

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the notices for adjournment motion?

(Interruptions)

14.11 hrs.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Communal Situation in the Country and Governments failure to curb communal Forces

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received twenty six notices of adjournment motion regarding communal situation in the country from the following Members:

1. Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat
2. Shri Raghavji
3. Shri Shopat Singh Makkasar
4. Shri Yamuna Prasad Shastri
5. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra
6. Shri Madan Lal Khurana
7. Shri Chitta Basu
8. Shri Basudeb Acharia
9. Shri Guman Mal Lodha
10. Dr. (Mrs) Malini Bhattacharya
11. Shri Saifuddin Choudhury
12. Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz
13. Shri Palai K.M. Mathew

14. Shri Rasheed Masood
15. Shri Yadvendra Datt
16. Shri A.K. Roy
17. Shri Ram Vilas Paswan
18. Shri Indrajit Gupta
19. Shri Bhogendra Jha
20. Shri Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait
21. Shri Harish Rawat
22. Shri P. R. Kumaramangalam
23. Shri Nathu Singh
24. Shri Chinta Mohan
25. Shri Janardhan Tewari
26. Prof. Madhu Dandavate

I give my consent to Shri Harish Rawat who has secured first place in the ballot to move the motion in the following form:

"Failure of Union Government to curb communal forces threatening the national unity and integrity as witnessed by recent eruption of communal riots in different parts of the country."

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora): Mr. Speaker, while reserving my right to move the adjournment motion,...

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You have to ask for leave to move the motion. You are not required to say anything else.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: Mr. Speaker,

Sir, I want to submit that there is a wide difference between the terminology of the notice of adjournment motion given by me and what has been accepted by you. The communal situation, the tension and the violence that are prevailing today....

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You have not to make a speech. You have only to seek permission of the House to move the motion.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: There are so many communal organisations including Bharatiya Janata Party and Janata Dal which supported that violence... (Interruptions) I am pained that you have not accepted my adjournment motion. The real culprits i.e., Bhartiya Janata Party and Janata Dal, will be absolved of it... (Interruptions) So, I am not moving this Adjournment motion. I request you to admit the adjournment motion in the form in which I have given notice of it. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You are not moving for leave. I call upon Prof. Soz to seek leave of the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Is he seeking leave of the House or not?

MR. SPEAKER: He is not seeking leave of the House.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You are not interested in seeking leave of the House. I have called Prof. Soz.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Speaker Sir, I am on a point of order. You have mentioned the names why did he append his name if he had to withdraw it?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed your point of order. You please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, are you moving now?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: If he was not to move the motion why did he append his name? I was also involved. I had given the notice of the motion. The motion could have been admitted in my name.

[English]

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM (Salem): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, what is your point of order?

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: I move a point of order under rule 56. Rule 56 says:

"Subject to the provisions of these rules, a motion for an adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the Speaker."

Mr. Rawat and I moved an adjournment motion specifying a definite matter. If you admit our motion you must admit it in the form in which we have moved otherwise there is no purpose in admitting it. Therefore, you should be clear whether you first take the subject and then decide about the adjournment motion or you decide about the adjournment motion first and then decide the subject. Sir, we would like to know this.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kumaramangalam, Speaker makes changes so as to make it

admissible. There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard you. Please take your seat, Mr. Rawat. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: Please tell us whether you accept this motion?

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): Sir, the point I wish to make is that if you had already decided on the subject then you should not have put us on the ballot. If you did not decide the subject then you let us move our subject.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: In that case the people who are responsible for the present Communal situation will be absolved.

[English]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, one is getting an impression that there is some kind of shadow-boxing going on.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order, you please tell that.

[Translation]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: Please tell us whether you hold BJP responsible for the present communal situation or not? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You sow the seeds and their party reaps the harvest. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Fernandes, you address to the Chair.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, the hon. Member has asked me whether I hold them guilty. I would say, 'Yes'. They are guilty of sowing seed only and this party is guilty of reaping.

My point of order is that if hon. Members have moved an adjournment motion then that motion as moved by hon. Members should be accepted. Now if the idea is that the Secretariat decides how exactly the motion should be worded in order to confuse the issue or otherwise divert is from the main thrust of the argument that the hon. Member wants to make then one gets the smell of some kind of shadow-boxing that is going on because he stands to move a motion and say that though he has a right to move the adjournment motion, however, because the Secretariat has made some changes, he is not moving it.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call Mr. Soz to move his motion.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: He is not seeking the leave of the House.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, the hon. Member should get up to move his motion. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.R. KUMARAMANGALAM: You allow us to move it in the form in which we had moved. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Harish Rawat has levelled a very serious charge. He has alleged that his motion has been entirely changed by the Secretariat without consulting him. I would like to submit that it should have been rejected, if it was not in proper form. I feel that it is a very wrong thing that motion has been included in the ballot after modifying it without consulting the author. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I will draw the attention of the House to Rule 337:

"If in the opinion of the Speaker, any notice contains words, phrases or expressions which are argumentative, unparliamentary, ironical, irrelevant, verbose, or other wise inappropriate, he may, in his discretion, amend such notice before it is circulated."

I have done it. It is in order now.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling. There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. The names of 15 or 16 Members who have given notice of the motion have been read out by you just now. The names which have been balloted include my name also. The name of Shri Rawat got the first place in the ballot. If Shri Rawat did not want to move the motion, he should have absented himself from the House, but when he is present in the House, how can he say that he does not want to move the motion. Now it is the property of the House. Had his name not been included in the ballot, perhaps my name would have got the first place in the ballot. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is upto him.

[Translation]

SHRI JAG PAL SINGH (Hardwar):—
Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are listening to the members of BJP only and not to us. Why is

this discrimination being done? I have also given a notice. I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Please resume your seat. I have just now called Shri Advaniji.

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Mr. Speaker Sir, I may submit that this is an occasion where a clear ruling from you as to what is an adjournment motion is necessary. If it is given, it would not lead to discussion of this kind being repeated, because even the one hour or 45 minutes' discussion we had in the morning had a bearing upon what is the responsibility of parties which are supporting the Government and what are its implications. Now Sir, I read from *Kaul and Shakder*, On what is an adjournment motion.

"The subject matter of an adjournment motion must have direct or indirect relation to the conduct or default on the part of the Government of India either for having done some action or for having omitted to do some action which was urgently necessary at the moment."

Now if my colleague Shri Harish Rawat wants to raise a discussion on the BJP's conduct in the present communal situation, he is welcome to do it by any other motion but not through an adjournment motion because an adjournment motion is related to the failure of the Union Government and nothing else. And no party which moves a motion of this kind should not try to wriggle out of it at a later stage having second thoughts and that too on the plea that the secretariat has done injustice to it. You are very right when you mentioned that the Secretariat has every right to reword the phraseology of a member's motion if needed. But through that motion if he wants to attack us, I would say that that would be out of order. Therefore, I would like to know what exactly was the wording of the member against which he is now saying in protest that he is not going to move that motion.

[Sh. L.K. Advani]

[*Translation*]

I would like to submit that this is the only occasion as hereafter Members of Congress Party will never move Adjournment motion. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAG PAL SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given a notice to you in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not concerned with this subject.

SHRI JAG PAL SINGH: It is definitely concerned with this subject. I have given a notice that the people who have contested the election under the Representation of the People Act and after winning the election have taken oath under the Constitution in the House, are now creating communal disharmony.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order? Under which rule you want to raise it.

SHRI JAG PAL SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Members of the parties, who are creating communal tension in the country by raising the slogan of "Hindu Rashtra", should be dismissed from the House. I have said earlier too that Members of BJP like Kumari Uma Bharati and Advaniji are spreading communal tension openly.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order.

[*Translation*]

SHRI JAGPAL SINGH: Communal riots are taking place at all places, which are being visited by Kumari Uma Bharati. No one else is responsible for these riots. Therefore, I would like to submit that membership of the members, who are raising slogan of "Hindu Rashtra" in this country today after taking oath of allegiance to the Constitution should be terminated. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Will you please take your seat?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Prof. Kurien, are you on a point of order?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Mavelikara): No. He has referred to our party. Our party has to react to it.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of reacting.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: When he has referred to our party, am I not to react to it? Why are you getting angry?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I am not angry. Are you on a point of order?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: I will also react to what Mr. Advani has said. Will you allow only Mr. Advani?

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing you also. I don't know why you are getting angry. Are you on a point of order? That is my point.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, I have to react only on what hon. Mr. Advani has said. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): I am on a point of order. My point of order is that you have been consistently asking him whether he is on a point of order and he is saying that he is not on a point of order. So, if he is not on a point of order, under what rules he is speaking?

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed him to make a submission.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: A Mover of an Adjournment Motion or any other motion has the right not to move it. He has the freedom to ascribe any reason for that. Once the Mover has not moved the Motion, whatever the reason he has given, he is not cognisable as far as this House is concerned.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): How can it be? He is charging the Speaker's Secretariat?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Sir, if the Mover has a right not to move the Motion, then the matter ends there and I do not think there should be any discussion on that.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Mr. Rawat has a concern about what is happening in this country—about the communal situation.

MR. SPEAKER: You are not allowing Mr. Rawat to speak. I have called Shri Soz.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Bahraich): Why is that Prof. Kurien has got up to explain on behalf of Mr. Rawat? They are trying to prevent Mr. Rawat from moving the Adjournment Motion. Otherwise Mr. Harish Rawat is a very articulate person. He can explain his case. He does not want your help (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. Mr. Rawat, are you moving? Are you seeking the leave of the House?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: So, you are not moving. I am giving my ruling. Prof. Soz, are you also not interested in moving it?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (Baramulla): I am moving.

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARISH RAWAT : I am going to read out my notice. I have given notice regarding threat to the stability and unity of the country due to the incidents of communal violence as a result of creation of atmosphere of religious frenzy in the country for political purposes by some militant religious organisations and some political parties like B.J.P. and Janata Dal.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing, Mr. Rawat.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: It has no bearing on the Congress, it has no bearing on the BJP.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you seeking leave of the House?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): On a point of order, Sir. Just now, from Kaul & Shakhdher, Shri Advani has rightly read it out. For years, I have seen the rulings of the Speakers. The Speakers' Conference at Srinagar has said that every adjournment motion has an element of censure against the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already placed that before the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDANVATE: Therefore, the adjournment motion has to be against the established Government. It cannot be against any party.

MR. SPEAKER: That is the practice.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Therefore, you are justified in giving that ruling, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Soz now. I have already given my ruling. Mr Soz, are you seeking the leave of the House? Are you accepting my version?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I have accepted your version, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Please seek the leave of the House now.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramulla): I seek the leave of the House for moving the adjournment motion regarding failure of Union Government to curb communal forces threatening the national unity and integrity as witnessed by recent eruption of communal riots in different parts of the country.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the leave opposed? is anybody opposing it?...Then leave is granted.

Under rule 61, the adjournment motion is to be taken up at 4 p.m. or at an earlier hour...and there will be 2 1/2 hours available for it. An the Motion be taken up at 4 O'clock?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

KUMARI UMA BHARATI (Khajuraho): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to give personal explanation since allegations have been made against me ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You may give in writing.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have it at 4 o'clock; or, do you want it immediately? Is it the sense of the House that it should be taken up now? Let us come to a consensus.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): I am on a point of order, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: On a number of occasions, at 12 o'clock when the Member had sought the permission of the House...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: It should conclude today.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: If you see the past precedents, in the past, there are precedents that at 12 o'clock when leave when leave has been granted to move the adjournment motion, by the consent of the House, then and there even the adjournment motion has been taken up. Therefore, we suggest that it should be taken up here and now.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 2.30 p.m. You may take 3 or 4 hours, so that the Prime Minister could reply at 6.30 p.m.

SHRIJASWANT SINGH (Jodhpur): Sir,

of course the adjournment motion must be taken up now.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that it is the sense of the House that it should be taken up now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But a colleague of mine has made a request to you. Certain allegations were made against her.

MR. SPEAKER: I have told her already. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Kundu please take your seat. You should not leave your seat. Please take you seat; let me hear Mr Jaswant Singh. I will hear you, Mr. Kundu, afterwards.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Certain allegations were made in the course of the discussion preceding the admission of the adjournment motion, about a colleague of mine in the party. It is well within her right to request for year permission and clarify. Please don't ask her to send it in writing, because whatever was said against her, has been said already in the House. It will take her a minute to explain, before the adjournment motion is taken up. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU : Would you not listen to my point of order? From the morning I am trying to raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Under what rule?

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: It is a very vital point. You found that this adjournment motion was moved by hon. member, Mr. Soz and nobody opposed it from the Treasury Benches. What does it mean? An indictment against the Government! It is already there, admitted by them. You should begin with it. There is no question of voting. You should give a ruling that the Government has already been censured.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. You please sit down.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: It is rare in the history of Parliament where the Government have not opposed the admitting of

an adjournment motion. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Uma Baharatiji?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. I have called the Hon. Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to make one thing clear. The communal situation is quite tense and quite bad. It is a matter of shame for the country. We want that the members should discuss this issue and find out the solution of this problem. The hon. member is not right. When communal riots took place in Delhi, I visited the place within an hour. I did not go to the States where the State Governments are in charge of the law and order position and I had to take the advice of the State Chief Ministers. I do not want to rush anywhere without the permission and without the advice of the State Governments. I want to make it clear.

[*Translation*]

SHRIMATI SUBHASHINI ALI (Kanpur): Who has presented you.

[*English*]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: No Chief Minister can prevent me but I was emphatic...

(*Interruptions*)

No, not permission. Kindly bear me out. This not going to make any impression.

[*Translation*]

My submission is that there is no question of prevention.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA (Calcutta South): Did you seek the permission of any State Government?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If you are satisfied by that wording, I sought the per-

mission. All right, now sit down. On such matters if the Members are not frivolous, they will be doing a great service to the country. When the matters are so serious we should not try to be frivolous in these matters. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): Are you serious?

SHRI CHANDAR SHEKHAR: Yes. I am quite serious; and that is why I am not replying you. So, I am saying that I was in constant touch with all the Chief Minister wherever the trouble was there and all the help that was needed by them was given by the Government of India. My going there would have given me some publicity in the Press but it would not help the situation. I want, Mr. Speaker, that the members should be more serious about this question. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding. The Prime Minister is not yielding. What can I do?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am also going to make my own observations on this.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: And I hope that the debate will take place not in the spirit of acrimony but we will try to find out the causes of the communal riots and try to find out the ways how we can meet the situation. That should be the spirit of the discussion. We should not accuse such on this question. That is all.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): I have remained silent but he has said that everybody is taking it lightly as if he alone is taking it seriously.

MR. SPEAKER: He does not mean it.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I take the

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

seriousness of Shri George Fernandes seriously. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats. When this matter will be discussed We will take it up too.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, the Prime Minister has said that Members are not serious. How can he say? He should withdraw it... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I said, be serious.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: What he meant was, more serious.

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: He has not said it nor has he used any unparliamentary word. Yes, Uma Bharati.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Biplab Babu, please sit down.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: One of the Members has alleged in the House that where- ever I go riots occur there. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I started touring Uttar Pradesh in the beginning of December. I went to Agra on 1st December and Ferozabad on 2nd December and after that—(*Interruptions*) on 2nd December a statement of Shri Abdullah Bukhari, the Imam of Delhi, appeared in the

newspapers wherein he had stated that if Babri Masjid was touched, places of worship of Hindus will be burnt to ashes following which attacks were made on me. Wherever I delivered speeches the contents thereof have been covered by the local newspapers which I would like to present in the House— (*Interruptions*)

No untoward incident took place in Agra, Ferozabad or Mainpuri where I gave speeches. Rather riots occurred at places where I did not deliver speech—

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude quickly.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: I therefore submit that the charge levelled against me should be expunged from the proceedings of the House. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Jag Pal Singhji, please sit down. I am not allowing you.

(*Interruptions*)*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I find the consensus of the House is that we may start discussion immediately. If the House agrees, the Prime Minister may intervene at 6 p.m. and thereafter, the mover may reply to the debate.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: M. Jagpal Singh, please take your seat. I have not permitted you. He is not going on record.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. SPEAKER: You are not going on record. Will you please take your seat?

I find, the consensus in the House is that we may start discussion immediately. If the House agrees, the Prime Minister may intervene at 6 p.m. and thereafter the Mover may reply to the debate.

Before the debate on the Adjournment Motion starts. I would like to appeal to all sections of the House to observe restraint in expression of their views. I am sure the whole House shares the anguish of the nation over the recent happenings which have tarnished the fair image of our country. We have to fight the demon of communalism unitedly and with all our might. I hope, the Members will give constructive suggestions as would strengthen the nationalist and secular forces in the country.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I thought that you would call me at 4 p.m. so that I could prepare myself on this very difficult question. But now I will speak from my memory altogether.

I beg to move:

"That the House do now adjourn."

It is a very agonising situation. The entire country is burning with the fire of communalism. What is more agonising for me is that this fire is being spread through an organised effort. It was compulsory for me to accept the version approved for me by the Speaker. But earlier my version was different.

14.47 hrs.

[SHRI VAKKOM PURUSHOTHAMAN in the Chair]

The spirit and tenor of my speech will be based on that because the menace of communalism is spreading fast in the country through the organised attempt of a certain political party which has posed a definite threat to the democracy in India. Now it was

compulsion to accept the version of the hon. Speaker because I wanted to speak on this motion.

When this question of censure comes in the mind I remember vividly what happened during the past 11 months before Mr. Chandra Shekhar took over as the Prime Minister. I will not get into details because I do not want to waste the time of the House. But I would relate a couple of things which had happened during V.P. Singhji's Government. I want to remind this House what V.P. Singhji thought about Ayodhya. Mr. Arun Shourie's charges have not been answered upto this time. I want to remind this House that it was Mr. Arun Shourie who transformed a cassette on the pages of papers and depicted a scene for us as to what was the real opinion of V.P. Singhji on the question of Ayodhya because it has become very important. It has never happened before.

Communalism this time is being organised by a political party which is known to everybody on the question of Ayodhya.

AN HON. MEMBER: *Shilanyas*.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Yes, *Shilanyas* and *Shilapoojan*. Sir, very important is the question that Shri V.P. Singh Ji told Mr. Arun Shourie that."

[Translation]

Where does the 'mandir' exist as such?

SHRIMATISUBHASHINIALI (Kanpur): Call it 'Masjid' and not 'Mandir.'

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Yes, it is masjid. You are right. (Interruptions) When your turn comes, I will keep quiet.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: No running commentary, please. This is not the way to behave in the House. Mr. Soz, you address the Chair...

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, the personal opinion of a Prime Minister matters. He told Arun Shourie... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Sir, today he is...* (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot say like that. If any Member has any question to ask, he can stand and if the Member yields, he can ask the question. Otherwise you cannot rise like this and make noise...

