

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): I would like to say that I will find time any time either today or tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: O.K.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: This is too an important matter to depend on my convenience; I will make it convenient.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us start discussion under rule 193.

Shri Saifuddin Choudhary.

15.42 hrs.

#### Discussion under Rule 193- Contd.

#### Ram Janm Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for allowing this discussion under 193. It is not that we have to ask for some clarifications.

MR. SPEAKER: Now you leave it at that and come to the discussion.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHARY: To begin with, I must make it clear that after about a fortnight of renewed agony and horror some respite has been achieved with the cessation of activities at the disputed site at Ayodhya.

During this phase of descending gloom many acts of deception, dishonesty, irresponsibility, subversion of cherished institutions took place in a most shameless manner. One such act of reprehensible complicity of a Government and its importance has been cited by the Prime Minister in his statement; and I quote from the statement which reads as follows:

" While the Government of Uttar Pradesh repeatedly assured the Government of India as also the

National Integration Council that they would undertake to have the order of the High Court implemented, the construction activities at the Ram Janamabhoomi Babri Masjid complex continued".

Now, this is an act of duplicity that I referred to a little while ago. While, on the one hand, the Government of U.P. committed itself to the implementation of the order of the court, on the other, it allowed illegal activities to continue. This is the most ironical situation that took place.

This period also witnessed ironic reversal of roles of the stringpullers and the puppet and the defiance by the Genie of its unleasher. One cannot help referring to the statement of the Prime Minister in the question where it has been said-

" It was the responsibility of the Government of Uttar Pradesh to ensure that the orders of the court are implemented and the construction activity on the acquired land is stopped. However the situation was allowed to escalate to a point where the State Government expressed its inability to do anything and in fact requested that either the Home Minister or I should persuade the saints and mahanuts to stop the work".

Now this part of the statement made by the Prime Minister may not be very comforting for my colleagues on the right side, but one should not forget that whenever hypocritical stances are adopted and religious sentiments misused for political gains, the outcome becomes always uncontrollable as we have seen during the case of Bhindranwale. This is a lesson not only for the friends of B.J.P. but also for the ruling party as any duplicity, dithering and double standard will prove equally fatal in future also.

We have been demanding that the Ayodhya tangle should be resolved through negotiations or through court verdict.

The Prime Minister said that his interactions with the religious leaders for amicable settlement through dialogues or through the majesty of court were acceptable to other side.

He says and I quote:

" I found agreement of this approach " But in the newspapers we find leaders of Bhartiya Janata Party and Vishwa Hindu Parishad have openly ridiculed this understanding, that this issue can be resolved through court. I want to know from the Prime Minister, what was the common understanding, common thing in the approach that was arrived at there? If it was arrived at there, if things are not resolved through dialogue then the order of the court would be respected by everybody. If this is the understanding, how some of them who are party to this understanding, come out and tell the people that they are not to abide by the order of the court. If you say that this was the commitment, then any floating of the same will be called betrayal by yourself in this House.

One thing is clear that this time, despite some unfortunate incidents that took place and about which two statements have been made by the Minister of State for Home Affairs, i.e. the riots that took place in Nasik and Thiruvananthapuram, large scale evidence did not break out in the country. This happened due to the fact that the secular, political parties really in a very unified manner raised its voice .... (*Interruptions*).... for the respect to be shown to the order of the court. In this House, many a time, we raised our voice in that regard.

I must admire the role played by the judiciary in our country. In this House though matured leaders we are, we could not in a peaceful manner conduct a dialogue, conduct a discussion in the absence of the Prime Minister for days together., The Government was non-cooperative in this regard. May be outside it is something else. That way, despite the will of the House, we could not play a very important role., a positive role that was expected of us. The highest judiciary in out

country and its different wings, had played a very remarkable role and that has reinforced faith in secularism in our country.

I want this House to express its all appreciation for the role played by the judiciary and the role that will be played in the most impartial manner in future. Now another thing that happened during this time, though it was a breath-taking lull before the storm during these 15-20 days there was not much of a violence despite the unfortunate incidents. One thing is clear that people in a big way now understand the design behind the whole thing. It cannot happen all the time on the expediency of a political party in this country.

One day they want to come to power, another day they lose a Presidential Election; on the third day they lose the New Delhi constituency seat; on the fourth day they lose the Himachal Municipalities seat; they rake commenced demon and bring the country to the brink of disaster. These political connections are very much exposed. I also appreciate the role played by the majority community of our country.

Here is an opinion poll conducted by the Pioneer newspapers. It come on last Sunday. It gives the headlines:

" Hindus for Temple with Babri Masjid intact." This is secularism in our country.

One may try to destroy it, one may try to climb to power by the misuse of religion, or the exploitation of religion. This country may be deceived by some for some time. But at the end it will rise to the occasion and foil all the evil designs of those people who are trying to destroy the cherished institutions, in our country.

Today what is demanded of us is this. We all welcome if the dialogue is conducted between the parties. We hear that the other side, the Babri Masjid Action Committee and others who there have not been taken into confidence. The political parties have sever complaints against the Government that they have not been taken into confidence also.

[Sh. Saifuddin Choudhary]

Now an all out effort should be made to start a serious dialogue so that the respite that has been achieved is fully utilised and we do not miss opportunities as we missed in the past. Today's stoppage of work should not be a tactical one. It should not be one for buying time. It should pave the way for a sincere settlement. Why can we not come to a settlement? That is my question, Why should the leaders vitiate the atmosphere? How can we say that on the basis of religious appeal, we can have a mandate in our country? Can we not separate religion from politics? May be, we are not to come to power for 10 years or maybe 20 years we are not to come to power. What harm will come to this country if we are not in power and sit in the Opposition? Why this hurry then? This is the main thing that is really disturbing.

The question of faith is brought out. But in a democracy we cannot blindly follow any faith. There has to be a reason for having faith on something, and who can do justice when there is a dispute, beside the third agency which is neutral, which is impartial and if we defy that, that means we are cutting at the roots of our democracy, We must understand this.

Today the main campaign should be - it is not what you did - but something else. Some complaints are there. I am not going into all that. This is no time to vitiate the atmosphere that has been created. I want the we all take part in a campaign for the country and that campaign should be that the order of the court should be respected and anyone who dares to defy that, subvert that, should be isolated and in this the Government has to be very firm. Any dithering — I am not going into the past — or any prevarication will prove very dangerous in the coming days.

In the whole world if you look at it, even the Arabs and the Israelis are proposing talks between themselves, construction in the West Bank is going to be stopped, I do not know where you are living with your ideas? Why are you taking our country back? When

the East and the West are meeting we are fighting sitting here, the leaders of this country. This is a shameful act happening in this country.

Some people try to say that those who are opposed to a particular political party, a particular ideology are opposed to the construction of a temple. Nobody in this country is opposed to the construction of the temple. Nobody is opposed. But everybody wants that it should not be built on the destruction of the religious place of somebody else. Can a prayer house of God be built on the blood of the humanity of our country? Can it be built on the foundation of hatred? Can this be built at the prospective division of our country? Many arguments are advanced that if in the name of majority community communalism is propagated that is condemned. But the other forms of communalism propounded by some minority outfit, they are not condemned. I do not agree with this. We ought to condemn all forms of communalism. And that is why it is necessary that we reiterate our faith in secularism and today the time has come when the prime Minister should stand up and tell the House and the nation that every effort will be made to fully utilise the time available and the campaign will be unleashed in the country with the help of everybody who is secular and patriotic that the order of the court will be respected and anyone who is not going to respect that in regard to the solution of this very contentitious dispute that is really tearing apart our country should be isolated in every manner. In this if right steps are taken all people, the political parties, those who are secular and patriotic, they will not be found wanting in giving cooperation and support. But for this Govt. stand has to be transparent and forthright. We do not want any acrimony; we do not want any hatred or any connection. But in a very dignified way, which is befitting of this House we must take part in this debate and give this message to our countrymen that in this country these types of obnoxious activities will never be tolerated and the whole House is united on that.

With these words, I thank you very

much for giving me the time to speak.

15.56. hrs.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum): Sir, the vexed problem of Ayodhya was listed for discussion week before the last. But quite unfortunately because of certain developments all over the country, the discussion had to be postponed.

Sir, the tone, the tenor and the very mode of approach would have been totally different if the discussion had taken place a few days ago. We are grateful to the hon. Prime Minister for the great statesmanship he has shown, the patience with which he has met all the political parties and have arrived at some sort of a consensus, The nation is really grateful to the hon. Prime Minister. The whole nation is equally grateful to the religious leaders also who have responded to the call of the hon. Prime Minister to avoid confrontation and bring peace in this great nation.

