m. itself. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : If one Member from each major political party speaks, we can conclude it much earlier.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : Sir, there are two minor parties. They should also be given a chance to put across their views.

MR. CHAIRMAN : O.K. So, one speaker from each of the major party will speak. Kindly restrict your speech to ten minutes.

[Translation]

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMY (Badaun) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, firstly, I would like to thank you for giving me time to speak on this important resolution. In view of the present situation, in our country today, it is necessary that the Ayodhya issue should be considered very honestly. I would like to submit that the question of Rama-janma-bhoomi is

not merely a question of a temple or a mosque. The word Rama-janma-bhoomi itself makes it clear that we have great attachment to that place where Lord Rama was born. We understand the importance of the land(Interruptions).... If Shri Syed Shahabuddin has been heard many times in this House on this matter, I should also be heard. I have participated in all the discussions right from the Governments of Shri Rajiv Gandhi to Shri Chandrashekhar that has been held between the Governments and the representatives of the people till now. Therefore, I would like to submit before the House some facts which have still not come to light. It is being said today that the problem can be solved through talks. In this context, I can tell you who obstructed the talks and whose dissent was there. I remember well that whenever the question of Rama-janmabhoomi came up, the religious leaders on behalf of Hindus came forward to handle the issue, and no political leader ever represented the Hindu case. But from the Muslim side, the issue was always handled by political leaders and never by their Alims, Maulvis or religious heads.

I would like to submit that on the 7th October, 1984 when we along with twenty thousand people were leading padyatra from Ayodhya to Lucknow, we were welcomed by our Muslim brethren at three places on the way. They greeted us by offering fruits and milk and made entire arrangements for our stay. If they were not agreed to the concept of Rama-janma-bhoomi, they would have not greeted us and instead raised obstructions. From 1984 to 1986, not a single Alim, Imam, Maulvi or any other Muslim religious leader opposed our movement. If

anybody came forward to oppose it for the first time, it was a political personality, Hon. Shahabuddin Saheb and with whom came some other people.

I would like to submit as to who made an attempt to give this religious question of Rama-janma-bhoomi a political colour. A lot of efforts were made to solve this question on religious level. Many meetings and discussions took place and religious people from both the sides took part in them. Shri Shahabuddin is sitting here. I would like to remind him that during our meeting with several Imams from all over the country in the Indian International Club, when they were agreeing with us and were prepared to listen to us, Shahabuddin Saheb interrupted in between and did not let us finish. On 20th of October, 1990 during the period of Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh, a meeting was called in the Andhra Bhawan. 19 head priests from our side and 13 Alims from Muslim side took part in it. Not only from India, but the personality of world fame, Alim Ali Miyan Naqvi also participated in it. At present, Shri Yunus Saleem is not present in the House. He was the then Governor of Bihar and was also present in the meeting. The Governor of Andhra Pradesh Shri Krishna Kant was also present in the meeting. The discussion went on in their presence. During the discussion, the then Home Minister Shri Subodh Kant Sahay came and asked to stop the discussion and said that it would be continued the next day, and at night too. Shri Santosh Bhartiya and Shri Subodh Kant Sahay told me that the Prime Minister wanted to see me. I went to the Prime Minister's house with them and he told me that this negotiation

would bear no fruits. The Imam is very angry. The question is from which quarter the point arose about discussing the issue honestly.

Definitions are formed according to the feelings and belief of people and the faith and belief of the people are evidences of religion. If we are respecting the national flag of our country today, we do it not because of any logical or historical factor but on account of our faith on it. As such we should keep in mind our faith and not history or logic.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the faith of crores of Rambhakt Hindu and Muslims are linked with Ram Janambhoomi. I would like to say that this issue needs attention. I would like to quote a couplet of Iqbal. He narrates his thought in the undermentioned couplet :—

“Hai Asman Sa Buland Ram Ka
Wajud,

Ahley Nazar Samazhte hain usko
Imame-Hind.”

The scholars like Alama Iqbal accept Lord Ram as Imame-Hind. I would like to ask where this Immam of Hind was born? Today, the question regarding the birth place of God Ram was raised in the august House. If that place is not Ram Janambhoomi, or Muslim leaders, the House and the Government should tell about its location. Wherever, they will tell, we will accept it as Ram Janma-

bhoomi and quit the present one. But you have no reply to it. You claim Ram Janambhoomi as Babri Masjid which is incorrect.(Interruptions)

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): That is not Ram Janambhoomi.