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever he has said will not go on record...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding, so, I cannot permit you.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, despite Mr. Singh's opinion expressed in confidence to Arun Shourie, I hold V.P. Singh in high esteem for his qualities. Personally I know he is a gentleman and he is an honest man. I will continue to respect him. But I was telling you, Sir, that the personal opinion of a Prime Minister matters much because when I read Arun Shourie's article, I felt it was a painful experience for me because he said that

[*Translation*]

Where does the mosque exist as such? If each person takes away even one brick home, the whole controversy will come to an end.

SHRIMATI SUBHASHINI ALI: But no one was allowed to do so.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: You cannot deny whatever he has stated. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: Has this motion been brought in view of that only?

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please address the Chair, Mr. Soz...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not behaving properly. Please resume your seat. This is not the way to behave in the House...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jena, you will also get your chance. If you disagree with him, you can express your view. If he is referring about Mr. V.P. Singh, he is an hon. Member of this House and he can also come and deny those things. Every Member has got the freedom to express his or her opinion. For God's sake, behave properly in the House.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA: I am just reminding Mr. Soz that there is a change in the Government. Mr. V.P. Singh is out and Mr. Chandra Shekhar is there as the Prime Minister. He is supporting Mr. Chandra Shekhar and he has brought a motion against his Government. So, he should speak about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has absolutely no relevance. You address the Chair Mr. Soz.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I am not citing hundreds of examples. I will give only two examples and I will speak on facts because Shourie has not been rebutted. Secondly, Sir, I am coming to Advaniji... (*Interruptions*) I am coming to BJP. You allow me time... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, this is not proper.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Then, Sir, on the question of that famous Ordinance... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI
(Rewa): Mr. Chairman... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am not yielding to you... (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, on the question of that famous Ordinance....

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI:
Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

[*Translation*]

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI:
Mr. Chairman, Sir, my point of order is that it has been clearly provided in the Rules of procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha that a notice should be first given, if any allegation is to be levelled against any Member. Our hon. Member, Shri Soz had just now levelled a very serious allegation against Shri V.P. Singh, but he hadn't informed Shri V.P. Singh about it. So, I request that his allegation should be expunged from the proceedings, because he has levelled this allegation against the rules. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I think he has not violated the rules. Prof. Soz, you continue.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV
(Jhanjharpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, what is your ruling on the point of order raised by Shri Shastri?

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The same tactics can be adopted by this side also. It is not proper. Please resume your seat. Your honourable leaders also may have their say. They can also be accused about their performance. So, it is not proper.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I have not made any allegations against the former Prime Minister. I was stating a fact, one more fact, about the famous Ordinance for acquisition of land. Even the copies we were given were corrected by Advaniji. Let it go on record. These are facts. I am not making any allegations against this regime. (*Interruptions*) Let it be known to you. I do not want any super Ministership or Chief Ministership.

Now, Sir, after placing it on record about the former Prime Minister, I will now tell Prime Minister Chandra Shekharji that he may talk on the left side or the right side, but ultimately he will have to discharge his duties as a Prime Minister whatever his opinion on the subject may be.

Now, Sir, I come to the person or the party who is responsible at this point of time for this fire of communalism in the country. Sir, Advaniji is not here. I wanted to address Advaniji as 'Hail Advani', as they address Hitler in Nazi Germany. They would say, 'Hail Adolf Hitler' because I see a comparison between what happened in Nazi Germany and what is happening in Bharat at this point of time. It was Hitler who saw an imaginary enemy in the Jews and launched the worst persecution against the Jews in Germany, and if Mr. Advani is allowed to become a Hitler, who is seeing an imaginary enemy among Muslims and if his Party and he are terrorising Muslims. I say, 'Hail Advani,' 'Hail Advani,' if the whole country allows him to become another Hitler in Bharat because he is seeing imaginary enemies in Muslims.

Sir, Mr. Advani's speeches are such that it is not possible for any Member of this House to catch hold of him because as you have a sugar coated pill, Mr. Advani is a capable speaker and he tailors his speeches according to at least the letter of the Constitution of India. But to Advaniji I am saying, it is the tenor and the inner secret of his speeches which makes single Uma Bharati and others to use a language that has ignited the fire of communalism worst in the history

[Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz]

of post-Independent India. It is not directly the responsibility of Uma Bharati. My friend was telling me, and he showed me the cassettes, it is not Uma Bharati, it is not Ashok Singhal, it is not other leaders, it is not Khuranaji, it is Advaniji who wants to become the Hitler in India.

(*Interruptions*)

15.00 hrs.

[*Translation*]

KUMARI UMABHARATI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am on a point of order. This is contempt of the House. I want your protection. Please protect me in this matter. He is levelling a baseless charge... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever you want to say, you can say it afterwards. If you want to deny anything or say anything, you can do it later. Now, please resume your seat.

KUMARI UMA BHARATI: Unnecessarily he is dragging my name. I will not resume my seat. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far he has not violated any rules. If you do not agree with his views or if you want to give any personal explanation, you can do it later.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I was just saying that the responsibility of all the Bajrang Dal speeches, all the VHP speeches... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

Do not create disturbance here.

(*Interruptions*)

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASTAVA (Patna): Just now, Shri Soz has said that do not create disturbance. Which means that disturbance is taking place. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. You are a Professor; you must understand the rules. You can either ask a question or you can raise a point of order. You cannot simply rise and make noise. It is unwanted and it will not form part of the record also.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

AN HON. MEMBER: He is.....**..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MOHD. HASSAN COMMANDER (Ladakh): For what you are saying that he is.....**..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SANTOSH BHARTIYA (Farrukhabad): Just now, an hon. Member has called another hon. Member as..... I request that this sentence should be expunged.

[*English*]

MR. CHAIRMAN: If anybody has called any hon. Member as '...' it is out of order and it will not form part of the record.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: It cannot be removed; I have no objection. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jagpal Singh, please take your seat. Please permit him to speak.

(*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI JAG PAL SINGH (Hardwar): He should apologise... (*Interruptions*) Please ask him to apologise.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We must keep the dignity of this House. Please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): The entire country.... (*Interruptions*) knows your policy....

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: None of the speeches said without the permission of the Chair will go on record. Anything said without the permission of the Chair will not form part of the record and it will not be published even.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: But I would say speaking against Shri Advani and BJP means is it be coming a Pakistani? I want this to be put on record. I am not afraid of them.

I was addressing things to Shri Advani for some reason. I was just explaining my point. Mr. L.K. Advani who unfortunately came from Sind, may be, in a way, Pakistani. My forefathers lived in India and I am living as Indian and will die as Indian.

Why I addressed things to Mr. Advani because from the time he performed Shila Pujan in Khan Market way back, perhaps 2 years ago, from the day he performed Shila Pujan, I took him very seriously. I found a number of BJP friends who were not then Members here were in agony. I want to take this House into confidence that every Hindu in India is not communal. They will not oblige Bhartiya Janata Party. Even within the Bhartiya Janata Party, there are members

who feel choked because of Mr. Advani, Mr. Khurana or Miss Uma Bharati on the question of Ayodhya. But they are in a party and they have to be there for some time in the Party. But the average Hindu is not communal. They do not want Mr. Advani to be Hitler. I hold him responsible because he is a trainer. I have read his speeches with interest. It is very difficult to get hold of him. But he has trained Miss Uma Bharati and Mr. Khurana and others who have unbridled in making speeches. Those speeches are not essentially against Muslims because the Muslims in India cannot be annihilated. They are 15 crores of people and who can kill 15 crores of people. They will become a question mark in this country. But before Mr. Advani annihilates the Muslims, before he becomes Hitler in the real sense—of course, there is no sense of his becoming Hitler because our people are matured and they will reply at proper time. But even if there is a change, before you destroy the Muslims, you will have to destroy India completely. At this point of time, if there is any danger to India, any danger to the integration of India, there is no question of another Pakistan taking place because there is no question of any Musalman raising the voice that they will have another homeland. That era is over. But there is terrible situation cropping up. The situation is that of disintegration, disunity. Who is sowing the seeds of disunity? It is Shri Advani because he is the President of the Party and he is leading the Rath Yatra, leading the Kar Sewa and speeches. You forgot this morning to give proper respect to Maulana Mohammad Saeed Masuodi, who signed the Constitution of India, was one of the founding-fathers and who knew these people well. The way Mr. Advani is leading the country is certainly against democracy. He is trying to lead this country to fascism. Mr. Advani's advance will be halted with all the command with all the force at our command.

What is the point under discussion? The issue under discussion before the countrymen is the question of Ayodhya where Advaniji wants to build a Ram temple. I am one of those who studied very thoroughly

[Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz]

this case. It is a matter of pride for me. I will come to Ram after some time. I tell you how Musalman have thought of Ram; how Ram cannot be compared to Babar. Babar was just a king. Ram was the spirit of culture. I will come to that later. But on the question of Ayodhya, it is a matter of pride for me to say this. I will not refer you back to history before 1949. I take you to only 1949. Who is the person who went in the dead of night to the Thana in Faizabad and got the Inspector? He was also a Hindu. The informer, a Police Inspector, a Hindu—I am forgetting the name—informed in the Police Station that the idols were stolen and placed in the Babri Mosque and an entry was made. The First Information report came from a Hindu and then when the matter hotted up, it was again a Hindu, Akshaya Brahmachari, who was District Secretary of the Congress at that time who went on fast on the question of Muslims living in fear. They could not go to the mosque because there was fear and idols were placed there and he went on fast in 1950. It was Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri's written assurance to Akshaya Pandit that Muslims at Faizabad, along with other Muslims of the country, will live with honour and dignity in this country. He was assured that if he ends his fast, the mosque will remain the mosque.

The third Hindu, I feel doubly proud, was a Kashmiri Pandit. His forefathers had come from Kashmir about 300 years before that date. The District Magistrate in Ayodhya went to the District Judge in 1950 and showed the revenue records and proved that it was a vacant piece of land. He told the Sessions Judge that it was a vacant piece of land and he has studied the revenue records and he was deposing before him that it belonged to Muslims and the mosque was built on a vacant piece of land. This is the evidence but I do not accept this evidence personally. I say let us leave it open. That is where the BJP should learn a lesson if it wants to serve the purpose of unity and integrity of India. The point is this is the evidence. This is the

record. This is part of the record in Allahabad High Court. My plea is that Vishwa Hindu Parishad or the Bharatiya Janata Party or their outfits are actually RSS. It is now a matter of pride for Shri Advaniji and others to have belonged to RSS which, in my opinion, is a great danger to the unity of this country. But, I say leave the door open. Ask Muslim leaders. I am not a religious leader. They have the records. You have the records. Let us exchange and let us come to a negotiated settlement. But, it is not only at Ayodhya where they have ignited a fire. Even in seminars, people like Shri Malkarni and others say, there is nothing like that. It is an emotive issue. There cannot be a negotiated settlement. Finally, they say they are not going to accept the verdict of the Supreme Court. That raises a big question. If anybody refuses to accept Supreme Court, there is no machinery here—as we have no machinery to check prices on ground because Prof. Madhu Dandavate allowed 3% or 4% increase in petrol and other things, the prices shot up by 20%. There is no mechanism to control prices—to control this communal menace under the provisions of the Constitution of India. Everything is written there. The point is if you do not accept the verdict of the Supreme Court, you are refusing to accept the Constitution of India because, the Supreme Court's authority is an integral part of the Constitution of India. (*Interruptions*) Parliament can do anything. I do not reject that. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASATAVA: What happened in the Shahbano case?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): The Supreme Court had given a verdict. What was that verdict?

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I would have given you the details, if I had time. You have not read it, but I have read it.

PROF. YADU NATH PANDEY (Hazaribagh): Panchkosi parikrama.....**

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair, Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz. Whatever he says will not be recorded. You are wasting your energy. It will not be recorded.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is very very bad. You will have to follow the Business rules.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, whatever you say will not be recorded. Then, why should you waste your energy?

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am really sorry you are not following the rules. This august House has got a great tradition. This is not the way to behave in Parliament. Please resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, please resume your seat. Prof. Soz, please continue.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I was explaining to you that the BJP neither wants a negotiated settlement nor wants to have a look at the records nor does BJP want any court verdict. What then does BJP want? BJP doesn't show any respect to the Constitution of India. Those people who refuse to accept the verdict of the Supreme Court will have to come to Parliament finally. This is the highest forum. He says he will not accept the decision of the Parliament. He says he will not accept the decision of the Supreme Court which is an integral part of the Constitution of India. BJP wants nothing short of anarchy; nothing short of Fascism.

[Translation]

Which you call as Ram Rajya is only Fascism and it will never be accepted by the

people of our country.... (Interruptions)

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASATAVA: The Ram-nam was given by Gandhiji. Was he a Fascist... (Interruptions)

PROF. YADU NATH PANDEY: The word 'Ram' is engraved on the samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi. Change it also..... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Mr. Pandey, You will have to follow the rules. I will follow the rules. Please resume your seat. He is not saying that *Ram Rajya* is anarchy. But he says that what you say *Ram Rajya* is anarchy. There is a difference in between the two. Please resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: In urdu, it is said that—I am touching their weak nerve. (Interruptions)

[English]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was saying that BJP does not accept a negotiated settlement; it does not accept records; it does not accept the historical and archival evidence; it does not accept the decision of the Supreme Court; it does not accept the Constitution of India. And only anarchy is acceptable to BJP. They want to lead India to fascism. We reject this plea of Shri Advani whole-heartedly. But I want to remember Shri V.P. Singh for half a minute again. It is he who gave them the long rope. It is Shri V.P. Singh's electoral policy which gave them numerical arrogance and from two their figure went up to 88. It is the political arrogance of BJP.

Now I want to say something about the so-called secular parties. I raise a question for some Members of the BJP. I consider

[Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz]

some Members of the BJP to be very secular. Even in BJP there are some people who feel as suffocated with the BJP's policy as myself. I raise a question for the Congress (I), the Janata Dal, the Janata Dal (S), the two communist parties and to myself: What for did you pass an amendment to the Representation of People Act 1951 which was amended many times and was finally amended in 1988 whereby you added a clause and incorporated many things. I am sorry to say that these five parties are playing defensive game against BJP including the ruling party.

[Translation]

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASTAVA: I am on a point of order.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

[Translation]

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASTAVA: My point of order is that Prof. Soz can express his views on communalism or on any other issue without taking the name of BJP. (Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I want to draw your attention to the whole section of 29 (a) which was added to the Representation of People Act, 1951 amended in 1988. It is for registration of political parties. It must go on record. Its sub-clause 5 says and I quote:

"The application under sub-section (1) shall be accompanied by a copy of the memorandum, the rules and regulations of the association or body by whatever name called and such

memorandum or rules and regulations shall contain a specific provision that the association or body shall bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India as by law established and to the principles of socialism, secularism and democracy and would uphold the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India."

This is the law of the land. I raise a question through you in this House and I raise a question for the whole of the country. Does BJP stand for the unity and integrity of India? Does it stand for a socialism and secularism? Does it stand for democracy. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not fair. For every sentence why are you getting up? You will get a chance and your party will get a chance. Why do you become restless? You must have tolerance.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should not get this much emotional.

(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, why are you wasting your energy? No word is written here. Whatever you have said is not recorded. Then why do you waste your energy? Don't become emotional.

SHRI BHABANI SHANKAR HOTA (Sambalpur): I am on a point of order Sir. Just now an hon. Member sitting there made an allegation that more than three hundred Hindu temples have been destroyed in Jammu and Kashmir. This is a very serious matter. I want to draw the attention of the Home Minister; let him clarify this point. Otherwise this kind of false propaganda will go on to inflame the communal situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any two or three Members can make this noise. But this is unbecoming of a Member. Please control your emotions. This is very bad.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): I want to raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: I have given a requisition earlier on the Ram Janam Bhoomi issue. Hon. Speaker of this august House has sent a letter saying that, that issue is a matter, *sub-judice* before the court; and so it cannot be debated. *(Interruptions)* Now, the evidences are being discussed here that in 1949, such and such person went and lodged an FIR, report, etc., and such and such case was taken up. All these evidences are being discussed. May I know whether the Speaker's ruling will be revised, because today we are debating this issue? *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Speaker's ruling is there. But, at the same time, facts can be said here. If it cannot be said here, then, where else can it be said?

(Interruptions)

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, kindly listen to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I have given my ruling.

(Interruptions)

SHRIGUMAN MAL LODHA: Then, can you allow this, Sir?

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, Mr. Lodha has posed a question to the Prime Minister. We should be cautious. What kind

of people have become Chief Justices in this country. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, please conclude.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I will not speak much about Kashmir. But one point is very important which is the game of spreading untruth. In 1986 two temples were partly damaged and they were repaired at Government expenses within a week's time. But they are saying this untruth here. I urge the Home Minister that he must give the figures. They are spreading falsehood. Why Kashmir feels alienated now? One factor for this is BJP and the other factor is communalism. You have been killing Muslims in this country all these forty years. That is the root cause of that alienation. You will have to correct yourself. *(Interruptions)* Please take your seats and hear me.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you please see as to what kind of things they are saying to the countrymen. *(Interruptions)* Shri Subodh Kant Sahay must give the figures. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Prof. Soz, please conclude.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I am trying to conclude.

[Translation]

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR (Bikaner): Both Hindus and Muslims have been killed in the riots. Children belonging to the Hindu Community have also been killed. Why are you distorting the facts? *(Interruptions)*

[English]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am not distorting. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Soz, please address the Chair; otherwise you have to conclude.

15.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was raising a question for the secular political parties of this country. What are the secular political parties like Congress (I), Janata Dal, Janata Dal (S), CPM and CPI doing here? The BJP is violating the provisions of Representation of the People Act. They have no respect for the Constitution of India. They are violating the provisions of this Act openly. They do not stand for secularism. What are these parties doing here? Why don't you move jointly for getting them de-registered from the Election Commission of India? You should do that. They are playing a defensive battle and they may be paying a very high price for that. So, you should launch an offensive against the rapid communalism of BJP and the countrymen will support you. They will reject BJP. But you are not doing that. You should do that and this is my request. (*Interruptions*) Sir, Shri Advani's plea for Hindu Rajya is not acceptable to this country. We, all the secular parties and overwhelming majority of this country are rejecting it. We cannot have a Hindu Rajya. This will never be allowed in a theocratic State. We shall be governed by the Constitution of India which enjoins upon us to be secular and to be wedded to the principles of socialism and secularism in democracy.

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Joshi Ji, I would give you a chance to speak later on. Please take your seat now.