Sir, the 26th of this month, I believe, is a red-letter day in the history of this great country. A great calamity has been overall. I do not say that the problem of Ayodhya has been totally solved. But I do believe that it marks the beginning of the end to a great disaster that would have totally solved. But I do believe that it marks the beginning of the end to a great disaster that would have totally ruined the secular fabric of this great country and which would have paved the way for the ultimate disintegration of the country. I once again congratulate the whole nation for the way in which they have very patiently waited without creating further problem.

Sir, on one matter I am totally pained. I have to share the agony of the people of my constituency. I represent Trivandrum constituency. This is the third time I have been elected from this constituency.

Sir, a statement has been made by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs. There have been some communal riots going on in my constituency. On hearing the calamity that took place in my

constituency. I rushed to Trivandrum. I reached there by noon on the last Wednesday. The people of Trivandrum was in the grip of fear. What has been reported in the press is partially true, Sir, from the bottom of my heart, I may say that there has been no communal clash between any sections, among the people, in my constituency. It is only due to the result of a clash between two communal fundamentalist groups that had resulted into a great havoc in the Trivandrum city. I had visited every nook and corner of my constituency, where arson, looting and murder had been committed. These had started because of a small clash between the ISS and RSS group of persons. The ISS is a new organ of a Muslim group which has been totally condemned even by the Muslim League of Kerala. We have to nip in the bud this fundamentalist group which will ultimately, if we allow to grow, will ruin the basic structure of secularism of this country. We, in Trivandrum, are united on that.

Sir, there was a peace march on Wednesday, two hours after my reaching Trivandrum. In that, every section, every political party, every communal party, participated. I thank all the leaders who had participated in the peace march because that paved the way for the peaceful atmosphere there.

16.00 hrs.

The President of the Kerala Unit of the BJP, Shri Raman Pillai and State President of the Muslim League, all the ministers of Kerala State, the local Parliament Member and others MLAs, everybody..... participated in a peace March.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you like to discuss this thing at this length?

SHRI A. CHARLES: There was no communal clash as such there. Yes, Sir, I am winding up this issue. There was one group of about 500 families of artisans. It is a Hindu area, Within that area there are hardly 15 Muslim families. But, they are the most protected families in the whole of Trivandrum.



[Sh. A. Charles]

when the violence took place. That shows the communal harmony that still exists in Trivandrum. It was the Ayodhya issue that started the whole trouble in Trivandrum. I condemn communalism wherever it takes place.

Now, I do not want to go back to the historical background of the Ayodhya issue. If the discuss had taken place 10 days back,, I would have naturally disussed that also. But because of the peaceful atmosphere prevailing I do not want to rake up unnecessary issues.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Shri Lal, K. Advani often speaks about the mandate of the people. What is the mandate of the people for the whole nation? In unequivocal terms the Congress manifesto and the prime Minister has again reiterated that the Congress is for the construction of the temple without dismantling the mosque because this is the mandate given to the nation. The temple shall be constructed, but under no circumstances the mosque shall be dismantled.

I am very glad to point out that there are 4 major initiatives mentioned by our hon. Prime Minister in his statement yesterday which are (i) to defuse the situation; (ii) avoid a confrontationist approach; (iii) to bring about reconciliation of views of various concerned parties; and (iv) upholding the dignity of the judiciary and respect for the rule of law. These are the basis on which we have to work for the final settlement of the Ayodhya issue.

Fortunately, I was one of the Members who visited Ayodhya with the Parliament team. So, I have personally seen what is happening there. I am not going to narrate all that because when we are in a peaceful atmosphere, when we are trying for peace; when we are trying for a negotiated settlement peacefully, I do not want to raise up necessarily any controversial issue.

The Congress has always been for a

negotiated settlement and that was our declared commitment. We stand for secularism. Secularism is the sole of democracy of this country. I may be permitted to quote two portions from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's approach to secularism. In his speech delivered at the Constituent Assembly (Legislative), New Delhi, April 3, 1948, great Panditji said, I quote:

"We have seen as a matter of fact how far communalism in politics has led us; all of us remember the grave dangers through which we have passed and the terrible consequences we have seen. In any event now there is no other alternative; and we must have it clearly in our minds and in the mind of the country that the alliance of religion and politics in the shape of communalism - I emphasis in the shape of communalism - is a most dangerous alliance and it yields the most abnormal kind of illegitimate brood."

I may be permitted to quote one more small portion from his speech in Hindi at Srinagar, July 19, 1961. I quote:

"Nationalism cannot exist together with communalism. Nationalism does not mean Hindu nationalism, Muslim nationalism or Sikh nationalism. As soon as you speak of Hindu, Sikh or Muslim, you do not speak for India. Each person has to ask himself the question: What do I want to make of India, one country, one nation without any strength or endurance ready to break to pieces at the slightest shock? Each person has to answer this question. Separateness has always been the weakness of India. Fissiparous tendencies whether they belong to Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians or others, are very dangerous and wrong tendencies: They belong to petty and backward minds. No one who understands the spirit of the times can think in terms of

communalism."

This is the message Panditji has given to the whole nation.

The message of every religion is love. But unfortunately, the message that every religion conveys is hatred. I quote a small sentence from Ananda Ramayana. I had once quoted it here but I have to repeat it again. Ananda Ramayana is written by Sadguru Devai Namah. When Shri Ram was approaching the Valmiki's *Ashram*, he asked; "Where should I live?" and the answer came:

"in the hearts of those who have no lust, anger, arrogance, pride, infatuation, who are without greed, excitement, attraction, aversion, and who are free from fraud, hypocrisy and deceit."

We, on this side of the House, are willing to unanimously uphold that Shri Ram in our heart. That is the need of the hour. That should be our approach to this basic problem.

What the nation wants today is peace, understanding and love. What we want is the healing touch. I am sure, that the greatest contribution can be made by the BJP from that side and I appeal to my good friends, the great leaders of BJP to understand the reality.

While concluding, I may be permitted to quote from Maharshi Rabindra Nath Tagore.

MR. SPEAKER: We understand your language better than the quotation.

SHRI A. CHARLES: I quote, Sir:

"Leave this chanting and singing and telling of beads. Whom dost thou worship in this lovely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut? Open thou eyes and see thy God is not before thou!

He is there where the tiller is tilting the hard ground and where the path-maker is breaking stones. He

is with them in sun and in shadow, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle and even like him come down on the dusty soil...

Come out of thy meditation and leave aside thy flowers and incense! What harm is there if thy clothes become tattered and stained? Meet him and stand by him in toil and in sweat of thy brow."

This is the message for the whole nation and I appeal to all right-thinking people of this country to come forward and with a healing touch, solve the problem of communalism in India. Once for all, let us decide to have the construction of the temple without dismantling the mosque.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhopura): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome the new situation. This is the highest Elected Body in this country and all of us who are sitting here are the elected representatives of the people. I do not intend to speak today on behalf of any party or under any prejudice. I am of the opinion that the democracy is the best system of Govt. for this country and it is the result of this democracy that the Kar seva has been suspended from 8th July. Since centuries there have been many good things in this country; nevertheless there have been many ills. Owing to which this country has been facing crisis for centuries. The struggle for freedom gave us a dream to make a new India. It is so justified and so firm that I would like to say by remembering the labour class and the intellectuals of India that the golden period in the history of the nation for centuries is the period during which the struggle for freedom was fought. Many people can believe in the rest of the history of this, hon. Shri Arjun Singh can believe it and he may have a sense of glory; my colleagues sitting in this side may also have a sense of glory; my colleagues sitting in this side may also have a sense of glory and they may have something to boast. But I am also a citizen of this country and I know that there is hardly any other

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

culture and civilization in the world which can have such bad after effects. Mahatma Gandhi used to say that whenever you are on the point of evaluating, a principle, a culture or a religion, you must always think of its impacts. And if their impacts are not good we must realize that there are some defects in the system..