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMI (Badaun): Syed Shahabuddin Saheb, you reconsider this point. You refuse to accept it as Ram Janambhoomi while I claim it to be so. My point is whether any attempt to make the Muslims understand by Hindu leaders or Vice-versa has been made during the course of 44 years of independence. This unfortunate moment has never arrived if any attempt would have been made to understand the religious feelings of the people, religious facts have been found out and religious belief would have been analysed; and after 44 years of independence such type of Bill was not necessary but the Muslim spokesmen who kept on changing*. They were such persons as have no knowledge of religion. Today persons like Ali Mian Nawi Sahab would have raised this issue....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Swamiji it is not right to name anyone. The name of *.....should be deleted from the record.

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I urge that the issue cannot be rightly understood if the concerned name is not mentioned in the context. The name of the concerned person has to be mentioned. As such I am of the opinion if Ulemas who are well acquainted with religious facts, religious sentiments and religious faith, had been invited to solve this tangle, there would not have been any difficulty. I wish to point out that religious matters can never be solved on the basis of history or through courts. The definition of religion is never confined to

*Not recorded.

books. I am not referring to law. I am talking about religious beliefs...
(Interruptions).

Mr. CHAIRMAN (RAO RAM SINGH): Please don't disturb Swamiji.

SWAMI CHINMAYANAND : Sayeed Sahab has been proving that he is not prepared to listen to any sentimental issue.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUD-DIN : But I can prove the existence of mosque there.

SWAMI CHINMAYANAND : If a mosque is existing there, I ask Shahabuddin Sahab to take the oath of holy Kuran and tell the House if he has ever offered Namaz there....*(Interruptions)*... I worship God. If you are talking about faith I will say the right thing. I am not talking about you. I urge all the Members present in the House to visit personally that site and see for themselves whether Muslims offer Namaz there or Hindus go there for offering prayer due to their faith. During the last discussion Shri E. Ahamed had said one thing.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN : Please take your seat. Swamiji, you also resume your seat...

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN : All of you please take your seat. Swamiji please take your seat. All the Members are requested to take their seats. You are all requested to sit in your seats.

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

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri) : I am on a point of order.

.... *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : He used the word*

.... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I did not here what he said. Now, how one can hear what has been said or what not in such an uproar.

.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : You delete those objectionable words from the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You resume your seat. I did not hear what was said.

.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI B. L. SHARMA PREM (East Delhi) : He called Swamiji
(Interruptions)
[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned for Twenty minutes.

15.57 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Fifteen minutes past Sixteen of the clock.

16.17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha reassemble at Seventeen minutes past Sixteen of the clock.

*Not recorded.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

(Translations)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there was an uproar in the House before it was adjourned and Members were excited. I could not hear properly whatever was said. I would request you to go through the records, delete all the unparliamentary words and allow the proceedings of the House to continue.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been the tradition of this House to have a brotherly feeling for each other despite the differences of opinion and bitter words used. They are reciprocated when the right occasion rises. It has been the decorum of this House to forget the atmosphere of bitterness that had prevailed inside the House once we came out of the House. I feel that this is the first instance when a situation has been dragged to such a long extent. I urge all the Members of this House not to provoke each other. Even if any unparliamentary word is used in the course of the proceeding, it should be deleted from the record as per the parliamentary procedure, if we start behaving like one does in public meeting or in other words hurling abuses on each other I understand . . . (Interruptions) . . . I would like to thank B. J. P. . . . (Interruptions) . . . I would also like to thank the members of B. J. P. who were standing holding the hands of each other. But the behaviour of some of our colleagues was not proper. I understand that such differences of opinion will always continue to go on irrespective of the party. We should put our views

but we should not stretch our differences of opinion too long. It is my request to you . . . (Interruptions) . . .

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL (God-da): We were present here.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have heard everything.

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL: If everyone had not taken safer side in that event certainly

MR. SPEAKER: No, you please take your seat.

. . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with both shri Advaniji and Shri Paswanji who have said something just now. I don't know if anything has happened here as I was not present in the House. There is no need of discussion on what has happened. We all do work here with honour and decorum. If anything wrong has happened by mistake we should forget it. In my opinion we will also behave today in the same manner.

If anything wrong has gone on record, I will look into it and expunge it. I request all the hon. Members to behave in such a manner that the decorum of this august House is not disturbed as this parliament is the highest body in the country.

SHRI SURAJ MANDAL (God-da): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we were present here (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Don't prolong it. I request you to sit down.

If you follow the person in the Chair, I can assure you that the House would function smoothly. In case you go on having your say, it would be

very difficult to run the House then.