[*English*]

Please do not interrupt.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I have one request to you. If the Prime Minister is to intervene at 6 o'clock and if the very first speaker takes so much time,

I do not think, we will be able to stick to the schedule. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not interrupt. Let him speak as he is making his submissions on an important issue. You may express your view points while you reply. I request you not to interrupt because I have to accommodate maximum number of Members for making their submissions.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Makkasar, please do not try to stop them. I will stop them.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, they have interrupted me. And they have wasted much of my time. I am not responsible for that. I will take only a couple of minutes now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: 'Couple of minutes' means, I think, you will take two minutes.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Five to seven minutes. I have very important material. But I will not take much time. I have lot of things. If Mr. Advani were here, I would say something he would like me to speak. The point is, I would tell Mr. Advani: "It is not proper to use your party to terrorise Muslim community particularly." My friend says, "Why Muslim community?" Other minorities also are feeling very bad and very terrorised. But this is the major minority in this country. And they are terrorising it openly. I was to quote a couplet for Mr. Advani as you elders have beloved:

"Zere Kadmat Hazar Jaan Ast,
Ahista Kharam Bila Kharam
Ai, Mehboob Aapke Kadmon Ke Neeche
Hazar Jaanen Hain,

Ahista Chalo, Balki Bilkul Na Chalo
Taki Kisi Ki Jaan Na Jaye
Balki Bilkul Hi Na Chalo".

[English]

Now, he has become leader of the Opposition. This party should feel some responsibility unto this nation and unto Muslims also. So, Mr. Advani should take the responsibility of the speeches of Kumari Uma Bharati. I have respect for her. She is our sister. He should also take the responsibility for the speeches made by other girls from Punjab and those of VHP and Bajrang Dal. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karol Bagh): Is it a cassette or a recorder? Are these things allowed here?

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: These are the cassettes. I am presenting them before you. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, these are not allowed.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am giving you these cassettes and I do not know what you will be doing with them.... (Interruptions)... Now these have become the property of the House. Sir, you know the rules better than anybody. I want the Chair, this House to investigate into the speeches made by Bajrang Dal and VHP. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, not like this. You follow the procedure please.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I am placing the cassettes on the Table. You can

study the speeches. I do not raise any other question. If you study them, you can see how they are going to raise disturbances in Mathura and Banaras and how they are terrorising the Muslims. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat. There is a proper procedure for it. An application must be submitted first for it.

[English]

Now Mr. Soz, if you want to produce something, you have to follow the rules. You take them back.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I will follow the rules but meanwhile, I have shown you the cassettes. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Members not to interrupt him like this. You cannot just stop him like this. If you interrupt him, he will take more time and thus your time will be wasted.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not accept them. I have said what I had to say.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I have accepted your ruling. (Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, I am on a point of order. Are the contents in the tape bad according to them? I do not know why these were produced. Are they bad? (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I request the Members not to interrupt like this. If you interrupt like this, then it is your time which is consumed just in the interruptions. If you want to make points and rebut points, you should have time for it. If you interrupt like

this, it cannot be done. For the benefit of Mr. Soz, I would like to read out the relevant portion of the rule. "The Member should not tear off documents in the House; the Member should not bring or play cassettes or tape in the House." You cannot bring it also. If you want to bring in and produce anything on the Floor, then you have to produce an application for doing so.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I have accepted your ruling. I will do that. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

DR. SHAILENDRANATH SHRIVASTAVA (Patna): He is teaching you the Constitution by reading it.

(Interruptions)

[English]

He cannot bring it. But he has brought it also. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Soz, you complete your speech first.

(Interruptions)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will go by your ruling by writing an application and submitting these cassettes to you.... *(Interruptions)*.... I was saying that Advaniji should feel his responsibility and it is not a small thing to terrorise the Muslim community. All other minorities are feeling unsafe and he cannot be allowed to do it.

[Translation]

The couplet that I had recited earlier contained a sense of responsibility—**"AHISTA KHARAM BILA KHARAM"**. Since

you have no love for Persian or Urdu, so you will enjoy it through translation only.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should address the Chair.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: BJP has a responsibility. They should know that literacy percentage among the Muslims is just three per cent. It is their responsibility to help Muslims to receive more education. As compared to that, morning and evening, they are seeing an imaginary enemy in Muslims as Adolf Hitler saw an enemy in Nazi Germany in Jews.

Finally, I will tell you now Muslims show the highest regard in respect of Ram and you are destroying the concept of Ram by organizing communal carnage in the country in the name of Ram temple. I want to inform this country, through you, Sir, that Shri Advani's plea that it is a question of Babar versus Ram is totally fallacious, wrong, incorrect and is misleading this nation. Babar was just a king. If it were a question of selecting between Babar and Ram and if Muslims were to vote, Muslims would exercise their choice and right and discretion and they would stand for Ram and not for Babar. You do not want to learn anything beyond the *Shakha* programme..... *(Interruptions)* I am surprised that even Shri Lodha is misleading you.

About Ram there is no dispute. There is no dispute on Babri mosque. It is a mosque. It is another thing that you are trying to destroy it. Evidence is galore. Ram is everywhere, in the hearts, in the minds; Ram is our culture. The greatest of the Muslims in the continent including Bangladesh and Pakistan was *Alama Iqbal*; see his tribute to Ram. I will read only four-five couplets. *(Interruptions)* You must learn to live with amity with Muslims and other communities for harmony in India.

"is desh mein huey hain hazaron mulk sarisht,

mashhoor jinke dam se hai duniya
mein nam-e-Hind."

Noble souls were born in India and they
brought great honour to this country.

"Hai Ram ke vajood pe Hindostan ko
naaz
ahle nazar samajhte hain usko imam-
e-Hind
aejaz iska yahi hai chirag-e-hidayat
raushan taraaz sahar hai zamane mein
sham-Hind."

(Interruptions)

You are darkness for India not all of you; but
some of you.

"talwaar ka dhani tha shujaaat mein
fard tha,
paakizagi mein josh muhabbat mein
fard tha."

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): I
have a point of information. Normally, the
main opposition party should get a chance to
speak after the mover of a Motion has spo-
ken. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was told
that somebody wanted to speak in someone's
presence.

[Translation]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani):
He should not be allowed to speak because
he does not allow others to speak." *(Inter-
ruptions)*

[English]

SHRI M.J. AKBAR (Kishanganj): Sir,
the consensus is that there should be a ban
on the cassettes since they are spreading
death and destruction wherever they are
being played. Since these cassettes have

been brought to the notice of the Govern-
ment, it should take some action.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can
make the submission.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not part
of the record now.

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA: Govern-
ment must act seriously against such acts. It
should not wait for all-party consensus.
Government cannot abduct this responsibil-
ity. Let the Government take all action and
ban this and also the producers and the
makers of such cassettes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion
moved:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Yes, Mr. Gujral.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL (Jalandhar): Mr.
Deputy Speaker, I had never thought that I
would have called upon at this stage of the
formation of the new Government to speak
on this issue particularly in terms of the
Adjournment Motion. I have been forced to
raise my voice today more in agony and in
pain than anything else. The nation today is
confronted with the situation which should
cause anxiety to all of us, not that side or this
side of the House. At this stage the nation is
confronted with a situation when all its basic
values, its ethos and its foundation are being
questioned. The historical experiences of
this nation are being erased and an effort is
being made that we should forget all that
constituted our heritage. An assault is
launched on those who are trying to safeguard
those values to isolate them and to make it
look as if they do not belong to this nation. All
those values by which the nation was built by
our founding fathers—by no less a great
person than Gandhiji himself—are under
question. All those values and basic structure
of the nation is now under attack. Therefore,
when I rise to speak today, I don't rise so

[Sh. I. K. Gujral]

much to criticise the Government for its inaction or for its lack of action but I rise to apprise them of the situation as it stands today and I do hope when the Government reply, they will share this agony.

They will also appreciate the fact that the situation today is such that unless we in totality raise our voice, nothing will be left to talk about in future. Those of us, like me, who had the privilege of participating in the freedom struggle, what was it that we were trying to build under the great leadership of Gandhiji when foundation of this great nation was being laid. Even at that time, I recall some of the theories that we hear today, the theories that question secularism, the theories that being forwarded to rouse passions, these theories were advanced at that time as well. This myopia that we are witnessing today is not new. At that time also, this myopia was visible and ultimately it ended in the greatness tragedy of our time slaying of Gandhiji. Gandhiji fell at the hands of those whose narrowmindedness did not see his greatness. He was murdered by those who did not realise what Gandhiji was trying to build. He was shot down by those who thought that by killing Gandhiji they were silencing the voice of Gandhiji. I am at this stage reminded of a couplet in Urdu which says:

[Translation]

"Kha ke jo teer dekha, kabhi gaon ki taraf,
 To apne hi dosto se mulakat ho gai."

[English]

At that time also we saw it. When we look around now, those who were donning some times some coloured clothes in whatever colour they might be—I would not mention the colour—they were holding the gun once again at Gandhiji and what he stood for. That gun as at that time is not aimed at Gandhiji's legacy but at all the basic values of this nation. Today when we see

that the difficulties, we see the same thing coming up again.

We also remember that in the early stages of our freedom struggle and also later, the great Maulana Azad was also subjected to similiar calumny. I also recall that in the 1965 war, a rumour was deliberately floated regarding no less a person than the great Zakir Hussain himself. We know all this and we also know how all of them faced such blasphemy with courage and fortitude. They strived for the nation which we bequeathed. They knew this nation could not be anything else but a secular nation. Our diversity is such. We speak several languages; we live in several ways; we eat a variety of food; we live in different areas of our country and our historical experiences have been varied. Yet Gandhiji and his colleagues saw that our nation could be built only by unification of this diversity. They never tried to make uniformity the basis. They knew that in a society like ours, uniformity was not feasible; nor practical nor advisable. They correctly perceived that only by giving everyone a feeling of participation, by giving everyone a feeling of security, by giving everyone a feeling of equality, by giving every culture a right to develop and by giving every member community right to express itself. Only on this basis our nation could be built. I think I do not have to tell this august House that India today would not have been India of today, but for that vision. But for that vision, India would not have been liberated because Macaulay and his co-horts had tried to destroy our unity in diversity. Gandhiji was able to revive our civilizational unity that Macaulay had tried to destroy. India was liberated because Gandhiji led movement succeeded in getting back and resurrecting our soul and also the soul of our civilizational unity based on diversity. We always felt and continue to feel and believe and I am sure this House particularly continues to believe—most of us at least continue to believe—that diversity is a respectable aspect of our nation. Diversity is inherent and only by unifying that diversities can we keep the integrity of this nation.

At this time when we are seeing agonies

of various types, we see that there is one common strain. Whether it is the agony of the Punjab, the agony in Kashmir, the agony of Kanpur, the agony of Aligarh, the agony of Agra.... I could go on counting... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: What about the agony of Ayodhya?

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Everywhere you find the same factor... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): What about the agony of Ahmedabad where teachers and children were massacred? (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not the method we follow in this house.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR (Bikaner): What is this, you do not allow any body to speak. This is not a good practice. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALKADAS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to say that he should not be allowed to interrupt in this manner.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please be seated.

(*Interruptions*)

16.00 hrs.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: When I mention some aspects and miss a few names, that is not because I do not want to attach importance to those names or places, it is because, that the list is very long and if I go on counting, perhaps, I would have counted half of India that is confronting such pain and agony. Who are bleeding? It is a very facile and a very maddening to count the dead bodies. We are counting, which community suffered more and how many children of

which community were killed. We are counting the corpses that could be of a Muslim, it could be a Hindu, it could be a Sikh—and then derive a great deal of religious pride from the fact that such and such a community had killed more than my own community. We forget that everyone killed is an innocent Indian whose only fault is that he was born here and in a community feels insecure here. He feels insecure and does not get his rights. Can we in honesty think in terms of a nation that could possibly safeguard and provide security to its own citizens whatever the religion, whatever the belief and whatever language?

I remember, my dear friend Mr. Akbar sitting here, who wrote a book two years ago and the subject was same. He had cautioned at that time and narrated the stories of various riots and agonies that had been inflicted on Hindus and Muslims alike. We read this book and forgot it. We have been doing all the time. We have debated here several times. We blame one another. We blame Mr. A more than Mr. B. Mr. A has done worst than Mr. B and then we forget till the riots resurface again. With the passage of time, we find the same obscurantist beliefs, the same beliefs in the passion of narrow communalism, are getting grip of the Nation. Today the entire nation is being strangulated. I request you to kindly look around—look behind us, look on our left side, look on our right side, look within, more than anywhere else—and each one of us may ask himself one question—"Am I an Indian; what is my concept of being an Indian; do I respect Gandhiji; if I respect Gandhiji; what is my concept of respecting Gandhiji; do I believe in Indian Constitution and if I believe in Indian Constitution, what is my concept of believing Indian constitution; do I believe in secularism and what is my concept of believing secularism?" You cannot possibly revise one of these concepts without endangering the entire edifice. If you ask me to revise the concept of secularism, you will have to revise the concept of Indian constitution. You will have to revise the concept of Indian nation as such and you will edit what Gandhiji wrote and you will perhaps edit history, as some

[Sh. I. K. Gujral]

countries have tried to do with a great deal of criminality and sufferings that came later. I feel pained, because when I look in front of me and when I look behind me, I feel that my situation is something like that of mythical or old historical aspect of *Mahabharatha* when Arjun looked around and did not know whom to blame who had brought such a situation around. The riots of today are not similar to the riots of forties or fifties. There is one basic difference now. There was a time when those who rioted did so with ill placed passion, misplaced of course. But gradually, that passion is being replaced by cold blood. Now, riots murder in cold blood, that passion was not a crime. We also see that the type of weapons are becoming more and more lethal every time. There was a time when *lathi* was used, then they came to knives. Then came guns and now we are coming to total destruction. So, neither the human beings nor their property nor their children nor their homes nor their women nothing can be saved. It is worse. We also see, with true this situation, this mad passion and this distorted outlook are seeping down to poison minds. I do not blame all policemen, I do not blame all the uniformed people—whether they are in the police or in para military forces at the Centre or States but some of these acted in a way that causes concern. If one community or the other feels that it is being harmed by those who are supposed to protect them, and if one community feels that their children are being killed, and newspapers report that in a cold-blooded some children were shot by them, it is no use trying to lionise them, it is no use trying to garland them, no use giving sweets to them, because ultimately by encouraging this trend, we are encouraging such a passion in this nation—that reminds me of Germany when Nazism emerged. I do not have to remind you, Sir; you know. You recall the story when somebody said: when they first came, they came for the Jews, and I was not a Jew; so, I did not speak for them. Then they came for the Communists, and I was not a Communist; so, I did not speak for them. When they ultimately came for me, there was nobody to speak for me. If we do

not raise our united voice today for those who are suffering, the day is not far when this criminality will assume that state when none of us will be left to speak.

I urge that we understand the role and place of various components of the nation. Can India be a nation without minorities? Can India be a nation without a role and place for minorities? Can India be a nation without their languages? Can India be a nation without their cultures? Can India have only one culture, can India have one language? Can India have one religion; can India have one uniform outlook? God forbid. If that day comes, then it will not be the India that Gandhiji had dreamt. Perhaps Hitler will come out from his grave to claim that India. Therefore, I feel: let us think of re-defining secularism. Yes, re-define it, make it more vital, so that all those who try to change it look criminals in the eyes of the nation, so that all those who try to re-define the basic construction of our Nation are made to look criminals in the eyes of the nation.

I also feel that the changing character of the State, by itself, is a crime that should be strongly criticised in this House and elsewhere. I want to point it out to my friends who are today in the Government. They are my colleagues; they are my friends; they are my brothers. I share their agony also. I do not question their motivation. But they are responsible for the State machinery. They have to look at it more intensely: why is it that riots are taking place in those particular types of States alone, and not everywhere, universally? Why is it that riots are more in U.P.; why is it happening more in Gujarat; why is it happening more in Andhra—where particular parties are ruling or supported? I do not say this just to criticise... (*Interruptions*) Let me finish.

SHRISONTOSH MOHANDEV (Tripura West): We are ruling now because of special circumstances. The MLAs were selected by you. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Why don't you take it as self-criticism?

SHRIP. CHIDAMBARAM (Sivaganga):
All right; we accept that.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Riots were there when you were in power in U.P. and Gujarat. Don't try to mislead Parliament. In public speeches it is all right.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: I am really sorry. I have a great deal of sympathy for Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev, because he gets characteristically irritated and agitated, before I finish what I am saying. But he must understand what I am trying to say, and the spirit in which I am trying to present it. He and I, both, have inherited the heritage of the Congress that we respect it. He and I, both, have inherited the heritage of Gandhiji. And if that is in danger, and if we try only to defend those Chief Ministers, those administrators, those policemen, those who are responsible for law and order everywhere, only because they do the same as I do, or the same as he does, then perhaps we will miss the bus, and the nation will not be there even to mourn for us. Kindly look at those States, those particular States, why it is happening so. Do not just discuss and say that I was also responsible for it. You and I all of us are responsible for it in a way. Let us also understand that today the main responsibility is on all of us and in that spirit I am speaking. And I do hope that you will kindly take it in that spirit also.

One question is there which all of us have to respond. That is not because Mr. Soz spoke here or my friends from the Muslim League are going to speak. We stare every nation, whether it is India or some other country. The test of a nation comes from one singular fact. Do the minorities feel secure? Do the minorities feel that they are safe? Do the minorities feel that their language is safe? And I am not talking only in terms of religious minorities. I am also talking in terms of cultural minorities. I am also talking only in terms of those who live in the rim lands of India. Some concepts may be right. May be there are some illusions and may be they have been made more to believe that they are not secure. If some of them are made to believe that they are not secure, is it not our

responsibility to make them feel that they are safe? Is it not our responsibility to raise our voice in their favour so that if they feel that they are endangered there

are some people who can stand with them and die for them? India is full of such heroes who laid down their lives for them also. I remember Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi of Kanpur who stood between two rioters and gave his life. Unfortunately, this heroic commodity is becoming very rare. Unfortunately all of us are more interested in trying to divide each other and not secure a debating point against each other rather than going into the field and to stand between those warring communities.

What is the purpose, I ask you, of the communal ideologies that are being pursued today? People have talked about writings in newspapers. Some people have talked about some cassettes. Some people have talked about inflammatory speeches made. I am not raising my finger against anybody. But I am asking a question simply and that is, does this all unify the nation? Do they go to serve to create a situation where the nation stands more unified? Do they help in creating more understanding and more security. If they do not, then what do we do? If those communal ideologies, divisive ideologies which try to separate one from the other ideologies, which try to erase culture and languages and the religions, when those ideologies are there, do we as a House have any responsibility, or do we not have any responsibility? Or is it enough for us to raise a voice against each other, a finger against the other and then sit down and go away because, after all we are not being called upon to launch a struggle unitedly?

In the short run, and I say it to my colleagues in the opposite benches, in the short run firm action is called for. In the short run, the Government must assert itself. In the short run the minorities must be made to feel that they are secure in this country. In the short run, we must try to see to it that wherever a crime is committed, the criminals are punished forthwith. But our struggle is not only in the short run. Even in the long run our attitudes, thinking, and all our ideologies

[Sh. I. K. Gujral]

have to be revised. And that is where the efforts of all of us have to be attended to.