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not believe in these unwritten history of India for which we have a sense of glory, I do not believe it at all. As much as we know whatever has been written about our entire Indian nation including Hindus and Muslims it is very shameful. No other country has as much long history of slavery as our country has. No other country has as much long history of defeat and disgrace as our country has. I think we perhaps stand second to none in this regard. This is all the result of our traditions. When we talk of communalism and goodwill it does not relate to the Muslims of India alone. The conflict in India between Hindu and Hindu is much more than the conflicts between Hindus and Muslims. The history of it hardly needs mentioning in detail. No Muslim was involved in the incidents happened in Kumher, Chimur and Bara. It is material whether JD, Congress or BJP is in power. I do not make any comment on the Caste system prevailing in India whether it is good or had but I have placed the facts before you. This system is full of cruelty. The discrimination between the black and the white is easily understandable. If there is anything in India to be proud of, it is the labour of the working people of India. Besides, so far as the intellectuals of India are concerned and so far as the so called glory of our culture is concerned, I think nothing worthwhile comes out of that glory. The labourers of India have constructed the Taj Mahal with their artistically skilful fingers. The credit of the construction of Ajanta Alora and Khajuraho also goes to the Indian artisans. Whenever the people from abroad come over here and cross through the doors of Khujuraho, they bow down before the art and culture of India. When an Ajanta is created in India it adds to our pride and the credit of it goes to the magic of the skilled

fingers of the people of labour class. So it is not the question of Hindu-Muslim. communalism The question of Communalism is too deep and wide. I agree that we have got a new thing in the form of freedom. As people say, the Panchayati Raj is established or they say that this system of Panchayats has always been there; but that was really in an unorganised way.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that India and this Parliament which is the highest democratic body in this country should be prepared to tackle such situations. This is the country which has a population of 80 crore and the largest area of fertile land but its history is very sorrowful.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to mention that I have not gone anywhere out in the world because I know that there is nothing with us to raise our heads with pride. Yes, we can raise our heads in the name of Gandhi or in the name of Khajuraho. We can certainly raise our heads by virtue of our music and art; but the rest of the history is very sorrowful. I would like to submit that we should introspect our culture. We sing the glory of this culture but what type of glory is this? The working class has been leading a disgraceful life for thousand of years. When the working class talks of their rights they are harassed, tortured and attached from all the corners of the so called civilized people of the society. This should also be looked into.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the very childhood, we have been facing a lot of harassment and difficulties. Though we are not so downtrodden yet we face such problems and humiliation as need not be described. I would, however, like to remind that you have to face several such maladies again and again. The people are of the opinion that the problem in Punjab is one of Hindus versus Sikh. I hold that in this country there is hardly any difference if a man becomes Sikh, keeps beard and he follows separate customs pertaining to panths. One can keep beards in India he can offer namaj. But there are things in Indian society like caste system, which are so old, strong and deep that the 70 years old communist

movement which was started to set up a humanitarian and ideal society, is proved useless. India is conservative because of its caste system. It is not the case of Muslim and Hindu conflict.

On my visit to Punjab I found the situation there to be entirely different, but I do not want to dwell much on it. For years we have been taking pride in our heritage. However, I would like to submit that this august House must now be prepared to fully realise the gravity of the situation and its impending consequences.

This country is great, but it is inhabited by maximum number of poor. India is known for its cultural heritage but maximum number of blind and persons afflicted with leprosy are found here. Loud proclamations are made by us, but not a single sports person wins a medal and all have come back empty-handed. 'Saraswati' the goddess of wisdom and knowledge is worshipped in our country. Have all the comforts of life like watch and electricity and other things being used by the people been invented by the worshippers of 'Saraswati' in this country. Certainly not. But, then in which direction are we treading? Such gossips and claims are being made. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am also proud of our rich heritage and will definitely speak about it if I go to any part of the world. India was once known for its culture and traditions. (Interruptions) However, we must ponder over the prevailing situation. Though, 'Saraswati' is being worshipped in the country, yet to check malaise of copying in the examinations an ordinance had to be promulgated. This tragedy has struck all of us. In the land where idols of 'Saraswati' are taken out in processions as a custom and in the land of people 90 percent of the people have lost their creativity. Nothing new is being invented and manufactured in the country and 90 percent of the scientists and intelligentsia and philosophers fade into oblivion for lack of avenues in the country. I do not want to dwell on the hurdles I have faced in getting elected to this august House. I aspire to live as long as Morarji Bhai, but

won't live that long and the people of India will say it was so destined. Nutrition holds key to longevity. All of us pray to God for long lives, but run after the Doctors i.e. nothing new is being invented in India.

I would like to submit that this country is afflicted with ills. Such had been the deeds of our ancestors that even if I rub shoulders with Shri Advaniji for 50 years, I can't hope to get married or marry off my daughter into his family. Broadmindedness holds key to the building of the nation. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that if I approach an officer of my caste for any work he is prompt enough to help me, but it is not so if I approach officer of any other caste. (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE  
(Bolpur): Is it so?

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Shri Somnathji is questioning all this even after having the first hand experience i.e. all of us here do not have any professed ideology but take the stand as the situation demands. Many ills are afflicting the country like the Punjab and Ayodhya issues which will come up here. Tension has gripped the House since 8th July. Allegations and counter allegations were made here which I think does not behave anyone. Though both Shri Advani and Shri Vajpayee agreed to uphold the verdict of the court, yet the former raised the issues of sentiments and mandate of the people and also said no court can adjudicate on this issue of sentiments. Shri Vajpayee categorically stated that the Government of Uttar Pradesh should honour the court's verdict. However, Shri Advani made another submission as they are caught in the whirlpool of 'Mandal'. Had we known that implementation of 'Mandal' will stir the hornet nest then announcement would have been definitely delayed. Sir, this Government assumed power on the anti Mandal sentiments and Shri Advani is keeping low profile as the spectre of Mandal has not vanished. Shri Rao may not agree that his Government and the whole country are banking on the anti mandal sentiments as many persons are afraid of the spectre of

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

Mandal being still active. Debate can be held on Mandal but still the panic is there. No doubt, Shri Advani is law abiding, but owing to circumstances he has taken this stand,

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to just submit that all of us are sick. Whatever I am saying may not be fully correct, but I am just giving vent to my feelings and sentiments so as to keep the debate lively. Atrocities are committed in every field and there are contradictions everywhere in the country and democracy, adopted 40 years ago at the time of Independence, has proved to be quite successful experiment. The poor too have got the freedom to raise their grievances. The remedy of all the ills, contradictions and atrocities is democracy in my view. I think in 3,000 years history this is our only achievement. The poor in the country drive strength from democracy. Only within the democratic frame work the caste system will weaken and a strong society would emerge. Therefore, non other than democracy is more dear to us. Sir, therefore, through you, I would like to tell the Hon. Prime Minister that since 8th July the day the Allahabad High Court gave the judgment the law is no more sacrosanct i.e the concept of the State is no more supreme. For example, if in our country the Head of the State dies, then alternate arrangements are immediately made, since judiciary, parliament and other institutions of the country cannot function. After the judgment of the Allahabad High Court, a few persons of the majority community met me and said they are unnecessarily fighting the battle in the court as the judgment has not been implemented. They were in favour of withdrawing the case for lack of implementation of the verdict, but I restrained them and told them that we are struggling for the implementation of the judgment.

My Friends in B.J.P. who met me privately were also in favour of finding a way out. However, at that time the law had lost its sanctity for delay in implementation of the judgment of the Court. Sir, if the judgment is not implemented in another few days as more than 2 years have been wasted in

litigation, then people will lose faith in judiciary and the institutions like democracy which are a source of strength to us. At present the courts are held in such a high esteem in the country that people happily walk upto the gallows in pursuance to the judgment of the court. Sanctity of courts does not depend on laws and enforcement of laws alone, but on the collective will of the country. I quote from the speech of Hon Prime Minister that nothing is more important than dialogue. I am also in favour of dialogue for finding a way out, but in the discussions executive, parliament and judiciary should not be involved. However, holding of parleys does not mean that judgments should not be implemented. Many persons sacrificed their lives when we threw off the yoke of British empire and became independent. Mr. Speaker. Sir, but the sacrifices we made at the time of partition were much more than at the time of Independence. We are a funny kind of people. Names of martyrs during the freedom struggle can be counted on finger tips and the list won't be more than 20-25, but if a court is made of the victims of atrocities then years will be wasted in finishing the list. As against it only 25 to 50 martyrs during freedom struggle can be figured out. This is all about the freedom struggle which was soaked in blood.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mahatmaji stated time and again that he is not bound by law. I would like to urge the BJP that are they think faith is supreme, then they must also be prepared for sufferings. People like Mahatama are still there in India and if they are approached they have remedy for everything. Mahatmaji during the freedom struggle once said that he was a very law abiding and orthodox citizen, but if the law was atrocious then he would willingly violate the law. Sir, he also said that he was prepared to undergo punishment for the same. You may not agree, but you are not prepared to undergo punishment. If shri Kalyan Singh is not prepared to implement the Court's order then he should relinquish his office.