Efforts have been made to sort out in the best manner whatever has happened here if you prolong the discussion, it will interrupt the endeavour of making congenial atmosphere. Therefore, please try to understand my intention and don't prolong it. The leaders of all parties were with us.

16.24 hrs.

Resolution re. steps for maintaining status quo of religious shrines and places of worship—Contd.

[Translation]

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMY (Badaun): Mr. Speaker, Sir, once again I would like to hold me responsible if I have used any wrong word during the course of discussion which might have hurt the feelings of other hon. Members and I would like to further state that I am a saint and have been leading a spiritual life for the last 27 years. I had never thought that Shri Shahabuddin whom I hold in high esteems . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't mention the name of any hon. Member.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMSHARAN YADAV (Khagaria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is asking from Shri Shahabuddin as to where the birth place of Rama was. What does he know? The birth place of Rama might be known to Dashratha and Kaushalya.

MR. SPEAKER: I am making an appeal to you once again not to get up

again and again and make your point. If you want that the business of the House should run smoothly, as we all wish, I would like to make an earnest appeal to you all not to rise again and again and try to make your point. Please be considerate to us and the House.

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while resuming my discussion I would like to ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Chinmayanandji, don't mention the name of any hon. Member. It is not necessary.

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMY: I would like to go back to the point where interruption began. The liberal attitude required for understanding the feelings of both the communities was not applied. Had we tried to understand the feelings of the two religious communities—and why the two only, why not all the religious communities in the country—with a liberal attitude, the country would not have landed in such a situation. It has been our misfortune that the leaders of our religious and communal affairs have been those who have little knowledge of religion. Even today, after leading 27 years of spiritual life and study, when I am on my legs here, the members feel that I should try to speak the language of Dashratha and Kaushalya. But I would like to do that certainly if the House and hon. Speaker permit me to do that. Whatever I have studied of my religion and practised it, I would like to say that land is land and what emotional attachment do we have with our land our motherland, is a question that it must be put to Chandrashekhar Azad and Bhagat Singh.

Have we not fought for our motherland? Are we not realising the sanctity of the motherland? The places like Anand Bhawan and Jawahar Bhawan can be the places of worship and faith. The Gandhi Dham where Mahatma Gandhi took birth can be the place of reverence. The places where Guru Nanak and Guru Gobind Singh were born are important because these places are their birth places and not because the Gurudwaras situated there. We attach importance to the land and not to the sentiments that have been fanned of this issue. Had an effort been made to realise the importance of land, disputes over Bhawans would not have arisen there. I would like to say earnestly that we don't know whether the birth place of Lord Rama exists anywhere else in India other than the one at Ayodhya. Had we known it and had our Puranas, our sacred books and our ancestors told us that there is some other birth place also, we would not certainly claim it.

During the course of last discussion the hon. Member Shri E. Ahmad stated that when the Police Constable reached there to study the situation, he used the word birth place. Even today I would like to say if you reach Ayodhya and Faizabad Stations, you will find all the tonga-drivers and rickshaw-pullers, who are our Muslim brethren repeatedly shout 'Janam Bhoomi Chalo'. They never talk anything that may create any doubt about its authenticity. I would only say that time has come when we should not see Rama Janam Bhoomi from political angle but it should be seen purely from religious and spiritual angle as well as from the angle of the faith of the country men. Today this faith puts a question to the Government and the

leaders of the country that if there could be the birth places of Gandhiji, Guru Nanak and Guru Gobind Singh anywhere else in the country. Why can the birth place of Lord Rama not be there. I am ready to withdraw my claim if this House, the Government and the people can clarify it.

I want to cite an example here. During the sixteenth century when the emperor Akbar was ruling the country, a healthy atmosphere of understanding one another was prevailing. Once when Rahim Khan Khana was going somewhere, somebody asked him a question. Why does the elephant throw dust over him while moving. Nobody knows it as to why does the elephant do so. It is a secret. A question in verse form was put to Abdul Rahim Khan Khana.

"Dhuridharat Nijisee Pe Kahu
Rahim Kehi Kaj".

(O Rahim! tell us why does the elephant throw dust over its head). Then Abdul Rahim Khan Khana replied completing the couplet:—

"Jehi Raj Muni Patni Tari So
Dhundhat Gaj Raj".