Unfortunately, a controversy, which has caused a great deal of harm nation pertions to the temple and mosque imbroglio. We are a civilised society. We know the methodology of civily settlement of disputes. In a democracy like ours we should try to persuade each other, by debate, Otherwise, this House will become irrelevant. This House is relevant only because we try to persuade each other, we try to debate with each other, just as tried to reply to Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev. This House is a House of debate and discussion and this also creates a society for debate, discussion and persuasion. We have given ourselves a Constitution which also gives a high place to judiciary. If there is a dispute about the mosque and the temple—I am not narrating the merits or demerits of the case—but what I a saying is that if we cannot discuss it, if we cannot settle it, then let us go to the court. Let the courts settle it. Some doubts have been raised about what the court will say. But way try to pre-judge it? Why should we try to say that if the judgment does go in our favour and only then we will accept it? How shall we keep a nation's faith injudiciary like this, if we do not want to settle by negotiation or by adjudication? One important issue has surfaced and I think that is where we all need to pay attention. What is the relation- ship between politics and religion in our societies? In this House several times we have discussed it. Particularly when the agony of Punjab comes before us, we always talked about dangers in religion and politics mixing. I think, there is a general consensus in this House that religion and politics should not be mixed. I do not want to point out a finger at anybody but I would like all of us t think, has it been done recently or has it not been done? If it has been done, then can we possibly realise the consequences of it? Do we realise what effect if is having in the rim-land of India? Do we realise what effect it is having in Kashmir; what effect it is having in Punjab and what effect it is having in the east? Therefore, it might suit me to get a few

votes more by trying to mix the religion and politics. But later on, the high cost of it will have to be paid. Indian diversity and national ethos has a long tradition. Prof. Ranga is sitting here, who also like me and Prof. Dandavate of course he is senior to me-had the privilege of participating in the freedom struggle.

I think, we all own a special responsibility to recall to the nation that the Indian long tradition basically based on compassion. Our religions are based on compassion. Our national ethos is based on compassion, accommodation and adjustment. Without this, neither composite culture would have been built; without this neither Indian nationhood can be built and without this no Government can possibly function in a civil way. The Government has a particular responsibility. The Government should discharge it. People like me have been once hurt by the partition. I am one of those who were deeply hurt. We left everything and came here. Thanks to this nation which owned us and which gave us an opportunity to come up again.

[*Translation*]

but our wounds are still wet.

[*English*]

We have not forgotten this. We know the cost that divisiveness means. It is not that one community alone will suffer. All will suffer. Unity of India, we perceive not a unity of land but unity of the people. It can not be a Kashmir without Kashmiris; it can not be a Punjab without Punjabis; it can not be an India without Muslims or without Sikhs or without Christians; it is India with everybody who is born here, who lives here and who loves this nation. It is that India which we are trying to build. And it is that diversity of complex and that unity of diversity that I would like to plead before this House. Let us unitedly save the edifice of this nation which is standing today on the edge of a precipice. We can tilt over. Once we tilt over, we will never come out again.

Unfortunately, my friend, Mr. Chandra Shekhar is not here. I respect him a great deal. We have shared a lot in our lives. Our values are the same. Our attitudes are the same. We have passed through the mill together. But today in the words of a poet I would say:

"No Idhar Udhar kee Too Baat kar, Ye
Bata Ki Kafila Kyon Luta,
Na Too Rehjano Ka Jikra Kar, Teri
Rehbari Ka Sawal Hai."

It is a question of his leadership. Please gave it to the nation. We want it.

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, an adjournment motion regarding the communal riots has been moved in the House today. I am pained to see the role played by the Central Government during these communal riots. Moreover, the Central Government has not been able to check the disturbances. Instead of speaking on this problem, most of the speeches were delivered on the communal situation in the country, and directly or indirectly Bhartiya Janata Party and Shri Lal Krishan Advani's name also featured in the discussion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, nothing is more condemnable than killing of any person especially of innocent people, children or women in communal riots. The person killed may be a Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or a Christian, all are Indians and human beings and their safety is the duty of this country and the Government. There should be no discrimination in this country on the basis of religion or way of worship, and no injustice or atrocity should be committed against anybody on the basis of caste. This should be our belief in this country, and I believe that secularism, forbearance, magnanimity are present in the roots of Hinduism. India was divided into two parts and Pakistan came into existence only on the basis of religion and the two-nation principle. Even at that time, there were 86 percent Hindus in India who maintained it a

secular country. Pakistan and Bangladesh became Islamic nations after partition. There were no rights for minorities in Middle East and other Islamic countries. In spite of this the 86 per cent Hindu population maintained the secular traditions in our country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, so I want to say that unless we strengthen that secularism, and unless we try to get at the root cause of the communal riots going on for the last 43 years, this problem cannot be solved completely. We can go on repeating certain often quoted words and phrases which will be on the record. Some people even surpass Gobells in telling lies. I want to prove the fact that there were no communal riots in this country as a consequence to the Rath Yatra of Advani Ji.

The Government has to take into account the periods when the communal riots took place in this country. The communal riots took place at least 25 hundred times from 1950 to 1990. Riots have been taking place almost every year. Only in one city of Godhra riots took place in 1947, 1952, 1959, 1961, 1965, 1967, 1969, 1972, 1974, 1980, 1983, 1988, 1989 and 1990. No Ram Rath procession was taken out at that time. Before 1989, thousands of people had been killed in the communal riots, which took place in Ahmedabad, Agra and in several parts of the country. There was no Rath-Yatra at that time too. Some 55 temples had been demolished in Kashmir. The Rath-Yatra did not went there. It is regrettable that Shri Soz is saying that no temples had been demolished there. I have this report-'Riots in Kashmir' with me. This report has been prepared by an independent body, Kashmir committee, in which, there were Congress Members also. The names of those places has been given in this report, where the temples had been demolished. According to it, 55 temples had been demolished, more than 550 Hindus had been massacred and more than 2.5 lakhs of Hindu population had been forced to leave the place. Shri Soz, you want to compare Shri Advani with Hitler. In 1950, the Muslim population in our country was only 9 percent of the total population, which has now increased to 12 per cent. In Kashmir,

[prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra]

2.5 lakhs population of Hindus and Sikhs had been forced to leave the place and you don't want to mention it. By repeatedly taking the name of Shri Advani, you want to say that these riots took place due to the Rath-Yatra only, whether they are the riots of Kashmir or the riots, which took place earlier. But the Rath-Yatra was organised in September, 1990 only. Unless you find out the reasons behind these riots, you cannot find a proper solution to these riots and they can never be stopped in the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, here reference has been made regarding the results of Shri Advani's Rath-Yatra. The effect of this Rath-Yatra of Shri Advani is that it has brought such an awakening in the national forces in the country that it has created a wave of patriotism and national unity among the crores of people of this country. This has given a severe blow to the destructive forces in the country. They are trying to hide their own crimes by finding a scapegoat and by raising slogans. Shri Gujaral mentioned here about Mahatma Gandhi. But I would like to submit that this country was divided on the basis of religion in the presence of *Gandhi Ji* itself. All these parties, who are sitting here, had supported that division. They divided the country on the basis of religion and formed Pakistan. Even today, it is being tried inside Kashmir to disintegrate the country on the basis of religion. On one hand, you cry for unity, but on the other hand, you are supporting the separatist forces in Kashmir. Even now, you are supporting the terrorists in Punjab and you take the name of B.J.P. *Our friends are helpless, otherwise they wouldn't have hesitated in even saying that the Bharatiya Janata Party is behind all the riots that are taking place in Beirut, Russia and Pakistan.*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I agree with Shri Gujaral that the minorities should not be concerned about their safety about their language or about the injustice committed on them. But, have you ever thought that the majority should also not be concerned about

the fact that inspite of constituting the 86 per cent population of this country, their religion, their culture or their identity is in danger? Does the secularism only mean that hinduism should be wiped out of this country? Does it mean that only the majority people should live a suppressed life and their population should go on decreasing? During these last 30 years, the population of Hindus has decreased by 3 per cent. Can anyone then tell me how it is so that in a country, where the minorities are killed, the population of the minorities increases and the population of the majority decreases. Those who present this wrong picture of our country that here the minorities are massacred like the Jews, I think they are doing treachery with the country and giving bad name to the country in the entire world. The people, who had been killed, should not be seen as Hindus or Muslims. I don't want to go into those figures. But the speech given by Shri Soz can create a misunderstanding. Is it not true that the 90 per cent of the people killed in the riots in Hyderabad were Hindus and 6 to 8 years old children were knifed to death? (*Interruptions*) Whenever, any riot takes place in Hyderabad, the Bharatiya Janata Party is made responsible for it, even though, 90 per cent of the killed people are Hindus. (*Interruptions*) Riots took place in Aligarh also... (*Interruptions*)

[English]

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY
(Mangalore): Sir, on a point of information.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is not yielding.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: My party went there. There is a report with us. I can give you the report, I can give you the names of the people who were killed.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: If you yield for a minute. Sir, I went to Hyderabad and, in fact, there Hindus were also killed, Muslims were also killed and even small children aged about six months were also butchered. In order to see the in-patients in the hospital, we went there. You may not

believe, Sir, that...*(Interruptions)*. I will come to the point...*(Interruptions)*. When we went to see the Hindu inmates in the hospital and also the Muslim inmates, his party workers came there...*(Interruptions)*. Please hear me. The Bhartiya Janata Party workers came and told us that they were going to send Muslims to Pakistan...*(Interruptions)*.

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Pathak, I am telling you. You are continuously disturbing. This is not right. Shri Makkasar, please don't disturb. Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am telling you after asking him.*(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Joshi, please sit down. Probably you don't realise that you are disturbing your own Members. So, please don't disturb.

[*Translation*]

Shri Tiwari, although you are talking to each other quietly, but please keep quiet.*(Interruptions)*

PROF. VJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was saying that whosoever has been killed, whether she is a woman or a child, is an human being and therefore, if any innocent person has been killed, it is a matter of concern for the entire House. But here a wrong picture is being presented. Shri Soz mentioned that the same behaviour is metted out to the Muslims here, as was done by Hitler with the Jews. He was trying to call Shri Advani as Hitler. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, whenever and wherever in the country, has been the Government of Bharatiya Janta Party, either there had been no riots or there had been very few of them.*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Bharatiya Janta

Party is the most powerful party in Delhi. Only a single riot took place in Delhi recently, but who was behind it. All the newspapers and even the Indian People's Front had said about the people who were instrumental for these riots. Shri Chandra Shekhar has also visited the riot-torn areas. Even the Shahi Imam, who is a very communal minded person, has said that the Muslim elements, who took out the procession, were behind all these riots, The IPF said that the Congress was behind these riots.*(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Your cassettes are spreading poison.*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

PROF. VJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is not proper to mention the name of Bharatiya Janta Party in all these things. Therefore, it would have been better, if such a picture regarding the minorities and majorities had not been presented here. 100 per cent of the people killed in Sambhal were Hindus, but here it was stated that the Muslims are being killed.

SHRI K. MANVENDRA SINGH (Mathura): Just now, he has said that riots had not taken place anywhere, where the BJP was in power. I would like to know how riots took place in Jaipur, which was never hit by riots and where the BJP is in power today.*(Interruptions)*

PROF. VJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to quote here from some newspapers of Uttar Pradesh. It is regrettable that Shri Akbar is using such a language, which was not even used by Shri Jinnah. Regarding the riots which took place in Hyderabad, Shri Chenna Reddy and Shri N. T. Ramarao also said that BJP was not behind these riots, but here in Delhi, he is stating that the BJP was behind all these riots and who are those people who had been killed in it.*(Interruptions)*

You have levelled this charge, but not

[prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra]

Shri Chenna Reddy. You cannot become Jinnah. Being in the Congress, you are trying to become Jinnah. I would like to quote here from some newspapers of Uttar Pradesh. I have 6-7 of them and they are all pro-Congress and pro-Janta Dal. Just look at the head-lines of these newspapers, whose owners are pro-congress and pro-Janta Dal. "Masjidon sesuraksha balon ke khilaf jehad ka elan, Kanpur me sthiti visfotak, sena, P.A.C. ke dston se alpasankhyakon ke ghamasan yudh-10 aur mare." (The Mosques has announced Jihad against the Security Forces, the situation in Kanpur is explosive, heavy fighting between the minorities and the squads of P.A.C. and other forces-10 killed) Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 'Amar-Ujala', the headline is "Suraksha balon per ghat laga kar hamle". (Security forces ambushed). The head-line in the third newspaper is-"Aligarh men dekhte hi goli marne ke adesh, vishwavidyalaya ke nikat bhyankar hinsa". (Shoot at sight orders in Aligarh, heavy violence near the university.) Mr. Speaker, Sir, all these newspapers are clearly exposing who is behind all these riots why these riots took place? In Uttar Pradesh.....**.....went to all the places and told the Muslims to gather arms and come out on the streets. The riots took place due to that reason only. The sadbhavna-yatras taken out by.....**.....spread the riots.(Interruptions) Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the cassettes are being mentioned repeatedly. I am speaking on them.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: What about your cassettes? Let us play the cassettes here and let the whole House hear it and decide as to who is arousing the passions.(Interruptions)

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr.

Deputy Speaker, Sir, today some people referred to the cassettes that are in circulation. In a report published in today's issue of the 'Navbharat Times', Shri Shakeel Akhtar, a Muslim reporter from Kashmir valley has said that cassettes containing secessionist propaganda are being fearlessly sold in the valley and I would like to read before the House, what Shri Akhtar has written...(Interruptions)

SHRI BALGOPAL MISHRA (Bolangir): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav is not a Member of this House and he is not present here to defend himself. Unfortunately, Mr. Malhotra has referred to his name.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept your point of order. His name will not be mentioned in the record.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: The speeches made by the Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister in which he exhorted the Muslim community to collect arms, was the primary cause for the communal riots that rocked Uttar Pradesh.(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI DEVILAL): The 'Sadbhavana Yatra' undertaken by him played a key role in cooling down the passions and on the contrary B.J.P. is responsible for arousing the Passions.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: I blame the Congress Party for it. It is supporting the.....**.....The Congress is supporting...**... contrary to your wishes and you are allowing those responsible for the killings to benefit from it. You are allowing him to continue.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Well, I will be allowing Mr. Sontosh Mohan Dev to say something immediately after the speech of Mr. V.K. Malhotra, if he has any point to make. I would request the Members to address the House and through the House to the people outside and not addressing each other because it is creating difficulties.

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Shri Shakeel Akhtar in his report in the 'Navbharat Times' says that, the potentiality of the contents of the Cassettes being sold in the Kashmir Valley, to instigate people to commit high treason, is astounding and unimaginable. He has also mentioned in his report that the contents of two cassettes are so provocative that they can even intense life in the dead. All of you seem to be oblivious of the distribution and sale of such cassettes containing provocative and secessionist utterances (*Interruptions*)

You donot seem to be bothered about the fact that hundreds of 'Kar Sewaks' who went to Ayodhya in a manner, chanting 'Ram Dhun' and without carrying even sticks or stones with them, were killed in unprovoked firing. (*Interruptions*) There, the Kothari brothers were taken out of their house and killed at point-blank range. However, if such facts are mentioned in cassettes, they are accused of spreading communal venom. After all, why did the Government kill these people? What was their fault? You cannot have double standards in this country. I would like to tell Shri Chandra Shekhar and all others who are giving wide-publicity to this motion, that most of the riot victims belong to the minority community and that only the minorities are being massacred, is not correct. It is not proper to count the riot victims on the basis of their religious affiliations. In order to bring the facts to light and to remove the misconceptions in the minds of the people, let the Government come out with a white Paper on the number of Hindus and Muslims killed in these riots. Even the report of the Criminal Investigation Department should be made public. The Report will make it clear

as to who were responsible for these riots and who started them. It would be an injustice, if you suppress that report and give more weightage to other reports presented by people with vested interests. Mr. Soz does not move out of Delhi and he is not in a position to visit Kashmir, yet, he prefers to give a general verdict, sitting in Delhi. This won't serve any purpose. I would like to raise some other points as well. Here, a reference was made to the Ram Janamabhooni issue. I would like to know from my Muslim brothers present in the House, whether a place, where 'Namaz' is not offered, can be called a Mosque? A place where 'Namaz' is not offered and within two hundred metres of whose periphery, Muslims are not allowed to sit their foot, can that place be termed as a Mosque?..... (*Interruptions*) Repeated attempts are being made to give the form of a mosque to a place where the idol of Lord Ram is installed and where 'Akhand Puja' is bring conducted... (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (Calcutta South): One hon. Member from BJP has mentioned about the Court. Let them accept the court verdict.

[*Translation*]

PROF. VIJAYKUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, how do they expect the riots to come to an end? It is indeed strange that those people who talk about 'two bation theory', who divide the country on those lines and those people who do not recognise India as one nation, but consider it as a union of many nationalities are considered as 'Nationalists', while we, who talk about the oneness of the country are labelled as 'Communalists'. We, in the Bhartiya Janata Party believe in the oneness of India and its culture and we firmly stand for upholding its unity and integrity. Yet, we are termed as 'Communalists'.

[*English*]

SHRI BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Your policies will lead to the disintegration of the country.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, let the entire House, unanimously agree to it that the people of this country won't be discriminated against on the basis of their religious beliefs, irrespective of whether they are in the majority or otherwise. I find it difficult to digest, when communalism is associated only with the majority community and not with the minorities. For the past 42 years, you have been suppressing the aspirations and hopes of the majority community by following an appeasement policy towards the minorities. (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Tell us whether the C.P.I.(M) had a pact with the Muslim league or not? (Interruptions)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: No doubt, the House should ponder over these points when it is discussing ways and means to eliminate communalism and to check the recurring communal riots, but over and above all this, we should also ponder about those who are responsible for these communal riots... (Interruptions) ...Pakistan is hatching a conspiracy to ruin this country and those who are trying to veil the nefarious activities of the Pakistani agents or those who are trying to prevent the exposure of the Pakistani conspiracy, are also responsible for these riots to a great extent. The self-proclaimed champions of the Muslim cause in this country are in fact the worst enemies of that community. The contractors of the Muslims votes, who are present in the House... (Interruptions)

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR: You have become the contractors of Hindu votes.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: I am not surprised by the attitude of the Communist Parties, they have all along been making attempts to destroy the cultural and national identity of this country... (Interruptions) The Communist Parties know very well that it is virtually an

impossible task to bring about a Communist Revolution in the country, as long as the people here are religious, that is why they are out to destroy the religious beliefs of the people. (Interruptions) I would also like to say here that illicit arms are being smuggled into the country from Pakistan and they are being collected here on a large scale. I would like to appeal to the Prime Minister that the Government should find out why it failed to check the illegal smuggling of arms into the country, from Pakistan and whether why it has failed to unearth the scores of illegal arms factories that have sprung up in many cities, across the length and breadth of the country. If the Prime Minister sincerely intends to take some effective steps, then the Government should check gun-running, unearth illegal arms factories and conduct house searches for illegal and unlicensed arms. This would prove effective only if and when, stringent punishments are given to those people, in whose houses, illegal arms are found.