I have come for that purpose and I would have appreciated you only if you had considered the welfare of the country as

supreme; but you have been in a dilemma. Whether it was BJP or the Congress party, both of them delayed the matter merely to achieve their political motives. (*Interruptions*) I would say in clear words that they delayed it due to their infatuation for power. (*Interruptions*) Your approach to the matter has been very slow. My submission is that delay in these matters is a crime. It is nothing more than depriving the hard working people of the country from their rights they acquired after a long struggle. We cannot tolerate it at all. My submission is that there should not be any such delay in future. I would like to submit to Shri Advani in the House that we achieved independence after the struggle of thousands of years; perhaps the people of no other country would have lived under slavery for as long as the people of our country lived. Therefore, we must protect our independency carefully and all the Members of the House should unanimously support the resolution brought under rule 184 to restore peace and abide by the court verdict. My submission is that Shri Advani in particular and also Mr. Speaker should extend their co-operation in this respect. Mr. Speaker, through you, I would submit that if the House fails to take an appropriate decision even after this discussion then whatever efforts the Government may make this issue will again come up after sometime because it is an age old problem. Therefore, it would be better if it is solved through negotiations; our party is ready to give help whatever is required. There is no question of politics into it. (*Interruptions*).. This issue will be raised again... (*Interruptions*) If Shri Khurana keeps good health, this problems will be solved. I will keep quiet. If Shri Khurana promises that he will set the things alright and says that we should not raise it again, we can observe silence for one month. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit to you that a one line resolution should be presented by you or the Hon. Prime Minister. The evolution of these institutions is based on our judiciary, democracy and our sacrifices for those. Though, we have got them with no efforts of ours but our freedom fighters have made great sacrifices for achieving those. We have to live each and every minute to protect this democracy. However, the result is always

good. Democracy always leads to a right direction. Since the time allotted to me has finished I would not take more time of the House. The only purpose of the resolution brought under rule 184 is that we take a ledge to fulfill the aspirations and dreams of the freedom fighters who made great sacrifices. With these words I conclude.

**SHRI CHINMAYANAD SWAMI**  
(Badaun): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to use the language which one of the hon. Member used just now in regard to this important matter. Because it is an issue related to the sentiments of the people all over the country and when sentiments of the people are related, we have to keep our language under restraint. I think conflicts arise mostly on language if we keep our language under restraint, we do not find any difficulty in expressing our views; the expression of views establishes a coordination and creates harmony. First of all, through the House and through you I would like to thank all of the religious leaders who gave full cooperation to safeguard not only the dignity of Rama temple but also of the judiciary. In this regard, I would like to refer the statement of the Hon. Prime Minister as a base to express my views. Like several other Members of the House if I also state defining the culture as a whole then the other Members would not get time. Therefore, I do not rise to define the culture and history and also their utility in national pretexts.

A discussion is proposed to held on culture by the Ministry of Human Resources Development; Members would express their views. I would like to draw the attention of the House only to the point which has been referred to in the statement given by the Hon. prime Minister. The Hon. Prime Minister definitely took an initiative by negotiating with the religious leaders to find out a solution to the uncertainty and tension prevailing in the country. I appreciate him for the initiative taken by him.

At the same time I would like to submit to the Hon Prime Minister that had he taken the initiative when he came to power, the situation would not had deteriorated to the



[Sh. Chinmay Anad Swami]

present extent. I know that Ayodhya issue has been the cause of whatever political upheaval or changes took place in the country during the last three years and when Ayodhya issue has been the cause of all political changes, the Government that takes over must give priority to the same issue. The Hon. President in his Address had said that initiative will be taken to solve the problem seriously. But this was said in July 1991. One year has already passed, however no initiative has been taken so far by the Prime Minister or the Government; no negotiations have been made. Rather the matter has not been taken seriously at all. Had it been taken seriously the problem would definitely have been solved. An exhaustive discussion has already taken place on the resolution brought in the House by Shri Abedin, and also on the places of worship Bill Ayodhya has been the topic of discussion for many days. Despite so much hue and cry made by the Members, the Hon. Prime Minister did not take it seriously; rather he did not consider it to be a matter of concern. We waited for long, but when we felt that nothing concrete was being done I took an appointment with the Hon. Prime Minister and met him on 9th May with the religious leaders whom the Prime Minister had to invite afterwards. At that time those leaders emphasised upon the same point which they repeated after two months. The Prime Minister had two month's time; he could follow the conventions set by Shri Chandra Shekhar. The discussion had been left incomplete at the point where negotiations stopped. Had the negotiations started at the same point we would certainly have been able to find out a solution to it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am proud of Indian culture and there is a lot to be proud of in the culture. I am unlike those Members who are not proud of their culture. I feel that there would be nothing - if not culture - to be proud of. What will be there if not culture to be proud of? I feel that Khajuraho, Konark are the gifts of our culture; the stone carvings of Ajanta and Elora depict our rich cultural heritage. Had we no faith in culture those carvings would not have been as lively as they are.

Everything in our country can perish but not our culture which flows like Ganga. It will overcome all the challenges including the challenge of time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the context of the subject of slavery, to which a reference has been made, I would also like to say that even centuries of foreign rule failed to subjugate our cultural self-respect. It was during the simultaneous period that Mirabai Sang' Mere to Girdhar Gopal, Doodro Na Koi' (I have nobody else, but Girdhar Gopal) She did not accept the sovereignty of even Emperor Akbar. It was during these very trying days that Tulsisaid' *Parshwanath Spandanaheen'*. It was an indirect declaration of independence. Even in the midst of alien rule, Ravi Das who initiated Queen Mera into the world of spiritualism of breaking all caste barriers. There was a continuous flow of cultural values and people were getting united, without any differences whatsoever. Let us not reach for the high walls. Let us not figure. They are part and parcel of indulge in mutual mudslinging, search for the splendor of the moon in the sky and not the specks on it. If we look at only the specks, it will certainly disappoint us. We have to aim for the brightness. Therefore, I would like to say that nobody should be allowed to raise a question mark on our cultural self-respect. It is a trust bequeathed to our nation, it is an asset of the nation.

(Interruptions)

It is in the context of this culture that our pilgrimage centres assume added significance. Our sentiments are so inseparably linked with them that even today, all efforts made in the direction of national unity seem insignificant before the unity forged by these pilgrimage centres. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru witnessed the Kumbh Mela at Allahabad in 1954, he said that no effort, anywhere in the world can achieve the task of forging national unity, single handedly undertaken and achieved by the Kumbh Mela. Don't we know that millions pour in from all parts of the country to take part in the Kumbh Mela? Many of them are very poor, who reach there only with single

mindful devotion and camp on the banks of the Ganges. You may term all of them as fools, but we pay our obeisance to all those pilgrims, including you and your ancestors. Therefore, I would say that these are our cultural traditions, which have always united the nation. Ayodhya is a symbol of that cultural tradition. Ayodhya is not the dominion or inheritance of anybody. Rather, the faith of the nation is inextricably linked to every inch of Ayodhya. If Ayodhya is venerable, it is because the city gave birth to Lord Rama and not because of anything else. If Lord Rama was born there, then certainly we will have to search for Ram-Janambhoomi there. (Interruptions) and I had said on August 24 last also that if anybody comes and tells us that the Ram Janambhoomi is located elsewhere, then we are prepared to shift the site. We respect the verdict of the court. We can prove it that, on earlier occasions too, we have always abided by the decisions of the judiciary. May I ask the hon. Members sitting in the august House about the conscience of this House, when the orders of the Allahabad High Court, passed respectively on October 30 and November 2, allowing the pilgrims to offer prayers at the temple, to take a holy dip in River Saryu and to do the Parkrama on the auspicious occasion of the 'Devtyagi Ekadashi, were being trampled under the boots of policemen? At that time, nobody raised the question of contempt of court. Shri V.P. Singh should have thought of tendering his resignation when the court orders were being flouted by the U.P. Police functioning under a Chief Minister belonging to his own party. Whose responsibility was it to resign at that time? I do concede that later on, the Senior leaders of the Janata Dal realized the futility of associating with such a person and left him. Subsequently, the Congress embraced him. These people went along with them, who are today gunning for us on the charge of contempt of court. I have not flouted the court orders. The Uttar Pradesh Government has all along been making strenuous efforts to implement the court orders. The Kalyan Singh Government has been making continuous efforts with all the resources at its disposal, but it was confronted not only with the question of implementing the court orders, but also that of maintaining

peace, law and order in the entire State and I can claim that when the Mulayam Singh Government was violating the court orders, curfew was imposed in 36 districts of the State and on the contrary, the Kalyan Singh Government, while implementing the court orders and making efforts to remove the obstacles in the way of temple construction successfully maintained the law and order situation in the State and peace prevailed throughout the State. There cannot be anything more to prove our commitment to the rule of the law and the Constitution.