(It is searching the dust that emancipated the wife of a sage from a curse)

There was an attitude of understanding each other in the Muslim regime during the sixteenth century. The people like Rahim Khan Khana of the country realised the feelings of other people deeply. It is the need of the hour that we should realise the sentiments of others. I am not contradicting what your history, what the books of law and what the courts of law hold on this count. I am ready to face the court if it can define the sentiments. If the constitution has the ability to

embody all our sentiments, I bow before it. But when we want to establish our feelings religiously at any stage, why is it given a political colour and why is it made a political target. Therefore, today I want to say that the Bill which has been brought forward, won't be able to have any regard for the religious sentiments because doubts are being raised as to where does lie the birth place of Lord Rama which are striking at the very faith. I have received a letter from one Jabbar Hussain who is a resident of Dosipura Warasi wherein he has quoted from the Puranas, Muslim 'Fatwas', holy books of Muslims and sayings of Muslim saints and asked the Muslims to respect the feelings of the Hindus and withdraw their agitation. Can't the Hindus and Muslims arrive at an understanding? Can snowfall on the Himalayas or flow of the Ganges happen within a legal framework? In fact, laws should be framed by keeping natural processes in mind. Temples and mosques will always exist. Nobody can stop the prayers in a mosque or temple bells from ringing. Those who create disputes between places of worship should do some self-introspection.

When the need of the hour is to make progress, efforts are being made to nullify the development process. Everything on earth has a right to be free. It is unfortunate that even after Independence our places of worship are not free from controversy. These places of worship do not seem to have the right to exist. Sir, this august House reflects the sentiments of the crores of Indian people. We should respect the sentiments of the people and find a solution to this problem.

The Ram Janambhoomi issue is

like a painful wound on the body of every devotee of Ram. These people stifle their emotions due to self-respect and self-control. This Session has been going on for the last 43 days. I have been elected to this House for the first time. I was confident that my views would be received seriously in the House. I thank all hon. Members for listening to me and request them to please understand my viewpoint.

Hindus will not be able to bear the shifting of idols from that area. If the idol of Rama which has been worshipped there for the last 44 years is shifted from there, many Hindus will kill themselves rather than allow such a thing to happen. There are over 66 mosques in Ayodhya. Hindus have always respected the status and have never had any disrespectful feelings towards them. I am proud of being a citizen of a country where there is a peaceful co-existence of temples and mosques. If all this controversy is over a single mosque then we must ask ourselves whether this is a demand for a mosque or a piece of land.

In conclusion, I would like to cite an example from Valmiki's Ramayana. After his victory when Lord Rama is ready to leave Sri Lanka, Bibhishana asks Lord Rama, through the later's younger brother Lakshmana, to visit Lankapuri. Then Sri Ram says that he is aware of the beauty of Lanka but—

**"Apiswarnmayi lanka nameh
Lakshman rochte,
Janani janmabhoomishcha
swargadapi gariyasi."**

So these are the words of Sri Rama on the importance of the motherland. This was the value of the motherland. No other country in the World could

attain this status. China, America, or Russia could not attain this status. But this part of the World has been nurtured by us with our blood and sweat since time immemorial and called it "Bharat Mata". We know the importance of our native land. So we cannot in any way undermine its importance. If the structure is important to some people, they can relocate it. But a 'Janmabhoomi' cannot be relocated. With these words, I thank you.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I think we have discussed this issue for a pretty long time. The Minister may now reply.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me opportunity to conclude this very important debate which lasted for almost ten hours. For nine hours and forty eight minutes, this subject was discussed.

Sir, earlier I requested the House to consider the aspect of the Mover withdrawing the Resolution because of the fact that the Government themselves have introduced a Bill this morning.

Sir, I do not have the time to go into all the details and the various aspects mentioned by various speakers here, though I wish to take some time. The constraint of time is for all of us.

I was surprised to find some time ago that tension prevailed in the House. Not only today, even from the very first day, the discussion was going on in a higher pitch. I failed to understand why this happened. The

essence of all the religions in this country—whatever religion one may belong to—is love and affection towards one another. I have not come across any religion that preaches hatred. So, when all the religions stand for love with one another and to serve the humanity and sacrifice life—if it is necessary for our brothers and sisters—I do not find any reason at all, for a fight of this nature, at a given moment of time. If you are really religious, if you are concerned about the motivation of our religions, naturally, our effort is to establish peace at any cost. The Resolution moved by my friend Shri Zainal Abedin is also for peaceful settlement of the problem regarding the places of worship.

Long before a lot of propaganda was going on in this country by various groups for and against the places of worship. I am not taking time on that because time is not there. But still considering all the aspects prevailing in this country, taking the cultural heritage and the background of this great nation, the culture we have emulated and evolved from the Vedas and Upanishads of this country, and valuing the greatness of the human beings, our leader Shri Rajiv Gandhi rightfully thought that a Bill has to be introduced; a legislation has to be brought in this country, to protect the places of worship.