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR: What about your 'Trishuls' (Tridents)? (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Joshi, Mr. Makkasar, please take your seats. I would like to urge the hon. Members to listen to the member who is speaking, instead of addressing each other, for it creates difficulty in the smooth running of the proceedings. Mr. Joshi, you also stand up again and again, you should take your seat when I am on my legs but on the contrary you stand up. It is not proper. I would like to urge Mr. Joshi and Mr. Makkasar to take their seats. It is not proper to stand up and start addressing each other in this way. Please, both of you take your seats.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, more than 2 crores of people have infiltrated into India from Bengla Desh. They should be identified and it should be enquired into how a foreigner gained entry into India in this way? Many people out of these two crore people are involved in the riots incidents in India. Efforts should be

made to drive them out. How these foreigners can enter Indian territory without any valid permission?

It is in the knowledge of Mr. Deputy Speaker and Hon. Prime Minister that the people who come here from Pakistan holding Pakistani Visa generally overstay here. Though the period of their stay as mentioned in their visas has already expired, they are still staying here. Many of them are working in sensitive areas, they should be driven out. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have an appeal to make. If educational Institutions run on the basis of religion in the country whether it is Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian, The admissions in those institutions will be made on the basis of religion. It is quite natural. And if universities like Aligarh are established here on the basis of religion, views of the student seeking admission there on the basis of religion are bound to be bigotry. Therefore, education system in all the universities should be uniform. Religion should have no place there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, our constitution provides for a common civil code, but the same is not being followed. This thing is creating discrimination. In the end, I want to say one thing more. I want to say to our Muslims brethren that they face no threat from majority community provided they are interested in maintaining harmony. The people who are participating in mad race to corner muslim votes pose a real threat to them. They should beware of such elements. I want to urge upon our muslim brethren that they just cooperate with the Hindus in the construction of the temple at the Lord Rama's birth place. This will automatically create an atmosphere of Hindu-Muslim party and that of peace in the country. (Interruptions) Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do agree that a muslim, a sikh, a christian or a person from minority community is a fullfledged citizen of this country, he should not be reduced to the status of a second grade citizen. But Hindus were teated as second grade citizen for one thousand years. Hindus would not like to be a second grade citizen any longer. If injustice by Hindus is going to be called secularism,

communal peace cannot be established in this country. There is only one way to end communalism and that is that the entire country is taken as a nation which should have one culture and every man of this country should accept it as his motherland and consider himself its son. Only then peace can be maintained here.

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF TOURISM (SHRI DEVI LAL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not want to speak but since a reference to contractorship has been made, I would like to say something. Contractors of muslim votes are encouraging all this. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask through you that before the formation of Pakistan when Haryana was a part of Punjab, at that time also these people were ruling, they were forming Government with the support of the people of Haryana. We used to try to take with us Muslims on economic basis which was practically me. In those days Muslims league was taken to be the synonym of Pakistan though the country was one. But these people of BJP who were in Jansangh then... (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Jansangh was formed in 1951. (Interruptions)

SHRI DEVI LAL: Earlier it had a different name... (Interruptions) Let me answer him. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Jansangh was not formed then but that was the feeling among the urban people. There was one Chaudhari Chotu Ram who united the Muslims, sikhs, Hindus of India on economic basis and these people called this Chotu Ram as Chotu Khan and today Shri Mulayam Singh is called Maulana Mulayam Singh well, who was responsible for these riots? Did they not contribute to these riots? These are the certain questions I would like to ask them. If it was really the Lord Rama birth place Yatra, it should have started from Somnath and reached Ayodhya direct but they visited the entire country upto Bengal and Bihar. This Rama's Birth place was in existence even two hundred and fifty years ago, but these congress people who ruled for 40 years

[Sh. Devi Lal]

never thought of it. Now when a certain feeling has developed among the rural people of India, due to which they came to power, but this thing is not going to be repeated in the next elections. You blame Mr. Makkasar, your candidate of BJP was contesting against Mr. Makkasar in the Lok Sabha elections in Bikaner and in spite of that you claim yourself to be the person managing the affairs of Rajasthan. This contractorship will vanish very soon but listen to me what I am saying. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI: I challenge you. Can you win Kota seat? *(Interruptions)*

SHRIDEVILAL: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was telling that when this feeling was developed all-around in India and when there were 542 members in this Lok Sabha. Prof. N. G. Ranga was sitting here. Chaudhari Ranbir Singh, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh and Chaudhari Badan Singh from Budaun and Sardar Patel from Gujarat were here. We had decided to get separated because we were fed up with these people. *(Interruptions)* They also tried to isolate Haryana. I am very grateful to you that you have separated Haryana from Punjab because your rule in Punjab helped in developing a feeling among our farmers that we should get rid of these urban people somehow. Sitting with Akalies we decided that we should get rid of them. Punjabi Suba or whatever you want in Punjab, you take that but give us Haryana, this was our condition. We spear-headed this agitation together. I would like to cite an example in support of this. There was a meeting of our Congress Party...

HON. MEMBER: Your Congress.

SHRI DEVI LAL: Yes, I was a Congressman. *(Interruptions)* But now I have no connection with them *(Interruptions)*. It was a Parliamentary Committee meeting of Congress. I was a member of Congress. There was a plot of land near Guhna Cheeka which was to be given to the 'Harijans' under Land Utilisation Act, but they chose to give it

to the 'Harijans' of Amritsar-Gurdaspur. One Shri Mool Chand Jain was there. He said to Kairon Saheb well if the land was to be given to Harijans why not give it Harijans belonging to Haryana. To which Shri Kairon replied that no body from Haryana had applied for that. The then Chief Minister Sacchar Saheb and had said that he was helpless as no application was received from people belonging to Haryana. Sacchar Saheb was the Chief Minister of Punjab at that time. At that time I rose and told Mr. Jain what these poor fellows can do, there is no one in our area who could apply for that. You should take it for granted that Bania from Punjab is more clever than a Baniya of our area. A Harijan of Punjab is more clever than that of our area. A Jat of Punjab is better than ours. An MLA of Punjab is also more clever than us. Then Sacchar Saheb quipped, "Is there any one more clever than you", upon which I said, "there is no doubt about it". From Ludhiana out of 11,9 MLA's are from Akali Dal and only two belong to Congress—One Shri Diwan Jagdish Chandra and the other is Shri Bhimsen Sacchar. While you became the leader, the post of Secretary went to Diwan Jagdish Chandra. Though we have a team of 11 from a district, no body bothers about us. That is why we thought of getting rid of these people. As soon as we got rid of them, a separate Haryana was formed and on the other side Punjab State was formed. After that I gave a call to the entire India to unite to get rid of these urban rich. As a result of that we 319 members are sitting this side, we did not join them. Out of those 319 one is our Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar and other one is myself the Deputy Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)* I am grateful to you because only because of you we could come to power. The place of Shri Gopi Chandra Bhargava, is occupied by Shri Badal and Shri Simranjeet Singh Mann today. Where the people like Shri Bhim Sen Sacchar was ruling, today these are people like Shri Chautala, Shri Hukum Singh and Shri Bansi Lal. Now Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav, is occupying the chair which was once occupied by Mr. Chandra Bhanu Gupta, about when they have many complaints. Now Mr. Lalu Prasad Yadav, Mr. Bhairon Singh Shekhawat

and Mr. Chimanbhai Patel are in the same positions which were once occupied by Mr. Lalit Narayan Mishra, Mr Mohan Lal Sukhadia and Mr Hiten Desai respectively. In state Mr. Bangarappa has come to power while in another Mr. Janardana Reddy. So, when all the prominent seats of power have been captured by the persons of rural background these people are frustrated they have no economic programmes to implement they have not been able to wave boons, make pensions for old age pensions and provide electricity and water. Now they are left with no alternative except to incite religious sentiments. That's why they thought it prudent to take up the Ram Janambhoomi issue. This issue has now become the stopping stone to capture power. In the olden times a story used to make rounds which is not merely an act of fiction but reality also, that once Lord Ram overheard a launderer telling his spouse, that I am not Shri Ram who will accept into the house Sita who spent some time in Lanka. This single episode led to her exile. Then after that Ashwamedha Yagya's horse was released... (*Interruptions*) ...please listen. This is the reason for our remaining in power, while they have been forced to abdicate and move over to the other side. Only they have spurned us and launched the rathayatra similar to Ashamedha Yagya to come out of wilderness. But Sita was well aware of the antecedents of the horse and that's why she asked Lava and Kusha to release the horse. So I would like to ask them one question, that if they are the ardent follower, of Lord Ram then why not struggle for the liberation of Lahore and Kasur from Pakistan Kasur, the two cities founded by Luva and Kusha. Can they acquire all the powers so easily. We have struggled a lot to come to power. This way they cannot come to power. That's why I congratulated Mr. Lalu Prasad Yadav for displaying courage to stop the rathayatra. The manner in which communal passions have been incited by them by pitting Hindus and Muslims against each other and their attempt to blame the Congress and my party here in the House are not justified, as the disturbances in Indore, Ahmedabad and Rajasthan were clearly their creations. (*Interruptions*) they are only to be blamed.

SHRI PHOOL CHAND VERMA (Shajapur): Who is in power in Madhya Pradesh? Who is cooperating with Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav?

SHRI DEVI LAL: He must have compassion for Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav. Large crowds up to even two lakhs were mobilised by Mr. Yadav for his Sadbhavna Sabhas to demonstrate his mass popularity. Whosoever is born in India favours establishment of communal harmony in the country. I ask who compelled the one lakh strong Niazi forces to lay down arms? It was Gen Arora. It took one year to release POWs under the agreement. Around 1.28 lakh Indians living in Kuwait were brought back through the air and sea routes. their strategy is to compel 12 crore Muslims to leave the country. But where will they be deported and in how much time. Only they are responsible for disturbances. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is totally baseless. Through such speeches the image of India will only get distorted. Who has stated that my party favours deportation of Muslims. (*Interruptions*) Sir, this is not a petty issue. The Deputy Prime Minister of India is saying that the India's favour deportation of 12 crore Muslims from the country. How is he saying this? Who has said this and where? The statement of the Deputy Prime Minister that Indians favour deportation of 12 crore Muslims from the country, will be highlighted by Pakistan and several other nations. repeatedly. So all this should be expunged and is not in the national interest (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVI LAL: The Deputy Prime Minister of India is only speaking the truth. He is saying what he is observing.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, he is speaking not in the capacity of a Janta Dal leader but as the Deputy Prime Minister in the House. So, my submission to you is to, check him from uttering such derogating things. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVI LAL: My submission is that

[Sh. Devi Lal]

they have no constructive programme. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (New Delhi): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, right now many allegations are being levelled against B.J.P. These will be refuted at the opportune moment. All these charges are being orally refuted and the public will also give their verdict. But through you I would like to request the hon. Deputy Prime Minister that I would like to clarify my party's stand on such an irresponsible statement attributed to my party colleague that we want to throw out Muslims from India. I take pride that even at the time of partition of the country when Pakistan became a theocratic state, India adopted the present secular constitution, which treats everyone equally. Nobody is first class or second class citizen. I firmly believe that whosoever tries to change the frame work of the constitution will not do good and my party is totally against all this. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR (Bikaner): We have the cassette and we will let you know. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have heard the cassettes *(Interruptions)* I have also seen the video cassette. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

Chaudhary Devi Lal is not speaking in his personal capacity, but as the Deputy Prime Minister of the country. So, he must restrain himself as whatever he says will not only have repercussions in the country, but also has got international ramifications. *(Interruptions)*

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am pained at the controversy that has arisen in the House. I would like to assure Advani Ji that what all Chowdhary Sahab stated was not intentioned to convey,

that B.J.P. favours depertation of some individuals from the country. Some people raise such slogans "Babar Kee Santan Chhoro Hindustan". *(Interruptions)*

To my mind chowdhary Sahab was referring to only such slogans. But the completion of deporting people from the country, is wrong. Constitution of India confers on everyone the right to live in the country. We donot want that such a image be created in the world. The Government will not allow anyone to deport anybody from the country whosoever he may be. Chowdhary Sahab was not referring to B.J.P., but to those persons who raise such slogans and if the party does not support them, then it is good. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVI LAL: Advani Ji. has stated that nobody from his party has made such statements. Right now somebody branded the people sitting in the front row as Pakistani agents. He has said that it is the Deputy Prime Minister who is speaking. I would like to ask Advani Ji, was he not participating as B.J.P. chief in the rath yatra, which spoiled the whole atmosphere? At that time Hindu religion was not being propogated, it remained packed in his briefcase. Hindu religion is dear to all of us and the nation also. I request them not to espase the cause of hindu religion, alone we all are Hindus. The people creating fuss, I would like to tell that we are not afraid of elections. If the elections are held they will be routed and will not be able to engineer Hindu Muslim riots *(Interruptions)* At present they all are creating lot of fuss. I want to tell them that we are not afraid of elections. If elections are held, they will be routed, they will not be able to create a Hindu Muslim divide *(Interruptions)* Let him resign and I also resign, that he will know who has the mass following in Rajasthan.

SHRI GULAB CHAND KATARIA (Udaipur): You emerged victorious in Rajasthan only because of us. Had you been that popular in Rajasthan then you must have toured the state. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVI LAL: You Concentrated in

Bikaner, but despite this Mr. Makkasar emerged victorious because of me, not you. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All of you sit down please. I request all the hon. Members to exercise restraint and donot have side talks with each other, as all it makes difficult for the members to highlight issues. I request the leaders and whips of all the parties to check the members of their parties, as alone I cannot control the House.

[*English*]

SHRISONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Tripura West): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I feel very much distressed, unhappy and perturbed when I participate in this discussion. Even after 43 years of independence when we have secularism in our Constitution, we are discussing the communal tension in the country. The situation in the country and the issues which are accenting tensions in the country are also creating tensions in this House which we have seen for the last three to four hours of the debate. I have heard with rapt attention the speeches from the Janata Party, Mr. I.K. Gujral, Mr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra and other Members. At the outset, on behalf of my party, I convey my heart full congratulations to the present Government and the Prime Minister for this Government have achieved one thing. Both the parties which were fighting on the basic issue of Ram Janambhoomi—Babri Masjid have been brought to the negotiating table. Moreover, recently they have been asked to exchange the documents. This is the right step in the right direction. I think that this is definitely a feather to the cap of the Government which is hardly 43 days old. And I hope that after this debate, the whole House will join and pass a resolution that this Government should be given political as well as all types of support so that the efforts which have been started can go ahead and the country which is now divided on caste and religion can bring its original position and we can forget the unhappy incidents which are happening in the country. The Congress Party had always stood and will

stand for secularism and whatever price the Congress might have to pay will be paid by it but they will never compromise for secularism. This is our principle and we strongly believe that the present Government will keep the fabric of Indian secularism and will fight against this issue of communalism which has become a cancerous spot in our present day country... (*Interruptions*) ... I have heard Mr. V.K. Malhotra who is a good friend of mine. I appreciate the way he has spoken. He has proved today in this House that whatever has been told about his party is very much correct. What was his trend of speech? He has now tried to charge the Deputy Prime Minister. Why is he saying that particular thing? I will request Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra to answer. He said that the population of the Muslims in this country is going up by three per cent and thereby country is in danger. What sort of message you are giving to Pakistan and Bangladesh? He just now spoke about it. You just now said that there are no riots in the States which you are running. I agree, because you will not disturb your own State. Therefore, you go to the States of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, or Shri Chimanbhai Patel and other Congress or non-Congress Governments where you are not there and you disturb them. You are the villain of peace. The whole House has come to the conclusion, and if you have any reason to believe what is the sense of the House, then you should decide, enough is enough and no further. Why I am saying this to you is that you are dividing this country on Hindu *Rashtra* basis. May I ask Shri Advani and Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra why Iraq and Iran are fighting in spite of the fact that they are Muslims *Rashtras*. Khalida Begam and Hasina Begam have come in the streets in Bangladesh in spite of the fact that it is a Muslim *rashtra*. Why Benazir Bhutto has come in the streets and given a call to fight; it is because it relates to the economic situation, in which the people are very much interested. Only *dharma* or Hindu *Rashtra* will not solve your Problem. If you want to make it a issue in the elections, it is a separate thing. But do you really want to make it an issue in the elections by creating a division in the country? Integration of the

[Sh. Sontosh Mohan Dev]

country is in peril.

Your leader, Shri Advani has given an interview in the Times of India. What did he say? He said: "I feel proud that I led the *Rath Yatra* with my symbol of lotus, and when I went round the country from Rameshwar to Samastipur, there were no riots." History does not speak that. One hundred and six riots took place. The Home Minister is there; he will speak. Not only that, six hundred persons died. You made a cassette to show how people died in Ayodhya. I condemned whosoever has done it, whether Mulayam Singh Yadav or anybody else. But who was the Prime Minister then? He was playing the game: Laloo Parsad versus others. He allowed Shri Advani to go for some time and then he arrested him. It is that Shri V.P. Singh, who refused to speak on Mathura, because there was a flag of your party. He said: It is a communal party; unless you remove the flag, I am not going to speak on this. From two seats, you got eighty-eight seats. You came because of Shri V. P. Singh. He created a situation where there was a 1:1 fight in the country during elections. Very good. You are the creation of Shri V.P. Singh, but you have also destroyed him... (*Interruptions*) Yes, he was my product. He stabbed me in the back and went away. Anyway, please do not disturb me.

I am very much surprised that Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra brought certain issues before the House. These issues were debated all over the country and he asked what action had been taken on them. I would ask him: Why did you not solve all those problems when you were having daily lunches, dinners and breakfasts with Shri V.P. Singh? Now, suddenly you have come to realise this.

Shri !.K. Gujral gave a very very nice speech. But it reminded me of a story. A man puts fire in his neighbour's house and then gives a ring to the fire brigade. In the process the neighbour's house as also his own house is gutted. Shri Gujral said that our secular fabric in India must be maintained.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has been consistent.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Yes, but he has been inconsistent in one thing. He gave a very good speech, but if he had given the same speech during your Government's time, the country would not have come to this situation. I do not dispute about his speech. He gave a very good speech but I cannot reconcile to one statement of his. He once wanted to sell a product in this House saying that the communal problem is there only in the Congress or Congress-run States. Shri Chimanbhai Patel was the Chief Minister during your time and you selected all the MLAs and Ministers. This Government is supported by Congress because of the circumstances created in the country and I agree with it but if you say that this is a Congress-run State and we are responsible, it is not correct. Shri Chimandbai Patel was ousted from Congress because of corruption. When he went to your party, he became a holy good fellow and you accepted him. He is back again.

What happens to Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav? Shri Yadav, Shri Joyti Basu and others had meeting in Kanpur and now we are having riots in Kanpur. I do not blame either Shri Basu or Shri Yadav. Congress has taken a stand in U.P. in Congress Working Committee meeting that Kar Sevaks must not be treated in the manner as they were treated during Shri V.P. Singh's regime. If somebody tells us that we have become a Hindu Party, we do not mind but our stand on Ramjanambhoomi and Babri Masjid is very clear. Our leader has given a letter to the Hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: What is your stand?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DAV: I am telling you. If you are deaf and you cannot hear, I will make you hear but give me a chance to say my point.