Our hon'ble Prime Minister has said that he will solve this problem within four months. Our respected Raja Saheb, Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh had also made a similar promise. This four month time-limit is a very ominous proposition. Whenever this time-limit was set, situation has always turned for the worse. Had I been in the company of the hon. Prime Minister, I would have suggested that we should set a time-limit of either three months or five months, but never four-months. Unfortunately, you stuck to four-months. We have no objection, if you extend it by another month. It doesn't make any difference. The Government has stated that it propose to constitute a Judicial authority and entrust it with the task of finding a solution to the vexed problem. I would like to tell you that if the proposed Judicial authority is entrusted with all the cases pending before the Faizabad district Court and the Allahabad high Court, it won't be able to come out with a solution even in four years, what to speak of four months. Therefore, the Government will have to decide on the task and issues to be entrusted to the authority. So far as our faith and belief are concerned, I would like to reiterate our stand. I would like to reiterate that the river Ganges won't chose its course, with the permission of the Constitution, not would the sun go by its dictates. Similarly, the faith of millions of our countrymen in their Gods, their deities is not dictated by the provisions of the Constitution. The holy scriptures act as the beacon light in such cases. The Islamic faith is based on Islamic scriptures, the Christian faith is based on Christian scriptures and the Hindu faith is based on Hindu scriptures. so, we believe

[Sh. Chinmay Anad Swami]

that it is our holy scriptures on which our faith is based and the Constitution cannot interpret it. Therefore, dialogue is considered the most appropriate way to look at and solve such issues. The Government should have clarified in its statement the modus operandi, it proposes to adopt and also the role it proposes to play in the same manner in which Sri Chandra Shekhar during his tenure as Prime Minister had decided about the number of people to be invited, the people to be invited, and also the documents to be taken up for consideration. Had the present Government also suggested some similar method or modus operandi, in its state also suggested some similar method or modus operandi, in its statement, we would have certainly believe that the Government wants to bring about a solution through dialogue, on the basis of those documents.

Therefore, as my colleague has demanded, the Government should have formulated such a plan. I would like the hon. Prime Minister to inform the House of the method it proposes to adopt to thrash out a solution for this problem.

Apart from these questions, one of our hon'ble friends used the term 'Bhindranwale' for the 'Kar Sevaks'. I would like to tell him that he should not use at least such strong term to refer to those people who reposing their faith in the leadership, stopped the work on receiving just one signal. 60,000 Kar Sevaks were present in Ayodhya when the Kar Seva was stopped. I myself was present there and when the 60,000 people present at the construction site were asked to do the construction work elsewhere, not a single Kar Sevak protested. All of them obeyed the instructions of the leadership without any fuss. They were not like 'Bhindranwale' rather, they were disciplined, organised and dedicated people. I think that use of such words for them is to ignore the facts and try not to understand the facts or is to reveal ones own nature. I do not want to suggest as to what kinds of words should be used for them, but they are not terrorists, they are not unorganised.

With these words, I would like to make a last submission to the hon. Prime Minister that the issue is very serious and I appreciate the boldness and courage with which Government has taken initiative to solve this issue and I on behalf of my party saints and our society assure the Government that we will extend our whole hearted support if the Government takes initiative to solve the Ram-Janambhoomi issue, if the Government takes the initiative in this regard keeping the faith of the people in mind. With these very words I conclude and thank you once again.

[English]

SHRI P.M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep): Mr. Speaker Sir, for the last fifteen days the country was almost at a point of suffocation. The reason is well known. But the sagacity and the maturity that the leader of the House, our beloved Prime Minister, has shown has saved the country from the brink of disaster. As you have already mentioned and given caution also at the beginning of the discussions, we should not utter any word here which may go against the very spirit of the talks that the hon. Prime Minister had with the *Sants*.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mohan Singh, you are identified.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Why is it that the Prime Minister had to contact them? The situation had come to that stage because the UP Government could not honour the verdict of the Allahabad High Court. The Prime Minister's position is almost like that of a policeman. In case he uses strictly the provisions of the law, he will be accused that he is using political power against a State. I was very carefully listening to Shri Salfuddin Choudhury's speech. I thought he would not make use at least of this occasion to accuse the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was prepared to take any step. At the same time, our friends were telling, "acquire the land, but do not go further". Thus far and no further. I do not want to use this occasion to accuse

them. But, who will implement the decision? Acquisition can be made, but who will implement the acquisition order? Then, he has also to follow suit, that menses politically, he will have to go on with the policy of confrontation. What he has done is this instead of confrontation, to have conciliation. From the time he assumed Office, that was made known to the country and he has consistently pursued the policy of national consensus. There was no alternative for coexistence and only confrontation was there; that was the only alternative for coexistence. Therefore, he has only perpetuated the one year policy, that is national consensus policy.'

My esteemed friend Shri Chinmayanand Swami has just now mentioned that if the Prime Minister had initiated the talks months earlier, this situation would not have arisen. But, where was then the situation? The problems in the country were such that there was not even any time to concentrate seriously on such problems. 'Better late than never'; and he is now in a position to tell them that the confrontational policy will not yield anything and will not help the Government or the country. Now, the whole country is congratulating the Prime Minister for averting the country from the brink of disaster. How is communalism sown in the country? I was born in 1941 and the country attained independence in 1947. The virus of communalism was sown in this country because of the historic tragedy of partition. I am not going into the historic part of it; but the division of the country was on the basis of religion. After 45 years, it is proved - everybody knows there and also here - that such a kind of partition cannot go on; and it has proved to be a failure. Even now, suppose the something is being continued by some other parties to make the State a theocratic one, will it not be futile? That is exactly where the problem lies in this country. I do not want to go into the details of Ayodhya issue; I was also one of the members of the team which went from here, along with the NIC Members. Our report was also placed here. Therefore, I am not going into the merits of it. Now, a golden opportunity is created in the country. As leaders of the country, we will have to rise above politics and see that this situation is

well cashed in, for the benefit of the solidarity, unity and integrity of the country. Therefore, the doubt or the suspicion which my good friend Shri Saifuddin Chudhary has pointed out, I think, is not going to have any place here because the statement and the talk the Prime Minister has had is as clear and transparent as crystal.

17.00 hrs

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: (Rosera)  
Are you sure?

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: I am sure. There is nothing secret kept behind. Therefore, Mr. Paswan should also know that the Congress Party has no difference of opinion. In the stand taken by the Prime Minister, the whole country, the party, everybody is behind him. I want to tell the hon. House that he will be in a position to prove his leadership.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack); But what about 'watch, hope and pray'? Are you not watching, hoping or praying? we are all watching, hoping and praying.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Mr. Jena, I am a practicing Muslim for the past 40 years. I have been praying five times in a day.

[Translation]

SHRI SHRIKANT JANA: No, I am not saying it to you. Just watch, hope and pray.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Mr. Jena now let us not draw capital out of this. What Mr. Chinmayanand Swami has just now mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sayeed, please follow your line.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: I am sorry, Sir. If you permit me, I will address you. In this situation, everyone of us has a chance to play his role. The Ayodhya issue has not only taken the national dimensions, but the world is also focussing towards Ayodhya. How best will we be in a position to solve this problem depends on how we be in a position

[Sh. P.M. Sayeed]

to solve this problem depends on how we take a stand with a give-and-take spirit whether it is majority community or minority community. Whichever community it may be, we will have to see that a negotiated settlement takes place failing which, as has been already mentioned by the Prime Minister, let it be decided by the court. Let there be faith in the Institution we have created, that is, Judiciary.

With this, I hope and pray that this initiative will yield result and all of us will rise above political lines and support the hon. Prime Minister and see that a negotiated settlement takes place and Ayodhya issue makes a permanent and harmonious solution in order to see that unity and integrity of the country is maintained.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want at this juncture to make any speech on the Indian culture. What in our country is. We have a composite culture. I must say that without acknowledging the contribution of the Muslims for the formulation, the composite culture it will be inane less. We have to acknowledge the contribution of the Muslims to composite culture. Then alone, we can talk of any composite culture which an asset.

Now coming to the statement of the Prime Minister, I must say that I appreciate the efforts of the Prime Minister to see that the construction work at *Shilananayas* site at Ayodhya is stopped. It has been well done. But one thing I must say very frankly is that there has been vacillation and lethargy on the party of the Central Government at the early stage because of which the action has been delayed. We could have talked about solution six months before when National Intergration Council to state negotiation for the purpose. We could have discussed this matter and brough about a settlement fifteen days before when there was a defiance of the High Court order in this matter, by the BJP government of Uttar Pradesh. But now though the Government has acted in

firmness and that has borne fruit and the construction work at Ayodhya has stopped and the nation has heaved a sigh of relief. The situation has been defused. So far so good. But I must say that the entire responsibility of all this agonising situation lies on that party, the BJP that is governing the UP State. When a direction of the High Court was there to stop the work, it was primarily the responsibility of the State Government to see that the High Court direction is implemented. You must understand that it was a deliberate defiance of judicial authority. We were hoodwinked; the National Integration Council was hoodwinked, the Parliament was hoodwinked and the work was going on. It was "clear defiance. I must also say that it was a deliberate abrogation of the duty and responsibility on the part of the State Government of UP the BJP Government. There is no doubt about it. And by doing so, they have actually abrogated the right to govern and have no justification to continue to rule Uttar Pradesh. It was failure in their part to discharge constitutional obligation. It is very clear from the statement of the Prime Minister that the State Government expressed its inability to do anything and in fact, requested that either the Home Minister or the Prime Minister should persuade the sadhs and the mahants to stop the work. What helplessness! They could have resigned and gone. They wanted to be in the Government and at the same time, they were praying and begging of the Prime Minister to save the situation. This was clear deception. It was dishonesty. And Prime Minister came to their rescue to save the situation. This was actually what happened. So, the situation has now been saved by the Prime Minister when the UP Government, of the BJP defied the High Court and Supreme court orders very clearly and abrogated the authority.