Sir, it is not a new thing. This is a country where the messenger of peace was assassinated; this is a country where peace-loving persons had to live and die for a cause of the nation; this is a country where Lord Buddha sacrificed his kingdom and everything for restoring peace and harmony among people. In such a country of

ours, the Constitution of India rightfully laid down Articles 23, 24, 25, 26 and so on. Especially the Article 26 emphasises that the religious right of every one to follow one's own religion and the right to maintain the religious places of worship should be protected. I do not want to elaborate again on the Constitutional aspect of it. All the colleagues would be knowing that. But the simple factor is this that emanating from the Constitution, arising out of the distress of the millions and millions of people who want to live peacefully in this country, my great leader Shri Rajiv Gandhi thought that the Government must take up the responsibility of initiating a dialogue for the peaceful settlement of the issue. For that, he even placed a sentence in the manifesto of the Congress Party just before the recent election that a peaceful solution has to be found for all the issues of places of worship, especially for the issue of Ayodhya, and so on and so forth.

Soon after that, the President's Address took place on July 11. Everyone knows as you have all read that. The President's Address mentioned :

"Government will make every effort to find a negotiated settlement to Ramjanambhoomi-Babri Masjid issue with due regards to the sentiments of both the communities involved. In the case of all other places of worship, a Bill will be introduced to maintain the *status quo* as on 15th August, 1947 in order to foreclose any new controversy."

When a Bill like that is brought as a consequence of this, I requested my friend, the mover of the Resolution, because we have already discussed for ten hours and successively for five

days in this House. In spite of the fact that there were emotional build-ups made in-between, the Hon. mover was very happy even to withdraw. He offered to withdraw.

I do not want to dwell more on it because we are going to debate in this House and the new Bill is coming up before the House. This morning only, we introduced that new Bill precisely seeking the same thing as we promised earlier.

So, in the light of all this, I request my friend to withdraw the Resolution before the House. I also request my friends on the other side to understand the necessity of the hour. When people in India need many things to be attended to, when the miseries and hardships are many, when the dangers are across the border, let us realise the significance of all these and understand the necessity of unity and integrity of this country above everything else. So, I request once again to withdraw this Resolution.

SHRI ZAINAL ABEDIN (Jangipur): Sir, my Resolution has two parts. In the second part, it was suggested that a legislation has to be enacted so that *status quo* of all the religious shrines and places of worship, barring the Ayodhya shrine, is preserved and maintained as they existed on 15th August, 1947. A Bill has been introduced this morning.

In the first part of the Resolution, it has been suggested that the Ayodhya dispute has to be settled peacefully through negotiation, dialogue and discussion, and if it is not possible, then through the process of law. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): You agree with that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ZAINAL ABEDIN : I would request the Hon. Minister to see that until a peaceful settlement is arrived at, *status quo* of the Ayodhya shrine should also be maintained.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : I can assure the Hon. Members that *status quo* will be maintained. Efforts and dialogues for a peaceful solution will be continued. Whenever the State Government wants, they are required to cooperate for negotiations. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You need not reply to all this.

SHRI ZAINAL ABEDIN : In view of the assurance just now given by the Hon. Minister, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER : Has the Hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution ?

MANY HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI ZAINAL ABEDIN : I withdraw the resolution.

The Resolution was by leave withdrawn

16.45 hrs.

Resolution re. Unemployment

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now take up the Resolution on Unemployment to be moved by Shri Tej Narayan Singh.

Before we take up that Resolution, we have to fix the time for the discussion of this Resolution. Shall we fix the time as two hours ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS :
Yes.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, for the time being, let it be two hours.

MR. SPEAKER : So, the time allotted is two hours for this Resolution. Mr. Tej Narayan Singh.

[Translation]

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH : I beg to move :—

“This House do consider the situation arising out of growing unemployment in the country and recommend to the Government to take urgent measures to tackle the same.”

16.46 hrs.

[SHRI P. M. SAYEED in the Chair]

It is irony of fate that such a Bill is being presented in the House after 42 years of independence. Frankly speaking, the problem of unemployment should not have been there after 42 years of independence, but today there are crores of unemployed youths in the country. There is no State in the country where you won't find a group of unemployed youth. Whether it is a small or a big State, the number of unemployed youth is enormous. It is surprising that not only literate people are unemployed but the uneducated people are also jobless. According to the official figures the number of uneducated unemployed is more as compared to educated unemployed. According to the official statistics the number of the people who are registered with Employment Exchanges is nearly 32 crores today. It means the number of unemployed youth is more