Our stand is very clear and it is that we will not allow Masjid to be demolished and

Mandir to be constructed. We do not agree that in a deputed land either Mandir or Masjid should be constructed. We have said that six Supreme Court judges should be invited by the Government to be in a Commission and papers which have come to the Hon. Prime Minister from the aggrieved parties, i.e. Ram Janambhoomi Babri Masjid and VHP should be given to them. They should examine them and this examination should be time bound and whatever decision is given should be acceptable to the Government as well as to these two parties. This is our stand. May I ask the BJP that if they are so sure that this is the Ram Janambhoomi and it was never a Masjid and only the idol was there then why they are afraid of accepting the verdict of the court? Why are they not accepting the legal position? You have mustered some weakness. You are playing politics with 'Ram' but I may tell you that Ram will not forgive you. Ram will take care of you in the right time. I would request you not to play politics with Ram.

On behalf of my party I would like to request the Hon. Prime Minister that there was a clear guideline from the Home Ministry and that guideline was followed by Shri V.P. Singh and that is still being followed by this Government-provocative statements, provocative posters and provocative video or audio cassettes must not be allowed. Where is the weakness? Why don't you hear the cassette which has been given here? You call all the party leaders and let them hear this cassette. If all the leaders say that it is not good for the country and it is provocative...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I would like to tell the Hon. Member that I would also like to have one other cassette which is in my possession and which is a conversation with Mahant Paramhans of Ayodhya in which he says that this whole problem began in September 1984 when he and Mr. Dau Dayal and others met Mrs. Gandhi. Mrs. Gandhi told them...*(*Interruptions*) I have the tape. Mahant Paramhans was talking to me.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KADAMBUR M.R. JANARDHAN (Tirunelveli): How could we believe you? How do we know that Mrs. Indira Gandhi said so? We know you people very well and the country also knows you well. How can we believe you?(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: On the 18th of this month, Mahant Paramhans was talking to me in Ayodhya. He made this statement.(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I am on my legs. Please sit down.

Well, a reference has been made to the former Prime Minister who is no more. It is very difficult to confirm or to prove whether what is said is correct or not. Therefore that portion referring to here will not form part of the record.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Thank you Sir for giving such a ruling. I do not want to prolong it I do not want to go on speaking on this subject. When I said cassettes, posters and other things, what I meant is that all those things which are creating communal tension and which are creating a division on caste and community lines should be removed. Mr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra alleges that we are casting aspersions on him. There is a slogan raised by his party in U.P. which says...

"Baccha Baccha Ram Ka, Musalman Baccha Haraam Ka: This is the slogan raised by the Bajrang Dal. Shri Advani says that he does not subscribe to that view. Merely saying that in Parliament is not enough. You have to prove it that you do not believe in it really. Do you know this? When our Congress delegation went to Hyderabad and visited the injured patients in the hospitals, some of their activists came and stated that they would throw out Muslims from India.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MADANLAL KHURANA: Sir, I had also gone to Hyderabad. They were not

[Sh. Madan Lal Khurana]

allowed to enter there and they had to return.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: Our friends from BJP are living in a fool's paradise. In Delhi University, he and his leader were kicked out by the students during the Mandal Commission agitation. Do not forget it. When you throw stones, you must be ready to accept them back. I am not a disciple of Gandhi Ji. I am a disciple of Neta Ji. Don't forget that. If we really want to solve this problem, we have to preach and do what we feel and think is right. Unfortunately, because of the present situation in the country, Mandir Masjid and Mandal have become an issue. Basically, this situation has been created by the BJP and also to certain extent by the 11 month old government of V.P. Singh. They have done it through the Mandal Commission's report and by projecting the BJP as an alternative to the Congress (I). (Interruptions) Our friends from CPI (M) and CP and other parties have always fought against communalism. I appreciate it. But they have now become a sort of grandfather. They go on offering advice that Shri Chandra Shekha should do it, Shri Devi Lal should do it, Shri V. P. Singh should do it or Shri Advani should do it and so on. They forget that they are wiped out from all over the country except in West Bengal and Kerala. I would like to ask them one thing.... (Interruptions)

Our friend Shri Saifuddin Chowdhury today admitted that they were never in the opposition and that they were supporting the previous Government. There was support not only from their party but also from the BJP. Is it not a fact? You had supported the Government which was supported by the BJP and how is that, you had not supported the cause of the BJP?

I would like to ask Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury—who is my personal friend—one question. Before the BJP withdrew their

support when the Rath Yatra was started, when communal tension was built up in the country why did you not withdraw the support? This is not my assessment, this is Mr. Surjeet, your leader's assessment as also Mr. Jyoti Basu's. Why did you not do that at that time? You kindly answer this. Either they should say that they had made a mistake or they should say that they thought that BJP will be corrected. (Interruptions) A question has been very rightly raised by Mr. Gujral and I will appreciate it also that religion and politics should not be mixed up. But the problem today is that religion and politics have been mixed up. Here, in this House, during our time, we had passed a Bill for Punjab and it was supported by all the parties. I remember the speech of Prof. Dandavate. That was one of the best speeches that he gave. He analysed it. He told this House that religion and politics should not be mixed. But what has happened today? It is unfortunate that religion and politics have been mixed. Who is doing it? The man, who is sitting on your right side. It is this House that have to come together and prevail upon the BJP to give this theory of mixing religion and politics.

Before I conclude, I would urge upon the Prime Minister, our Party's demands that he should take immediate action regarding those cassette, speeches and posters. (Interruptions) You have created an impact in the country by saying things in public and not keeping anything unto yourselves. Don't be afraid of our unconditional support. We are with you. We shall continue to support you. It is because we want that you should do good things. But unless you take stern action, it is not possible... (Interruptions)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why, your party had completely remained silent on the issue of communalism?

(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Dasgupta, it is not going on record. Please do not interrupt like that. I am allowing Mr. Saifuddin

Choudhury to speak. You can pass on your points to him.

*(Interruptions)**

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: He is yielding.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He has yielded to me and not to you. If he has yielded to you, then I will allow you.*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Have you yielded to him, Mr. Dev?

SHRISONTOSH MOHANDEV: All right; I will hear him.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: My point is simple: in West Bengal, we have been consistently fighting communalism. But I do not find the Congress Party in West Bengal doing anything to fight communalism, by holding meetings, demonstrations or in any other way. On the 5th December, they organized a rally in Calcutta where many speeches were made, and allegations were made against Mr. Jyoti Basu; not a single word was uttered on communalism, not a single word on BJP, nor on Ram Janmabhoomi. I want to know why your party is silent on these issues in West Bengal.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: We have been telling this to all the political parties. But there is one interesting feature. Everybody says 'Chandra Shekhar Ji is a good man; he is a long-time associate of mine.' But then they start criticising him.

What happened in West Bengal? I was in my constituency in Tripura. Jyoti Basu said; "Chandra Shekhar Ji is coming; I am not trying to meet him. He has not informed me." Then suddenly, I saw in the papers that the Prime Minister had been requested to come one day earlier. The Prime Minister had gone there one day earlier; there was some discussion. Whenever there is dis-

cussion with the Central Government, they discuss about Haldia and all those things. I do not know what transpired between the Prime Minister and the Chief Minister and what the Chief Minister was given. Then Mr Jyoti Basu said: 'On certain issues, I will certainly support Chandra Shekhar Ji.' And in the Press conference he said, Chandra Shekhar was a defector.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a communal issue.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I did not say that it was a communal issue. *(Interruptions)* The hon. Prime Minister gave a Press conference. There he was told that Jyoti Basu had said such-and-such things. In reply, in his characteristic style, the Prime Minister said: 'If a man feels something according to his standards, I am not a party to it. I am not bothered about what he says.' Very good. Then what happened? After he left, the Chief Minister made an aspersion against the Prime Minister, saying that during his time, communalism has spread all over the country, except in West Bengal. I would ask my friend: What happened in Purulia? Was it not a communal riot? *(Interruptions)* In West Bengal, a riot has taken place; but for that I will not blame CPI(M), even if they shout at me, because I will admit that in West Bengal, when there is a communal riot, Mr. Jyoti Basu takes special measures. I appreciate it. But don't say that there are not communal riots there. I appreciate what he has done.*(Interruptions)*

Before I conclude, I would made a request.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Before concluding, make it clear whether you are supporting or opposing the adjournment motion.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: We will decide it after listening to the reply of the hon. Home Minister who is also the Prime Minister. If we are satisfied with his reply, we shall take

[Sh. Sontosh Mohan Dev]

a decision. If he cannot satisfy us, we will take a decision. Why are you worried? But your chance is not coming. One thing, Mr. Dandavate, which I must tell you: I was happy to see your performance today. But as a Finance Minister, you were a failure. (*Interruptions*) You will be named by the party. None of you is competent to come this side. Step by step you are going down; and we shall be going there. Don't worry, though you are quite ambitious to come there. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Why did you not explain your stand on the *shilanyas*?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: He is competent to take care of himself. We need not advise him.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am happy, both on this side as well as on that side.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Dev, don't reply to all the questions; time is very short. I think the hon. Prime Minister is going to reply at 6 o' clock.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not reply all the questions which were hurled at you.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV: I will finish in two minutes. Before I conclude, All want to say one thing.

I have mentioned about the cassette. I have mentioned about the posters and I will like to request the hon. Prime Minister, as it is long overdue that the National Integration Council should meet and discuss the present issue, to convene a meeting. I know he is now busy with this session. After this session a meeting should be convened and if necessary it should be reconstituted and some additions and alterations have to be made

and in that meeting this issue should be discussed.

Before I conclude, I request you and the Hon. Speaker, that like in the past, let there be a resolution at the end of this debate, from the Chair, belonging to all the parties to maintain communal harmony in the country and to bring back normalcy in the country. I think it will go a long way to assuage the feelings of the people who are now perturbed because of this particular situation.

With these words I thank you very much for giving me a chance to speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury. May I request Mr. Saifuddin Choudhury to address the Chair? Otherwise, you will get a very glorious response to your speech.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Yes. I will.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He likes the Chair's face.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: The on-going communal riots are a gram warning to our nationhood, to the basic tenets of our Constitution and to the unity and integrity of our country.

Now the riots that have taken place in different parts, be it Hyderabad, Ahmedabad or Aligarh, or Khurja or Rajasthan, where precious lives have been lost, all are regrettable. These who are responsible for this, are to be condemned severely. Those who have lost their lives—I do not try to identify them as Hindus or Muslims—are all Indians and in that way we have to understand the seriousness of the situation.

Now at this juncture it is imperative that irrespective of political affiliations, barring the known communal parties which should be excluded deliberately, all the secular forces should unite. We may have many differences. I did not at all like the way the Government was formed. I do not like the

many policies of the Congress Party, but to save the nation, it is imperative that we who are all divided among many parties, come together on this single question to fight communalism in the country. And in this I am ready and, our party is ready to cooperate with this Government in any step that they would take to suppress communalism in this country.

Now in this background I must try to recollect two incidents that I encountered during my visit to Aligarh and Bulandshahr just a few days ago.

In Aligarh in a hospital I found a man who was attacked by some people and his eyes were taken out with the nib of a pen. When the first eye was taken out he prayed that the next should be spared. That was not spared. Both of his eyes are gone. When I met him—whether it was Hindu or Muslim it is immaterial for me—he asked me for an eye. He wanted to have the sight. What should be my answer, I do not know.

Then in another place in a room some 24 persons took shelter. They locked it from inside. The attackers set fire to the room. But such was the fire as the smoke was coming, they were being suffocated. They went holding together to a corner of the room. Such was the fear of the outside attack that they could not come out and got suffocated to death inside. Out of them nine were children.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): That was in Bulandshahr.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Yes, near Bulandshahr Jahangirpur. It is no concern to me whether they are Hindus or Muslims. The question is, do you require Ram, or Allah to kill our children? If that is so, I say we do not require any such God, Ram or Allah in this country. Do we require Mandir and Masjid to kill our children? We have to give an answer. I have very much appreciated what Mr. Gujral has said in his speech. But he said that he did not want to raise the finger at anybody. I say, today is the time to

raise the finger at anyone who mixes politics with religion and who has contributed to this deterioration, be it Mr. Shahabuddin or Mr. Advani. I wanted Mr. Advani to be very much here. I know my BJP friends will be very angry with me. I know that in 1986 Mr. Shahabuddin had contributed in a big way in the communal situation. But for these currents flare up of riots, the BJP and its leader Mr. Advani are singularly responsible for this. I can understand that there is a dispute, and VHP is saying that Ayodhya, a particular place is the birth place of Ram. They are a Hindu organisation. But the BJP says that they are not a Hindu organisation. Then, why did Mr. Advani take out his Rath to Ayodhya? He has to give an answer. If he is such a Ram devotee then why did he not sit at the boat club, not for self-immolation but for fast-unto death and say, "Ram is in my heart and I want this temple to be at that particular place in Ayodhya"? Where sentiments of both communities are involved, he cannot just unilaterally take out some kind of a conquering journey to a place, he does not understand what can be the impact of it and what can be the reaction of it. Who is responsible for all these killings? He has to give an answer.

About cassettes, so much has been said. What was the need to bring out those cassettes? I do not know, maybe an Imam has said something; maybe in Kashmir somebody has taken out a cassette; maybe some other MP has taken out a cassette. What was the need for this? What was there in those cassettes? That is to be investigated properly. I want that all the leaders in this House must sit together, go into all those cassettes and identify who had done these things and take stern action against them.

Now, there are certain other points. I have a respect for everybody, who has a real religious sentiment in their mind. If somebody wants to set up a temple, he is welcome to do it. If somebody wants to set up a Mosque, he is welcome to do it. I want to know, whether the kind of activity that was undertaken by the BJP was really for Mandir or for power. That is the question. We have to expose their design. That is very important. I understand

[Sh. Saifuddin Choudhury]

that somebody has religion in heart. Mr. Advani has said time and again as to why he decided to take out his Rath. In Calcutta in a newspaper interview I found—where he addressed his people—that he decided to bring down the Government. When the Mandal issue came up he decided at that time that was the convenient time to bring down this Government. Then, I ask him is Ram Mandir the real issue or the Mandal Commission the real issue? What is the real issue? The moot point that comes to my mind is this. There is a design. Even today, much has been talked about Mr. V.P. Singh's responsibility and much has been talked about Mr. Mulayam Singh's responsibility. If they had committed an excess, that is condemnable. My first point is that Mr. Advani should not have entered to go to Ayodhya. When Mr. Shahabuddin tried to go to Ayodhya to liberate the Mosque, we condemned him and said that he should not go there and he should sit at the boat club. Now, Mr. Advani has said: "Mr. Mulayam provoked everybody. Mulayam gave this kind of speeches. We wanted to teach him a lesson. That is why some of our people had climbed the Mosque." Is that the way, Sir? Is that the responsible behaviour? If he had to teach a lesson to Mr. Mulayam, he could direct his Rath to Lucknow, enter the fort of the Secretariat, hold him by his ears and give a slap there. Instead of that he preferred going to Ayodhya, doing some small act and for that the country is burning. If there is any height of irresponsible behaviour it is this. There is a design. It is not simply a Hindu-Muslim question. But it is a question of taking advantage politically.

Much has been said about Pakistani agents and their active involvement. We all know that. They are active so that the Muslims are alienated from the mass of this country. That is the Pakistani design and that is why they want to encourage fissiparous tendencies in our country. Now if I being a political leader, behave in such a manner that widens the gulf, am I not acting as a Pakistani agent—willingly not, unwillingly? Then today in our country who is the biggest Pakistani agent?

AN HON. MEMBER: Advani!

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: I do not know. You draw your own conclusions. There is a philosophy behind all this. I want to quote a paragraph from Mr. Golwalkar's book "We or Our Nationhood—How defined":

German race pride has now become the topic of the day. To keep up purity of the race and its culture, Germany shocked the world by her purging the country of the Semitic races, the Jews. Race pride at its highest has been manifested here. Germany has also shown how will nigh impossible it is for races and cultures, having differences going to the root, to be assimilated into one united whole, a good lesson for us in Hindustan to learn and profit by."

This is the theory that is now being attempted to put into practice in India'.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Something back you gave a ruling that the name of any Chief Minister should not be brought into this. In the first place, it should not have been allowed. Now he has mentioned the name of late Mr. Golwalkar who is no more.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is from his writing that he is quoting. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK: I know that. But it should have some relevance with the topic which is being dealt with if we want to go in a proper direction. Mentioning the names of Mr. Mulayam Singh or Late Mr. Golwalkar will not lead us in that direction. Then why to bring in controversy unnecessarily? And Sir, you have already given the ruling on this... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I really appreciate what you have said. I would rather request the hon. Member not to make references to those people who may not be able to reply to the charges made against them on the floor of the House. As far as the book is concerned, if it is written in the book, it can be found out what is mentioned is there or not.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: It is a quotation. What I want to distinguish is that it is not the simple communal riots that are taking place but there is a design behind it. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You also referred to some others names. They are not here.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Can I not quote from any book?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have allowed you to quote from the book. What I am saying is that do not refer to those people who are not here. I have allowed you to refer to the book. I am saying that please do not refer to other persons. You mentioned two-three other names. You have not followed carefully what I have said...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not a court where you will be arguing the things. I have already allowed to quote from the book. You have not followed what I have said.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: Now, Sir, there is a design, there is philosophy and there is an attempt to reach to the seat of power by encouraging these kinds of passions in the country. So, it is not a question of Hindu v/s Muslim, it is a question of rabid, reactionary, neo-fascists, communalists v/s the whole of the secular forces of the country. This is a critical time we are passing by and in this I have to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister certain things, for which I am very sorry. It is not the question of who gave you permission or not to visit affected areas when the country was burning. I have all respect for you but then it should have been that you had that arrangement to go there because it was necessary to exert some kind of moral authority. There was a collapse of administration in many parts. There was partial behaviour from the uniformed forces. For that it was necessary. You are Prime Minister now and you have to exert that moral authority. But if I condemn you on that,

you should take it kindly. This is a very serious matter and not to be enraged by just certain utterances. This kind of things happen. I do not know. I have to say something about the local Press there. Here I have a Presscutting from Aaj, Agra, dated 10.12.90: "28 marizon Sahib 74 mautke ghat utare gay". 74 persons were murdered including 28 patients. That is about killings in a medical college. This is the headline. Have you seen that. Again in this, in a small corner here it is written: "Aisi Kai ghatna Nahin Hai. Nothing of this sort happened. Have you seen that, Prime Minister? This is the headline. This was distributed for seven days in Aligarh and the national Press was not allowed in. Who is responsible for this? I do not want banning of the Press but there is a responsibility of the Editors, responsibility of the journalists. Should not they come together and expel this Press from circulation? On that, the rampant killings took place in Aligarh. This kind of irresponsible behaviour took place and the administration also did not take right action at the right time. The situation is very serious. I am all for a dialogue. There has to be a dialogue. I know that even now if today Advaniji starts his *Rath Yatra* and tries to go to Ayodhya, the same thing Mr. Chandra Shekhar will do as Mr. V.P. Singh did. He has no other option. The same kind of stern action has to be taken. And I also know that the same kind of action will be undertaken by BJP and Advaniji if you just announce the date of the polls. It is not Ramachandra, it is polls that is more important. We know how they move. Also, in this context—you have no time to waste, you have many things to do—I request the Prime Minister that we have still time to Act. I would remind the protagonists of a theocratic State in this country, not orally but may be by heart who have belief in that, that please remember what happened to Irshad of Bangla Desh. He tried to impose Islamic State in Bangladesh where they have high tradition of lerance and civilised culture. That Irshad is now behind the bars. This happens. You can excite passions. People may be encouraged to bring bricks. But when the design is clear, the same brick will be thrown at you. So, beware of that. We do not want to waste

[Sh. Saifuddin Choudhury]

time. You call us, call all political parties, forget BJP forget Muslim league. We are secular. We have differences on economy, we have differences on many other things, may be on Bofors also, but on this please call us. We are ready to cooperate. We are fighting. We will give all kind of help that is necessary. This is the need of the time. This is the need of the hour and I hope the Government would stand up to the need of the time. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Manjeri): I have given an adjournment motion on this, Sir. I must be given a chance to speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I would really like to give hence to some other Members also. But I will request you to be brief. I don't know whether the hon. Prime Minister has time to...