Sir, now the work has been stopped and Kar Seva has been shifted to the adjoining area where they are going to build up a Lakshman temple. We are ensured that this construction is not on a disputed land. Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary said that nobody is against the construction of a temple. I say again and again that a vast majority of

Hindus brother in this country are against demolition of mosque for the construction of the temple, what to talk of our BJP friends. I know that even in heart of hearts, Mr. Vajpayee also feels so. He is also not in favour of demolition of the mosque. I say this very very sincerely because he is a person who will never like a place of worship of one community to be demolished and construct place of worship of another community. So also there. No Muslim in this country is against the construction of temple at Ayodhya. But the only condition is that the mosque should not be demolished for constructing a temple. Nowhere in the world, in any democratic secular country, such thing has happened. There is no parallel in the entire world where a fascist party has come forward with a nefarious design to see that one place of worship is demolished for the sake of the construction of another place of worship. Such a thing has never happened. All this is sought to be done to day by the BJP for electoral gains. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJSHER SINGH: Can they offer prayer in the so called Mosque in such a situation? If not, how it can be called a mosque? (Interruptions)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: We can offer prayers there (Interruptions) we do not offer prayer because of fear from you people. If you people leave that place, we will offer namaz there (Interruptions)

[English:]

It is our right to pray and we will pray. You are keeping it in your possession forcibly and that is why, we are not praying.

Now, Sir, I must say that Prime Minister has got the national responsibility, in a secular country, to see that he must never allow a place of worship belonging to one section of the population to be demolished for the construction of a place of worship of the other section of the population. This can never happen. If that happens not only the mosque will be demolished but the entire

secular fabric of this country will be demolished and the integrity of the country will be shattered. Therefore, it should not be allowed to happen in this secular and democratic country otherwise, come what may a farce.

Now, certain claims are being made. The Prime Minister is very clear about it. He says, in his statement I quote "No guarantee is given to anybody." But one thing he says is that the case lies with the leaders of VHP. Daily papers are quoting Mr. Singhal as saying that the P.M.'s statement is a diversion from the main points of agreement between him and saints. This is what Mr. Ashok Singhal, the Secretary General of VHP says. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether the talks were held with sadhus or with Mr. Ashok Singhal because Mr. Ram Shankar Agnihotir, the spokesman of VHP says that Mr. Ashok singhal never had talks with the Prime Minister. On the other hand Mr. Ashok Singhal says that the Prime Minister is deviating from the commitments made by him in his statement. These are two aspects. I would like the Prime Minister to clarify whether any commitment has been made; whether any agreement has been made and whether he talked to only sadhus or to Mr. Singhal. All this has to be cleared. If the Prime Minister has not talked to Mr. Singhal then all these loose talks by Mr. Singhal should stop because it is indulging in an irresponsible behaviour. The Prime Minister should clarify the whole thing.

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 from the statement of the Prime Minister "congress is for the construction of temple without dismantling any mosque." He does not say the disputed structure but he says what we demand is protection and Protection of mosque means not protection structure but it means that later on the idols will be removed and mosque will be restored, to the Muslims.



[Sh. Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait]

So, which the P.M. should explain is how the mosque will be protected. I do not want to say anything more.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): The word 'damage' has been eliminated.

MR. SPEAKER: No derailment, please.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Sir, the Prime Minister says it is a national issue and so it should be solved at a national level. He said in his statement and I quote: "Central Government believes that all avenues of amicable settlement must be sincerely explored in the first instance." That is the direction given in the NIC meeting on the 2nd November, 1991. That should be followed and the Prime Minister should start negotiation.

We all know that a security plan has been prepared by experts for the security of Babri Mosque complex. The Central Government should see that the security plan is completely implemented. The BJP is trying to create some misunderstanding about the Ram Deewar and the Security Plan. These are two different things. Ram Deewar is a 15 feet high deewar along 2.77 acre of land and the security plan is something different. It is prepared by the experts, and the officers of Home Ministry at Central level. The Prime Minister should see that this security plan is completely implemented by the State Government. This security plan is meant for the protection of the Babri Mosque Complex.

Then, Sir, as far as we are concerned, we all desire an amicable settlement. Keeping in view the sentiments of all the parties concerned, such an amicable settlement should be brought about. Through negotiation.

The Prime Minister has said that he will try his level best to bring in an amicable settlement. What methods will he follow? I think, he should sit with all the parties concerned and decide the issue finally. I think, the Prime Minister has an open mind

and is also in favour of having a negotiated settlement. Finally, if that fails, then what will the course of action should be spelled in his statement by the Prime Minister. In case it becomes necessary, the cases that are pending in various courts should be expedited. In case all the avenues of an amicable settlement fail or negotiations do not succeed, then judicial decision should be binding? Now, I want to ask two things.

How will the decision of the judicial authority be made binding. What is the guarantee that all concerned parties will accept the final judicial verdict?

I am asking this question because of declaration by Shri Ashok Singhal that the judicial verdict will not be accepted.

My suggestion is that all cases should be consolidated all the cases and handed over to the judicial authority for consideration and decision and that decision should be final. All the parties should accept that decision. I cannot understand how the Prime Minister is going to enforce the decision of the court on the people who have defied the court order. I am sorry to say this, I am not making any charge on anybody. But it is a fact that B.J.P. and the V.H.P. have broken their promise which they had given on 27th September 1989. They had signed an Agreement. That was an agreement signed between the VHP Leaders and the Government of India viz. by Shri Buta Singh, when he was the Home Minister. Unfortunately agreement was broken by the VHP leadership.

Now, Shri Kalyan Singh gave an assurance in the national Integration Council that he will protect the mosque and he will abide by the court verdict and maintain peace. That was flouted by Shri Kalyan Singh himself. The Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh had himself done it. Therefore, it is very difficult for us to believe such people. But, if the Prime Minister could give a guarantee that he will keep up the promise for the sake of peace in the country, for the sake of integrity of the country, for the sake of secular character of the country, then we are prepared to accept.

So, I again say that in this matter for the sake of peace, for the sake of tranquillity, for the sake of rule of law, for the sake of dignity of Judiciary for the sake of integrity and secularism, we are prepared to accept the judicial pronouncements.

This matter is before us and we are prepared to accept the judicial verdict, I hope and wish for the betterment of the country, we from our part, will cooperate with the Prime Minister for finding a solution which would be honorable and accessible and acceptable to all of us

[Translation]

SHRI SULTAN SALAUDDIN OWAIS (Hyderabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will take only few minutes to express my views on this issue. Today debate is going on in this House on this issue but we do not have any concrete proposal before us. Had there been any concrete proposal; before us, it would have been better to speak something on that. But we do not have any concrete proposal before us. The second thing is that the consecration work has been suspended. But it has not been stopped under any court order. It shows the helplessness of our judiciary. Again we have to see this also that this work is being done in a well planned and in a phased manner. First of all lock was opened then idols were placed in mosque, the foundation stone was laid and now a puce concrete stage has been constructed.

Now the consecration work is to be started on another site. So in this way work is being done in a phased manner and the orders of the court are not being obeyed and moreover, it is being said that the entire issue may be referred to the Supreme Court. Now the question arises, whether statements of witnesses will also be done. All these things have created a baffling situation and I would like to say that this issue should either be decided by the court or through negotiations. We will certainly welcome it. Now the question here is that if some people are not ready to accept the judgment of the court and they are not ready to accept the judgment of the court and they say that it

is the issue of their religious faith. I have no intention to hurt anybody's sentiments. But I would like to know as to where does their faith lie? First, they people said that their faith lies on RamChabutra then they said it was in laying of foundation stone latter on, it was said that it was there inside the mosque. really, where does their faith lie this is beyond my understanding, and coprtension?? They say that it was the question of their faith but where does their faith lie in true sense? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down, please do not disturb.

(Interruptions)

SHRISULTAN SALAHUDDIN OWAIS: I do not want to hurt the feelings of anybody. But there are certain historical rights. They themselves had agreed to it. During the rule of Shri V.P. Singh also efforts were made to settle it through negotiations and it was done so during the tenure of Chandraraj Shekhar, Government. But the negotiation was abruptly ended and it was said that they did not want to hold any talk. The talk was not stopped from our side. You people had said "Now, we do not want to hold talk anymore ." but if you people want to want to hold talk any more." but if you people want to start a dialogue with the us we are ready to accept this proposal and we are ready even today.