AN HON. MEMBER: We have to speak.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give a few minutes to each of the Members, please.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: When others can have one hour, we must have a few minutes at least, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. Time is allotted according to the number of Members of the Party.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: When others can have one hour, at least a few minutes should be given to us. Why this discrimination? (*Interruptions*) Our hearts are burring. We are suffering in the country because of communal riots.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall allow time according to the number of Members. Now, Mr. Indirajit Gupta may speak.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is on the

basis of the number of Members. You know it, you are a pretty senior Member in the House. I am addressing him, not you, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): If the House agrees and you agree, then in view of the importance and urgency of the subject...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are giving some more time.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: ...We can continue tomorrow also for an hour or so.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not tomorrow. Let us do it today.

(*Interruptions*)

SRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Many hon. Members want to speak, Sir. You would not be able to accommodate team according to the time schedule.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have got to do it. You please continue your speech.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I will continue, of course. What about all the other friends?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will decide.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Sir, the confrontation which took place at Ayodhya on the 31st of October was most unfortunate. I don't apportion blame to either side. That confrontation which came about should have been avoided. Subsequent events show that it could have been avoided and we are deeply distressed at the casualties which occurred as a result of that confrontation.

We have always taken a stand regarding this temple and mosque dispute which, I think, is a consistent stand. We are not against the building of a temple, we have never been against the construction of any temple, the Ram temple in Ayodhya. The only thing we have said is that that temple

should not be constructed by demolishing the mosque. Mr. Malhotra has tried to argue here that it is not a mosque etc. I do not have time to go into all that. He said, it is a question of faith and conviction of Hindus and so on. But then, other people who are not Hindus, they may also have faith and conviction regarding their own beliefs. We have got a country where, Mr. Gujral has already admirably pointed out that we are a people, a nation, who are sharing so many different religious beliefs and cultures and languages and so on. This is not Pakistan. This is not Bangladesh or Pakistan or Iran or Iraq or any country like that. I am proud of the fact that India is a country where people of so many different faiths and beliefs live together as Indians. No other country in the world can give an example like this. But now, if attempts are made to disturb and destroy this social fabric of this country, it has to be resisted. Therefore, they always talk about Hindu Rashtra, which is condemnable. The BJP may say, 'We don't demand a Hindu Rashtra, somebody else demands it.' I don't know, but the only trouble is that there are so many outfits and what is their inter-connection, we don't know. There is BJP, there is RSS, there is Bajrang Dal, there is Vishwa Hindu Parishad, there is something else. When somebody is accused of something, they always say, 'It is not we, but somebody else. I would like the leader of the BJP to say clearly on the floor of the House what is the nexus between the BJP and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Are they the same? Obviously not. Do they agree on all these issues connected with this controversy or do they not? If they have differences, will the BJP leaders kindly tell us what are those differences?

Sir, the BJP is a political party and it is the party, the leader of which has now got the Leader of the Opposition here, in the Lok Sabha. The VHP is not a political party. It may become one day, I do not know. At present, it is not a political party; it is some kind of an outfit which swears by religion. The VHP is not an organisation which needs to bother about the Constitution of this country. They have nothing to do with the Constitu-

tion. But the BJP is a political party, its members, its Ministers in different States, its MPs, its MLAs cannot take their seats in the Legislatures without taking an oath on the Constitution. They are bound by all the main principles and fundamental tenets of the Constitution. They have taken an oath and that is why they are sitting here. The VHP is not bothered about the Constitution. Increasingly we find that on many issues, they are saying that they would go along with the VHP. They do not want to do anything which the VHP disapproves of. This has been proved in so many occurrences recently. I think you will allow me to quote from the Press atleast. A statement has appeared in the Press given by Mr. Sirish Chandra Dixit, the Vice-President of the VHP and the former Director General of Police, UP, welcoming the BJP's support for the construction of the temple at Ayodhya. Mr. Dixit clarified that the agitation was primarily a programme of the VHP and not of the BJP. The VHP was unconcerned with whether the BJP has extended support out of devotion for Ram or for getting political mileage out of this issue. Any party is free to cash in by joining hands with us irrespective of political ideologies and motives as long as it suits our cause of constructing a temple at Ayodhya. The VHP is very clear and they say that they do not know as to what is the motive of the BJP; whether they are really concerned about Ram or about getting political mileage out of this issue. But, I want to know as to why the BJP is taking to a line of following the VHP on all matters. Let them say that they are not doing that. I want them to state here that they are not tied to the VHP. Please say it. If you are tied to them, well it is difficult for you to say anything. If you are not tied to them, please spell it out here, because a party which has taken an oath on the Constitution and a religious organisation which does not care two hoots for the Constitution cannot go together on an issue like this. This business of mixing politics with religion is very clearly reflected in the statement of Mr. Dixit himself.

Now, as far as the Congress Party is concerned, on the 7th of November, when we were debating here on the Motion of

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

Confidence or No-Confidence whatever it was in V.P. Singh's Government, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi made a speech. In that he attacked Mr. V.P. Singh by saying, "why did not you have the courage to arrest Mr. Advani long before, just when he started his Yatra from Gujarat? You should have arrested him at that time. You did not do it because you are a weak Government; you are a weak Prime Minister." But when this issue of Confidence in Mulayam Singh Yadav's Government came up in the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha, you please read the speech made by the Leader of the Congress Legislature Party, Mr. Narayan Datt Tiwari. He said that it was wrong to arrest Mr. Advani and disrupt his Rath. It should have been allowed to proceed right upto Ayodhya; then there would have been perfect peace and there would have been trouble. Which is the voice of the Congress (I) on this issue about the Rath Yatra? Is it the voice of Mr. Gandhi speaking here or is it the voice of Mr. Narayan Datt Tiwari speaking in Lucknow? These are two absolutely opposite angles. You must decide and make up your mind. It was not Mr. V.P. Singh who was vacillating; it is you, who are vacillating. Let the BJP leaders search their hearts what they are doing, what they are saying and what they are propagating. I submit, it is completely against the letter and spirit of articles 25, 29, 51A and other articles of the Constitution of India. You cannot go on with this campaign and yet say—

[Translation]

In the name of God we have taken oath of allegiance to the constitution.

[English]

Mr. Saif-ud-din Soz's adjournment-motion is regarding the failure of the Union Government to curb communal forces etc. This is the adjournment-motion to which the Government will have to reply. About the failure of the Union Government to curb communal forces threatening unity, integrity etc., I agree. But I do not think, it is only this

Government which is concerned. There is no Central Government of this country up to now which has effectively taken measures to curb these communal forces. Now we are talking about why action has not been taken against the people who have produced these inflammatory cassettes. Well, it is for them to reply. Or why action has not been taken against people who published that kind of report in the newspapers which Mr. Saifuddin has read out? It is for the Government reply. If the Government cannot do anything, there is a Press Council of India in this country, which has to take up complaints which are made before it. Why has the Government not filed complaints before the Press Council against the people who are publishing this kind of irresponsible and false news just in order to instigate people?

So many Commission of Inquiry have been appointed in the past into various major riots, and they have submitted their reports and findings. I want to know from the Government whether any action has ever been taken on the basis of those reports. There was a tremendous riot some years ago in Bhiwandi in Maharashtra. The inquiry commission sat on it for a long time and published a voluminous report. What action has been taken? There were riots in Jamshedpur, riots in Ranchi riots last year in Bhagalpur. Every year judicial commissions are appointed for inquiry but no action has been taken. They have forgotten about those Inquiry Commissions. Is that the Government's responsibility?

I would just like to remind the House that in the case of Bhagalpur riots last year, an Army officer, a Sikh Officer—everybody knows about it, Major Wirk—had his Company of jawans in that disturbed area. He was the man who entrusted the safety of over 100 Muslims—men, women and children—who took shelter in a big house belonging to some landlord. He entrusted their safety to the police for the night till the next day. The next day when he came back, he found that not a single person was kept alive. That Major Wirk went back to his unit. He was posted in Punjab, Jullundar. These

service officers cannot get leave any time they like. It is very difficult to get leave. Major Wirk came all the way from Punjab again in order to file an affidavit in the court and before the Commission of Inquiry which is inquiring into the Bhagalpur riots. He wanted to give an affidavit about what he saw and what he experienced there. He has not been allowed to file an affidavit to this date. Has anybody bothered to find out on what pretext, under what so-called technical or legal plea, the Army officers were prevented from filing an affidavit? I think, if the Government is serious they should bother to find out and locate Major Wirk again. Perhaps he is in Jullundur in Punjab, I do not know. You give him the opportunity to come here and file his evidence.

[Translation]

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: Kindly tell who was the Prime Minister and who was the Home Minister.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Whosoever they may be, all did the same thing.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: At least they were not from BJP.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Rather they will not get the opportunity.

[English]

I do not want to take more time because I am firmly convinced whether Mr. Advani personally meant it or did not mean it, the objective result, the fall out, from his Rath Yatra has been to poison the whole atmosphere. I know he himself did not issue any call for attacking Muslims or preaching hatred against Muslims. But the point is that there are many people here, the different agencies and organisations which are interested in using this weapon. Perhaps, it is an ultimate weapon for getting votes. I do not know. But, can there be any doubt that Muslims are being terrorised? These people who are giving slogans "Either they must live,

[Translation]

If they want to live in this country, they have to convert to Hinduism otherwise they will have to leave the country.

[English]

It is violative of the elementary Articles of the Constitution. Who gave them the right to give these slogans? If BJP has not given it, they should come out publicly and condemn them.

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: We have already decided it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You will have to deny it outside, not here.

[English]

You must condemn the killings of all people, whether they are Muslims or Hindus or anybody else. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: We have condemned the slogans like "Jojahan rahega Hindu rahega. Baccha Baccha Ram Ka, Janambhoomi Ke naam Ka" (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am the last person to claim that there are no communal elements in Muslims or no communal organisations among Muslims. Of course, there are. Let me tell you that BJP or the VHP do not have the right to speak in the name of all Hindus. Who has given them that right? They got 11% of the votes in the last election and they have become the sole monopolistic spokesmen of the Hindus. Hindus are against you. The majority of Hindus are against you. We are not against anybody who has any religious faith. But, do not use it for communal purposes. Do not use it for instigating people against other people. Do not try to interfere with others' places of worship which belong

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

to other people in this country. (*Interruptions*) What happened to the Prime Minister of this country? I will never forget it. Do you think the Prime Minister's murder in Delhi was unconnected with the events of four months earlier? Shrimati Indira Gandhi may have been justified or not justified. You may have your own view as the situation prevailing at that time for sending the army into the Golden Temple. May be it was necessary, because of what was going on inside the temple. But the fact remains that the people to whom that temple belongs, for who it is a symbol of their sacred faith in Sikhism, what was their reaction? If the army goes into the temple or mosque or mandir or into Christian Church with fire arms

[*Translation*]

They had warned that in case the Government allowed the forces to enter our Gurudwara with shoes and guns and gunned down people. They would not forgive them for this and take revenge at any cost and they took revenge within a period of four and a half months.

[*English*]

I do not think Shrimati Indira Gandhi's assassination was unconnected with what happened in the Golden Temple. In our country, this is the most sensitive thing. All that we should try to understand. You say that nobody has the right to follow a different religious faith in this country and that everybody must belong to one religion. Is it possible? Then the country will be broken into pieces.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have never said it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then, you must respect all religions. You must allow them to function. (*Interruptions*)

it is very wrong to go on describing secularism or pseudo-secularism as ap-

peasement of the minorities, as minoritism. Then somebody can say: "What about majorityism?" If there is minorityism, there can be majorityism also. Secularism means that all religions in this country have to be given equal rights; they must be given equal respect and honour and the people practising the different faiths must not be interfered with in any way. If this simple lesson is learnt by the BJP and its allied organisations, then all this trouble would subside in this country. If it has got a political motive behind it because elections are coming sooner or later, it would be difficult. May be sooner, may be later but elections will come. Therefore, if my friends here think that this is the best weapon we have got now in order to get the votes from the Hindus, then they will continue doing all these things. There will be more riots in different parts of the country and more and more innocent people will be killed. If the Government does not take firm measures, the situation would be grave. I say they are not taking firm measures. We have heard hundred times in this House, not now but I am talking about several years ago. Since then, we have been hearing from different Home Ministers who say: "We are going to set up a composite police force which is specially meant to deal with the riot situation." The other day I was hearing our friend Shri Subodh Kant on the TV also saying: "We are going to have a special commando force which will consist of people drawn from different communities and all that and they will be sent to all these troubled spots so that they can deal with the riot situation." But I am sitting in this House and I heard it 50 times for the last 10-12 years. Nothing ever happened. Wherever you go in a riot area, people will complain to you first and foremost about the police of that State whether it is the PAC or the Bihar Armed Police or the Rajasthan Armed Constabulary, everywhere the people would first complain about the role played by the State police forces. Therefore, I want to know from them whether there is any time bound idea of forming some composite police force which will be specially trained to deal with the riot situation and will be impartial in their behaviour towards the citizens following different religious faiths. Simply say-

ing that we will do it will not suffice. I have heard so many times. Nothing happened.

In conclusion, therefore, I want to say that soon after the present Prime Minister assumed office- he knows-on behalf of my party, I wrote a letter to him, which was published in the newspapers also, offering our full cooperation if any firm measures were taken on this issue to suppress communalism and the communal forces. I wrote saying that we may have many differences with you. But on this issue please call together the representatives of the political parties and let us put our heads together and devise some means by which we can unitedly and jointly fight against these communal monsters. That was the crux of my letter. He called one meeting. Of course, it was an informal meeting. I do not know what is the fall-out from that meeting subsequently. But I want to say one thing. This is my last word as far as this issue is concerned today. I do not believe that the hon. Judges of the Supreme Court, who may be great legal pundits and all that, who understand law very well, they are the best qualified people to decide whether a temple was there or not before the Mosque came based on this evidence which is to be given by both the sides. In the beginning it was said that no evidence is required; only our faith is there and that is enough. Every Hindu believes that that is the Ram Janmabhoomi. Therefore, what do you want the evidence for? Both sides are going with all their evidence. Wherefrom they collected, I do not know. What is the implication of it? I want the Prime Minister to consider one thing. Suppose those Judges say that after seeing the papers documents, this and that, we are now convinced that there was a temple here, then what is the next step? The Mosque should be demolished. Then, what will happen in hundred other places throughout the country? Something which may have happened or may not have happened five hundred years ago or six hundred years ago, that has to be corrected and that has to be avenged now after five hundred or six hundred years? Is this the way we can live together and preach tolerance of different religion? Why cannot you decide whether

on a particular day—whether it is 15th August, 1947 or the date when the Constitution was promulgated—all the places or religious worship wherever they were, their status quo should be observed and maintained by law? Do something right then. Take some steps. Otherwise, there will be no end to this communal situation and no end to these riots and killings. So, we are prepared to cooperate with you. But please take some firm measures in consultation with others.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I stand today with a bleeding heart because it is full of agony and pain. And I just pick out some very hard realities before this august House. Therefore, I strongly appeal to this august House to bear with me and particularly my friends of BJP. And I hope you will not ring the bell unless I get sufficient time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You shall have to be brief.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: All have talked about democracy in this country, about the secularism in this country. But I cannot understand and do not know at all where do the secularism and democracy exist in this country. It is because we see today that daily, every hour of the day, democracy is being shattered and secularism is being destroyed. Now, here I must say that during the last ten years, fascist, aggressive and communal forces have been getting stronger and stronger. When they become stronger, communal riots also increase and there is lot of destruction in this country. That is the position. What is the objective of these riots? These riots are the designed riots. These riots take place under some designed riots. These riots take place under some designed concept. The objective is to demoralise the Musalmans in this country. It is the objective. Whatever you may say, that is the objective, and you cannot refuse that. All the riots are meant to demoralise Muslims and also to economically annihilate them. That is the objective. Whatever you may say that every Indian is alike and there is no difference between a Hindu and a Muslim,

[Sh. Ibrahim Sulaiman Sait]

but the reality is something else. It's a fact. Why don't you give us the facts. Whenever riots take place, it is the Muslims who suffer the most; it is the Muslims who are killed the most, and it is their houses which are burnt. I know that 90 per cent Muslims suffer. Others also may be there but 90 per cent Muslims are there. This has been happening in this country right from Independence to date. We are suffering the most. And it is we who need sympathy and justice from the Government.

Our Prime Minister said that he did not want to interfere with that as it was a law and order question. I must humbly submit to him that as far as communal riots are concerned, as far as communal violence is concerned, he cannot just brush aside by saying that it is a law and order question. It is a national problem today. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Government to see that minorities are completely protected. What has always happened is, invariably State forces have failed whether it is PAC, RAC or any other force. Just now my friends Shri Indrajit Gupta has said that State forces have failed and if at all some law and order situation has improved, that is because of the Central force going over there. Now here it is the responsibility of the Central Government. Here you must understand the objective of 'Rath Yatra'. As they say, the objective of the Rath Yatra is to perform Kar Sewa for the construction of a temple. But I say, it is not like that. The objective of the Rath Yatra was to demolish the mosque and to raise tension in the country, shatter the integrity of the country and to see the *Hindu Rashtra* is established here. You may not like my saying this here because you don't want to hear that. But that was Rath Yatra doing then? Rath Yatra was having swords and brandishing Trishuls. They were using abusive language during the Rath Yatra. Here inside the House they want Muslims to be in this House. They say all Muslims are like their brothers. What a love for them. I am thankful to them for their love for Muslims at least inside the House. But outside? "Hindustan

mein rehna hai to Hindu Banke rehna hoga" What does it mean? Is it not their slogan written on the walls? There are posters and during the Rath Yatra also they went on shouting.