I do not want to go into any controversy now I want to reply to all those bitter points which were raised here because if I reply to them acrimony will be created here. It is being said that we have become free after a slavery of thousand for years. It means that prior to this period all the Muslim period was the era of slavery, I object to this very thinking then similarly, the Aryan era was also that of slavery and after that the Dravida are can also be considered so. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura): Mr. Speaker, sir, he is right. (Interruptions). My statement might have been misconstrued. I am talking of prior to the Mughal period and the invaders who looted and took away the wealth with them. I am not talking of the

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

slavery of this who had not gone and remained here and mixed up with the culture and civilization of this country.

SHRI SULTAN SALAHUDDI OWAI: I am not reporting you it was said in the speech made after you. (Interruptions) Therefore, I did not want to go into all those things. Here such things are said about which people ask me as to why I did not reply to such points.

However, we want to say that we have no disagreement with anybody, there is no other issue. But such things are said with great force without reason or rhyme. At the same time it must be noticed here that the ball is not in their court. They themselves have said so that the hon. Prime Minister had called them and talked with them and after that the work was stopped. Then, why such things are being said? These should not be raised. Your party and the Government of your party has failed, now it is in the hands of the hon. Prime Minister and he will do it a better way. You have acknowledged your those on whom the responsibility of finding solution has fallen to evolve an acceptable solution so that an congenial atmosphere may be created in the country and tension is removed and the practice of levelling allegations and counter allegations in the House may be stopped and we all Indian may proceed on the path of progress and development.

SHRI EESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Varanasi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to mention some matters. Emotion is no solution to anything. The two points i.e. court's decision and negotiation are repeatedly mentioned. A charge is being levelled on us that we are not ready to accept court's decision. Sir, through you would like to inform the House that this incident occurred in 22/23 December 1949 and immediately after this incident a case was filed by the worshippers. I would like to read out the court's Judgement in that case. You please listen. (Interruptions) I am failing to find the proper documents for a moment.

SHRI RAM VILAS PAWAN (Rosera):

You should have learnt such things by heart.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I will find them by the grace of Rama and now I read them out by the grace of Rama. You will be pleased. (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: After all he has been a police officer.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I have been a police officer that is why I am talking legally. The civil judge of Faizabad passed the interim injunction order on 16.1.1950 and an appeal was made against the order

[English]

The court passed the order.

"The incident is alleged to have occurred on the night between 22/23 December 1949."

The matter was immediately taken to the court by Shri Ram Chandra Parahanas and Shri Gopal Singh Shastri.

During its Judgement, on 3.3.5 the court said this also:

"The interim injunction order dated 16.1.19950 as modified on 19.1.1950 shall remain in force until the suit is disposed of."

"It further appears from the copies of a number of affidavits of certain Muslim residents of Ayodhya that at least from 1936 onwards the Muslims have neither used the site as a Mosque nor offered prayers there and that the Hindus have been performing their pooja etc. on the disputed site"

[Translation]

This is not my statement but it is a court's statement. This judgment was challenged in High Court. The Chief justice of High Court Mr. Moothan and Mr. Justice Raghuvir Dayal confirmed this injunction in 1955. Those who

are performing worship there are not doing so by the grace of anybody or by any force or fraud but are doing so by the judgment of the Court. No Muslim brother has ever submitted any application to the effect that the Masjid has been occupied forcibly, what to speak of filing legal suit. A police constable registered a report that a clash has occurred there.

SHRI BRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: What is his name.

[English]

SIR SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: He is a constable.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he a Hindu.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: How does it matter if he was Hindu? Policemen are not cast Hindus and Muslims. They are members of a force.

[Translation]

I do not remember the name. A police constable reported it.

[English]

An. hon. Member: He is talking like a Policeman.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: Certainly. I have not forgotten I have commanded a force and I can command it even now. You cannot heckle me.

[Translation]

They may speak as much as they can, only their time will be wasted, I am not going to yield without having my say. The case filed on 18 December 1961 by Sunny Central Board of Wakf. It means it was filed after eleven years, eleven months and twenty six days. On that day they thought that their Masjid has been occupied forcibly.

Several people visited that place recently

Sir, I want to ask question. There is a platform of Lord Rama inside the premises of Masjid where worship of Rama is performed, leave aside the disputed site. I would like to ask you whether you can name any Masjid in the World inside whose premises there is a temple and worship is performed there. Can you name any temple where Kirtan is going on without a minute's recess since 1949, when this incident occurred. Hindus are performing worship and Krsitan continuously. I have a list of court's total business in this case ever since the case was filed in the court. I can show it, anybody may see it. He will find that the delay is being done deliberately by those who filed the case belatedly after 11 years, 11 months and 26 days. We have tried to decide the case as early as possible.

The opinion which I want to present before you is not the opinion of a Tom, Dick and Harry but it is an opinion of Shri Lal Naryan Sinha who had been Attorney General of India, of at least four Chief Justices of High Courts and is of a dozen retired judges of High Court. They have opined that there are three ways to decide it.

They found three such points in this case as make this case unable to be proceeded further. First they said that the case has been filed after 11 years 11 months and 26 days.

[English]

Mr. Lal Narain Sinha has opined in his written opinion that he is prepared to argue the case in the Court that the period of limitation in this case is for six years and therefore the case is time barred. Secondly the case has been filed by Sunni Central Board of Wakf.

[Translation]

But each Masjid has a mutvalli (caretaker)

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Katihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be a real point of order. It should not be a point of disorder.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM:  
He has just mentioned about a case here.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Which part of the Constitution or rule or convention is flouted?

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM:  
Sir, I have not studied the rules..(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Then, it is not a point of order. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM:  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, the speech which is being delivered by Mr. Diskshit is suppressing a very important fact of the case, which he has referred just now. He just now mentioned before the House that an injunction order was passed but the Sub-Judge of the Faizabad Court and taken to the High Court. But he conveniently forgot to mention before the House as to what was the reply filed by the State of U.P. (Interruptions) The U.P. Government is a party in that suit. The U.P. Government had categorically said that it was a Mosque until it was forcibly occupied. This fact has not been presented by him. He has conveniently suppressed this fact..(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: it is a point but not in order.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT:  
The question is not as to who said what. The question is what order the Court passed. He has said what he liked and you have said what you like. A reference is being made to court..(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please follow your own lines.

[Translation]

SHRI SHRESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I have said that it should be decided soon. Keeping the three drawbacks in the suit in mind it should be settled soon. The case is going on for 40 years but it is not making any progress. First of all it should be decided whether this case can be filed in a court or not. Unfortunately I can say nothing. It was decided that the suit should be continued so it is continuing. I am saying it in the presence of hon. Prime Minister So far as the court is concerned and all its hon. Judges are concerned.

[English]

Mr. Palkiwala is on record having said that this suit cannot be decided in the Court of Law for at least one century.

[Translation]

The opinion which I have expressed in the House is not my own opinion. It is an opinion of our Former attorney general. Mr Lal Naraiian Sinha and of the retired judges and of the Chief Justice.

As far as the verdict of the court is concerned, it is alleged that we do not follow the verdict of the court. Cite an example where we have not followed the verdict of the court. When we had started agitation "Aage Bado, Jor Se Bolo Janam Bhoomi Ka Tala Kholo", we had said that if the lock is not opened before Shivratri which falls on 8th March, 1986, we would launch an other agitation peacefully. But before the expiry of that dead line an advocate filed a petition before the District Judge requesting the court to pass an order to open the lock. On the orders from the Judge the District Magistrate and the S.S.P. examined it and after that the judge passed order to open the lock. On 1st February, 1986..(Interruptions)

I am not showing any disrespect to the court, but you are doing that. I am not talking about the court. I am trying to bring the verdict of the court to your notice.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are committing contempt of the court.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: You are committing contempt of the court but blaming us. Why should we discuss the action taken by the court? I am putting forth the verdict of the court. If the court had given a wrong judgment then nobody had stopped you to challenge that judgment. You should have appealed and obtained a stay on that judgment. You should have gone to the High Court at the time when this court gave its judgment. Even today that verdict of February 1986 exists.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Those who are violating the orders of the court are swearing in the name of the court. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Professor, may I ask you not to act as a student?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: Whatever I am saying is a fact, I am not saying anything from my own side.

[English]

The truth is very unpalatable to these people. What I am talking is the truth on record.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): The discussion was going on smoothly till now. Interruptions will not serve any purpose. Shri Sulaiman Sait had made a remark against me a short while before, I could have interrupted him, if I had wished.

I neglected it since I thought that I would express my views when I would have a chance to speak. Anyone can have difference of opinion with Dikshitji, he is putting forth the facts before the House. You can say that there are other facts also which should be brought to the notice of the House. You can bring those to the notice of the House when you get a chance but the discussion can not be run smoothly if you interrupt in this way.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Who is speaking from back side..

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You are speaking not from the backside but from the front side.

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, in parliamentary debate, there are some justified interruptions. This was an occasion.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is unjustified. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: I agree with him but the interruption should be interesting one.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: The court ordered to open the lock on 1st February 1986.

[English]

It was an order by a competent court of law in an open court which is still binding today and has not been upset so far. The result of that has been the formation of a Babri Masjid Action Committee. There was no Babri Masjid Action Committee before 1 February, 1986. The formation of the Babri Masjid Action Committee took place as a result of the pronouncement of a judgment by a competent court of law in the open court. Thereafter meeting was held in the lawns of the Boat Club of India. I would like to repeat the demands that were raised. They were reported in the press. It was said:



[Sh. Shreesh Chandra Dikshit]

(1) Boycott the Republic Day,

(2) An All India Bandh on the 1 February, 1987 to condemn the judgment after one year,

(3) Paralysing the administration;

(4) Coercing the Muslim Politicians and Ministers to toe their line;

(5) inciting the Muslims after offering Friday Prayers in every mosque,

(6) Using abusive language against the Judges and

(7) A march from Delhi to Ayodhya to offer NAMAZ at the so called BABRI MASJID and to remove the Idols situated therein.

[Translation]

These are unpalatable facts. This happened before our eyes. This is your own document which I am reading out.

[English]

SHR: P.C. THOMAS: On a point of order, Sir, the document from which he has read should be authenticated. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No, it is not going as a quotation.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, he should tell us from which document he is quoting. He should mention it. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: They are unhappy with what I am saying.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down now. Up to this time we were very seriously discussing this. Please allow him to out

forth the points which he wants to put forth in his own manner. If you have any other point, you can make it.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, he should mention from which document he is quoting. He should not be allowed to quote like that.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very sorry, Acharia ji. Please sit down now.

[Translation]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: It is alleged that we do not honour the law but the special bench of the court has stated this thing in its 1989 judgment.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: We will rather rely upon your words.

It is not necessary to quote this.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: They have said: "It is doubtful that some of the questions involved in the suit are soluble by judicial process."

[Translation]

Later on we laid the foundation stone, five writs were filed against us in the Supreme Court. It is there in the verdict of the Supreme Court that the Shilanayak or the Shilayatra

[English]

This is a judgment given by the Supreme Court that this is a fundamental right guaranteed under the Constitution.

[Translation]

Today, people say that we are committing the contempt of court, but which court has said this thing. It is your opinion that we are committing the contempt of court. Where is the contempt of court?

Contempt of court is the only fact in which the court is the complainant and the court can deliver the judgment.

[Translation]

There is no such judgment of the court in which it is stated that we are committing the contempt of court. Who is doing it, we or you?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as negotiations are concerned, we are prepared for that. We are thankful to the Hon. Prime Minister who has provided us an opportunity for negotiations. With whom have not we done negotiations? We had held negotiations when Buda Singhji was Home Minister. We did the Shilany with your permission and you had said that it can be performed since it was an undisputed site. You are present here and later on Shri V.P. Singh came who became the Prime Minister. We went to Shri V.P. Singh and did negotiations with him. He gave us a faithful hearing. We were impressed by him. The new Prime Minister came, who has given in writing and has asked us to keep mum for four months. We kept silent for four months. Later on Shri Chandra Shekharji came and set up a committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Dikshit ji there is no need at all to give Proof that you are prepared for negotiations. Come to the point.

SHRISHREESHCHANDRADISKSHIT: I want to show it to you. When we went to hold talks with them on 24th December, Shri Shard Pawar, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, Shri Bharat Singh Shekhawat and the then Home Minister Shri Subodh Kant Sahai, who was its conpanion were present there. It was decided after discussion with them that this matter will be settled by 5th February. It is with me in writing, which I can show you, but they went away after signing it on 24th January.

[English]

They have said: "We want at least six months time to visit Ayodhya and to study the

facts of this case."

[Translation]

Those who were asking, I can show them the documents. They went after signing on 24th January. We met again on 25th. There were Shri Subodh Kant Shay, one S.P. and one D.I.G. These people tried very much on telephone but there was no response from the other side.

Sir, we would like to know as to when we committed contempt of court and denied to settle the issue? I would like to inform the prime Minister about one thing from that he gave a statement in this House and the saints who came there are not present here in the House to submit their views. I talked to them. Sir, through you I would like to request the hon. Prime Minister that there is some difference between his understanding and the understanding of the Saints. The Governemnt should realise it. I am stating a very serious thing. I am not levelling any charges on anyone. There is difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the saints. It would be better if first of all this misunderstanding is removed. I would like to submit that in the opinion if he Prime Minister four months period is very crucial. The Prime minister thinks that of the wants to reduce this time by ten days the saints would agree to that. I may tell vies of the saints to the Prime Minister that they will not come again to place their point of view. The saints are hopeful that the hon. Prime Minister will find a solution to the issue in three months time. But the hon. Prime Minister has said that the Government will consolidate all the documents relating to it and hand over them to a judicial authority which will decide the matter. Each and every person is saying that if we entrust this matter to the court to decide it will take atleast four years time even if the Supreme Court suspends it's all pending cases and take up this issue only. Because this issue have become very complicated. Therefore, it has become necessary to know their point of view. Kar Sewa was stopped at the instance of the saints, 60, 000 Kar Sevaks were assembled there. When we conveyed the message of the saints, and outcome of

[Sh. Shraesh Chandra Dikshit]

the negotiations held with the Prime Minister, they stopped 'kar Sewa'. Media persons from abroad were present there. They felt surprise to see how thousand of people stopped 'Kar Sewa' and left the place. It is an example of their being disciplined. How much faith they have that when they were asked to stop, they immediately stopped 'Kar Sewa'. We have welcomed the advice and appeal made by the hon. Prime Minister. But we want to bring it to the notice of the Prime Minister as there is some difference between his understanding and the understanding of the saints. That is why I request that..(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is this happening? Such a serious matter is being discussed here but you are busy in gossiping there.

SHR. PHOOL CHAND VERMA (Shjajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir they are disturbing the House again and again. Here a serious discussion is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: You please sit down. I have instructed them. Now you too are disturbing.

SHR. SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Varanasi): The hon. Prime Minister has taken such a good step to diffuse this tension, we welcome it. The hon. Prime Minister has taken one step towards it but the saints with whom he had in takes are not present here to express their reaction to the statement made by the Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister would feel difficulty in solving the problem if he is not aware of their reaction. That is why I thought it necessary to tell the saints about the view point of the hon. Prime Minister. I personally went there to Ayodhya and talked to the saints to know their reaction. I want to convey the reaction of the saints to the Prime Minister. They are of the opinion that it is matter of only 3 months so they will not say any thing upto three months; they also said that it is a matter of coincidence..

MR. SPEAKER: You come to the main point and leave other things aside.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: How will the hon. Minister come to know the reaction of the saints if I do not tell him all these things.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes please. You tell him he is ready to hear it.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I am saying the same thing and placing it before you. They say that the hon. Prime Minister should solve the problem within three months in any way. If he fails to do so, there will be no binding on us after three months. I would like to announce it clearly that their concept is clear.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. You have explained your view point clearly.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: In the end, I would like to request the hon. Prime Minister that we have examined every legal aspect in this case. We have seen the result of negotiations. We have talked with Shri Buta Singhji, Shri V.P. Singhji and Shri Chandra Shekharji. Now we are talking with the hon. Prime Minister. We are ready for holding negotiations. the court can never settle the issue. It is the opinion of the people. That is why I would like to request the hon. Prime Minister to find out a solution to the problem keeping in view the concept of the saints.(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, it is a serious matter. He repudiates the Prime Minister's understanding and the Prime Minister's commitment to the country. What is this?

MR. SPEAKER: Please. Let us wait.

[Translation]

SHRIBUTA SINGH (Jalore): Mr. speaker Sir, if you kindly allow me, I would like to say a few words regarding the reference made about me during the speech.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I will give you

enough time to speak. Would you like to speak today or tomorrow.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: If you allow me I would prefer to place my view point today itself since something has been said about me and it is on record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no objection if the House is sitting late today as two minutes are left. I have no objection if we are sitting late.

[English]

Are we willing to sit for more time?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GULAM NABI AZAD): We can continue tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, Indrajitji, I was intending to call you today, but then you can speak tomorrow. And other Members also can speak tomorrow. We will meet again and give time to the hon. Members to speak tomorrow.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: And also, please give me an opportunity, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: You will have.

The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow, the 29th July, at 11.00 a.m.

17.59 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, July 29, 1992/ Saravana 7, 1914 (Saka).