"Hindustan mein rehna hai to Hindu banke rehna hoga"

They want to always drive us to Pakistan. They want us to always think about Pakistan and feel that we are not secure here. Is it doing justice to us? Even now they say:

[Translation]

Are you reiterating that you are friends of Muslims.

[English]

That means if you want to live in India, either give up Qaran and live as Hindus or leave India. This is their slogan.

You may say that I must not take the names of persons who are not present in this House. So I would say that one of the leaders of VHP said that not one mosque, they are going to take three thousand mosques in this country. This is what he had declared. He said Muslims cannot live in this country at the mercy of any political party or political leadership. Muslims will have to live at our mercy. See what he declares! The Government is here; what is it doing when such declarations are being made that Muslims will have to live at their mercy and three thousand mosques will be taken? No action is taken. Everybody speaks like that and gets away scot-free.

Then there is PAC. I have always said in this House that PAC is a perennial Communal force. They cannot be humane. For so many years—Prof. Dandavate is here—we have always been pleading that there should be a composite force—Muslims should be there, Christians should be there and Sikhs should be there. But here you have this PAC which has got only one community people cent per cent. Muslims have no confidence in that.

PAC is always attacking, looting, setting fire and killing people—not my Hindus brothers to a great extent. It is not our Hindu brothers who are killing but it is this force which is killing and looting and burning.

I said the other day that this is a very very sad story. In Kanpur PAC said all right we will just save you, we will not attack this Moholla provided you pay us Rs. 5 lakhs. Because when we loot and set fire we can earn Rs. 5 lakhs. They have said all the inhabitants of that locality gather together and give us Rs. 5 lakhs and we will save you. This is how PAC is behaving. That is why I say there is an urgent need to see that it is completely revamped and if that cannot be done then resurrection of the PAC is very much essential.

Our friends have been demanding for a riot force. But nothing has been done so far. Moreover one must understand that now if a riot takes place what is the action taken against the culprits who are responsible. No action is taken against the culprits. When we raise the issue here, compensation—sometimes of Rs. 1 lakh, sometimes Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 20,000—is paid. What is this difference? If a man dies somewhere he is given R. 1 lakh and somewhere else only Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 20,000.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: In Hyderabad Rs. 10,000 only.

SHRI IBRAHM SULAIMAN SAIT: Why should this be done? If Rs. 1 lakh is paid at one place, the same amount should be paid everywhere.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karol Bagh): Because most of the persons killed were scheduled castes.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Whatever it be, compensation should be equal everywhere. There should be proper

rehabilitation done and then culprits should be punished. But, that has not been done. We must understand the present situation and the objectives of such fascist, communal forces, So, we must do it. We should take serious steps; we must resurrect the PAC. It is the responsibility of the Government to see that protection is given for the life and property of the minorities who are suffering the most, in the country. I feel that the Prime Minister should have gone to all the riot-hill places, That would have given some consultation to the minorities there. He has visited Delhi, that I know. But, that place is very near. He must have gone to Bijnor he must have gone to Aligarh; he must have gone to Hyderabad and he must have also gone to Agra. That would have created confidence in the minds of the minorities because they cannot depend on the State Governments; they cannot depend on the State force; they can only depend on the Centre. The Centre should shoulder the responsibility and see that steps are taken to give them protection and to see that all the propaganda—that they are very much sympathetic to them—is made wrong. In the heart of hearts, they want to destroy and see that they are liquidated. They want to destroy them economically and also destroy their identity. That is the main objective. We must realise it today. All the secular forces should come together. You may call Muslim League, a communal organisation. It is wrong to call Muslim League, a communal organisation. It is a national political organisation of the Muslims and other minorities. It stands for national integrity and secularism. It joins with all the secular forces to fight the reactionary forces, fascist forces, communal forces of aggression and hatred. I hope the Government will realise the duty and together with this, all the Left parties should realise that it is the national duty to save the country from disaster and let us have peace in the country. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will have opportunities later.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Deshmukh, please take your seat. Shri Mahadik, you may also take your seat. I will allow you.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do appreciate that you want to express your views. I cannot just allow, if all of you want to speak according to your desires. If you want to continue your speeches for about ten minutes, then it become difficult.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please allow me to regulate the House.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mahadik ji, Deshmukh ji please sit down, I am on my legs. *(Interruptions)* If all of you take so much time it will be difficult. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUDAM DATTATRYA DESHMUKH (Amravati): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, when the members of Muslim league have been allowed to speak, Shivsena members should also be allowed to express their views.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please understand, kindly listen to me for a minute.

SHRIVAMANRAO MAHADIK: (Bombay South Central): We should also be given an opportunity to speak so that the hon. Prime Minister may reply to our points also.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you are allowed to speak for two minutes, you will take ten minutes. I am allowing you to speak, please conclude within two minutes.

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI (Jhansi): You should apply same rules to everybody.

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have given more time to your members also. You could have spoken during this period. I am giving you time. Whatever you have to say please it in two minutes. *(Interruptions)*

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have given time to the Prime Minister to speak at 6 o'clock. Now it is 7 o'clock. *(Interruptions)* I will give you the time. But you should also cooperate with the House.

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Even then, you are repeatedly interrupting. If you go on interrupting like this, neither you nor others will have the opportunity to speak.

SHRI VAMANRAO MAHADIK: Mr. Dy. Speaker, Sir, you are not allowing me to speak. It has been alleged that Hindu-Muslims riots erupted because of Advaniji's Rath Yatra. The Ayodhya issue was not responsible for Hindu-Muslim riots. This riots occurred everywhere when the Satyagrah was started. There is no hand of any power or conspiracy behind it. This has been done by Pakistan sponsored Muslims. They have got sophisticated weapons. Where from they are getting these weapons? It should be investigated. Please tell us about Ayodhya incidents. What kind of secularism is it? Whenever Hindus are killed and victimised that is taken as secularism and when minorities are attacked or Hindus try to retaliate, they are branded as fanatics. It is termed as religious fanaticism. The Hindus if not today, are going to unite very soon and they will oppose all types of victimisation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding the issue of secularism raised by Leftists, they talk of teaching us secularism. I would like to ask

them that what they have done is Russia, China and West-Bengal except bloodshed? Now they are telling us to have patience and maintain peace. Riots have taken place in Hyderabad also. These were all sponsored by Pakistan. Pakistan is our enemy. How Advaniji is concerned with it. These Muslims always praise Pakistan and hoist the flag of that country. Why don't you say anything at that time. When they injure the feelings of Hindus and insult them. Then, nobody talks about the sense of justice. You talk about Babri Masjid. Who was Babar? He was an invader of India. He demolished all our religious places. How can we love Babar, in whose Jungle-rule, Hindus were insulted. Hindus are going to unite because they know that they are being victimised.

SHRI RAM KRISHNA YADAV (Azamgarh): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Secularism, Democracy and socialism are the three main principles which have been enshrined in our Constitution to strengthen our country. Some people are trying to break the temples of Socialism, Democracy and Secularism. There are certain forces raising their head to spread fascism in the country and BJP is playing the leading role in it. These are the people who are disintegrating the country. It is not in the interest of the nation. BJP is playing a leading role for fascism in the country in its own way. (*Interruptions*) Everybody knows what they did in U.P. The people of Bahujan Samaj Party, Scheduled castes and Scheduled tribes are uniting and are becoming socially and politically conscious and are aware of their rights. Efforts are being made to push them backward in the name of religion and bereft them from social consciousness. They did not participate in the Kar-Sewa. The Kar Sewaks were called from Bihar, Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh. Very few people from U.P. participated in the Kar Sewa. Kar Sewaks were called from other places also... (*Interruptions*) But the people did not support them. Jagadguru Shankracharya in our area Phulpur did not know it. If Rath Yatra of Advani had passed through U.P., BJP would have come to know about its support there. Why don't you take

your Rath Yatra to Punjab or Kashmir. He should have gone there. There is no danger to Hindu religion in U.P. Advani Saheb wanted to harm the religion and politics there. The people of U.P. are very alert. If they really wanted to save Hind religion, they should have gone to Punjab. They could not dare to go there because of terrorists. The public of Ayodhya is imbued with political and social awareness... (*Interruptions*)... with these words I would like to conclude my speech.

SHRI MITRA SEN YADAV: Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is an important issue. This issue is related to the entire people of our country... (*Interruptions*) I would like to say that all the Hon. members should be allowed to speak. You are requested to allot more time for it. You please accept it. It is an important issue. We want to know the number of persons killed in U.P. and the persons responsible for these killings and the extent of damage done to property... (*Interruptions*) Therefore, more time should be allotted for discussion on this subject.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it would have come under rule 193 it could be taken tomorrow. You have taken it as adjournment motion. After the discussion on adjournment motion, it is necessary to take some other business also. It is very difficult to convert adjournment motion into a discussion under rule 193. So you please do not insist on that.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARISH RAWAT (Almora): The suggestion of Shri Mitrasenji is very important. The present situation is very explosive and critical and if all the members want to express their views and if this House is of the unanimous view, it can be taken under rule—193. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAMESHWAR PRASAD (Arrah): All the Hon. members have expressed their views on communalism here. The Vishwa Hindu Parishad and B.J.P. are preaching the concept of Hindu Rashtra. I want to say that India is a country of diverse religions, communities and languages. But despite this,

[Sh. Rameshwar Prasad]

the concept of Hindu Rashtra is being talked about which is definitely a conspiracy to disintegrate our country. In the eastern part of India, most of the population is Christian and in the Western sector, Kashmir has got the Muslim majority. Out of total population of the country, 12 percent are Muslims but even then, people, talk of Ram Nam. Advaniji has given clarification about it but Shailendranath Shrivastava has clearly said that if you have to live in India, then you will have to recite Ram Nam. People are being forced to adopt a religion. The Rath Yatra raised communal passions of the people and as a result of which we are witnessing communal riots and people are being killed. Congress Party and Bhartiya Janata Party are deriving political mileage out of it and fanning communal riots. Riots have to be checked with a heavy hand. I would like to request the Government to take steps to punish these powers particularly those responsible for inciting these riots. These riots should be controlled by punishing the quality.

SHRIMUNNAN KHAN (Balrampur): Sir, India is the largest democratic country in the world. Today, the entire country is burning due to communalism. The main reason behind it is not the issue of Mandir or Masjid. It is due to some inherent weaknesses in our democratic system. I would like to say through you that the present electoral system of our democracy is responsible for this to a certain extent. Casteism gets greater impetus during elections right from the election of Gram Sabha Pradhan to Member of Parliament and it creates communal tension and elections are also responsible for huge expenses in our country. I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that the present electoral system should be reformed to put an end to communalism in this country. Arrangements should be made to hold elections on the basis of allowing Parties of National and Social ideologies only and effective laws should be made to protect the places of worship. The citizenship of these foreigners like Khurana and Advaniji should be with-

drawn as these people are inciting communalism... (*Interruptions*) Hon Sir, this communalism should be stopped which is being fanned through newspapers, pamphlets and wall slogans and the communalists, who incite the riots should be identified and punished and the losses sustained by the people during the communal riots should be recovered from them. The working class of the nation is penic-stricken. No work is being done. No development work is being done. Labourers, farmers, traders, shopkeepers etc. are not able to do their work. production has come to stand still. People are sitting in their homes. Something must be done or their protection. These people should be provided better dwelling units. Either the weaker sections should be provided with licenses or all the licenses in this country should be cancelled. The poor should be enrolled in the Armed Forces of the country. Upholding of national honour, fearlessness among the people of all classes of the nation and advancement in the field of agriculture and commerce are fundamental of national glory.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI CHANDRASHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I listened the whole debate with great anguish. Any Indian will feel ashamed or whatever happened during last few days. I do not want to blame anybody. As the leader of this House and as the Prime Minister of India, I take the whole responsibility upon myself. I admit, if a single Indian dies it is a matter of shame for us. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to tell those friends quite humbly that the whole malady has not come into existence just in a month and a half. This is an old malady. We are trying to solve it, but it has become incurable. I would not go into the figures. We are not satisfied by the figures relating to the number of riots and the number of the deaths occurred. As I said, it is a matter of shame. We will have to go deep into the causes of these riots. What are our feelings and emotions in this regard? When I listened the speeches of Shri Inderjit and Shri Saifuddin I was somewhat satisfied that the sentiment of the people is the root cause of the riots which creates estrangement be-

tween brothers. Religion is not responsible for riots but it becomes dangerous when it is used for political ends. If religion is an instrument of developing a relationship between God and man, then it is religion alone which can lead a man to elevation. When religion finds a place in our social and religious life and influences the nature and disposition of man it becomes very dangerous and this malady is in our country. This is an old malady. This country was divided on the basis of religion and this is our history. Our Deputy Prime Minister made a mention of the time when the country was divided. That time also there were people who had intense emotions. There were other forces—the forces of majority, in whose minds the same kind of emotions were predominate. We do not know anything. We do not want to name any party or any leader because the atmosphere is not such. We may create tension and cause the death of people. So we do not want to name any person.

There is no hesitation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to submit in humble words that when there is a slogan like—

"Babar Ki Santaan, Chhodo
 Hindustan"

the sentiment becomes evident?.....It shows how much of hatred and malice is there against each other. The people who are raising these slogans are our brothers. We have no objection when it is said that there is religious equality in our country. There should be no discrimination among different religion, whether it is the religion of majority or of minority. But it is said that why the minorities are not given same and similar chances for progress, and why special assistance is being given to please them and thus politics of vote is being played. I would like to say most humbly that they have not understood the basic principles of our constitution. In our constitution there is equality for all religions, but they there is a provision for providing special facility to minorities in our Constitu-

tion? This was done by the founding fathers of Constitution to remove the fear of disrespect from the minds of the minorities and to create confidence in them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to repeat that it is not a new thing for our country only. Minorities all over the world have this fear, whether the minority is linguistic, religious or ethnic. The responsibility of removing this fear from the minorities is the duty of majority and the Government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we are not ready to discharge this duty. I would like to say to this House through you that we are not discharging our national duty. We would understand this. This is associated with bigger sentiment and the memories of that are not sweet. I want to repeat these memories only to know the reality. The country was divided into two. Who opted for Pakistan? Wealthy Muslims and those who were working on higher posts went to Pakistan. Only poor Muslims remained here. In a society where the sources and opportunities are limited, only those people get chances who get a chance by recommendations. There is no difference between a Hindu and a Muslim in our Country. Higher castes and backward castes get the same treatment. The people who are highly placed in society give more shelter to the people of their own caste. This is the human nature. This is prevalent world over and India is no exception to it. At that time all the affluent people left leaving poor Muslims here. Nobody was there to recommend these remaining poor Muslims. So if we look at it please do not tell us afterwards that I am asking for votes in the elections. I would only like to inform this House that in Government services prior to 1947.....(*Interruptions*)if you want to speak, you may, I will speak later on. I have no desire to discuss it with you.

Sir, if you have a look at the figures prior to 1947, whether these figures are related to Government service or trade or Industrial establishments, the number of minority communities gradually decreased. I have got great respect for my friend, (Shri) Vijay Kumar Malhotra, whom I want to say that the figures he gave are self-contradictory. The

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

person who produces more children increases poverty. "The more backward person produces more children. Whether he is a Harijan, a Muslim or a person living in slums (Jhuggi-Jhopri) who has no hope for the future. It is not that if the number of Muslims becomes 13 crores, they can push back 85 crores. If we look at the problems of minority from this point of view we will arrive at a wrong conclusion. I also admit this that at times the leaders and the masses of our minority community talk in rage. I have repeatedly said that it happened in the entire world. We will take wrong political decision if we go by the dictionary meaning of the word minorities. If the people of minority classes speak in anger that should not be considered a challenge, it is their internal voice their internal feelings which they want to express. I would like to say humbly that majority class of this country should understand their feelings. They are also our brothers. They are not the offsprings of Babar. Babar came here with 10,000 people. 10,000 people cannot multiply into cores of people, they were our brothers. These people were ignored, insulted and condemned by us who were converted as Muslims. Therefore, we should not look at the history in this way and if we do so, we would be responsible for destroying history. I agree that some time certain questions are raised. Whether Ram can be issue of our dispute. Anybody who lives in India feels that Rama was a unique and great personality of our civilisation and our culture. We can say that he was the personality of which any Indian can feel proud. So how can a person kill his own brother in the name of Rama. I do not know as to where it is written that Rama was born within 1 yard of land. I do not want to go into disputes. If our Muslims brother allow us to construct temple here, then we would have no objection but no where in Hinduism it is mentioned as such. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Shri Mathli Sharan Gupta had said in Rajya Sabha that:

Ram tum Manav ho, Ishwar nahi ho
Kaya.

Vishwa mein Rame hue, sabhi Kahin

nahin ho Kya.

Tub me nirishwar hoon, Ishwar Shamna
kare,

Tum Norottam ho, Maun Tum mein
Rama kare,

It is our opinion. Lord Rama is in every temple and mosque, he is everywhere including you and us. Rama is in every thing this is the Hindu religion. which Hindu sect says that for a piece of 1 yard land and in the name of Rama people will be killed in this country. If a political leader or religions leader says..(Interruptions) Please remember, we can not change the civilisation and culture of thousands of years. We can be the member of parliament but we cannot be the makers of Indian culture. We can also not be the scripture writer. Indian culture is like continous flow of Ganga. It has only one speciality that is we accepted the people of every religion. We have never condemned anyone. We did not use weapons against anyone to assimilate them with us. We have never forced anyone but we always adopted the path of persuasions. Therefore I tried that the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi should be sorted out through metual negotiation. We felt that Indian culture has equally affected Hindus and Muslim. Indian culture is not the property of anyone. It is the achievement of crores of people who have taken birth in Bharat, out mother land. Who can say that Taj Mahal is not a part of our culture and who will deny that Red Fort is not an unique monument of our culture. If it is true to whom we want to separate from us. Do we want to develop our body by cutting a part of our body. Neither our culture will be develop nor our country will make progress by it. This is the basic question before us. Therefore, Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to say to the people of this country through you that they may not try to create any disputes on this issue. We have many other issues for discussion. We have many issues like economic issue to discuss, we should not raise any issue between the human beings. We should not create differences between Ram and Rahim, If we do so, will it enhance the prestige of our country. I have no hesitation to say as our friend Safuddin Sahib has said that he is a

young man and he has more enthusiasm whereas I may not having that much enthusiasm. I know that no Chief Minister can stop it. At the time when riots take place, firing and stabbing incidents take place hardly 100-200 or 500 police men are there to maintain law and order situation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be my weaknesses. If Prime Minister, visits any place, whatever you do, all police force is utilised for the security of Prime Minister and no body goes to the riot-affected areas. My assessment can be wrong, do not say that I am always right but I would like to say to my elder leader of Muslim league that we might be informed that so much force is on duty there but out of them 500 or 1000 are deputed for the security of Prime Minister then there may not be a single policeman to care for the injured crying in lanes, It can be a wrong decision from administrative point of view but I have not taken this decision due to lack of resources or because of the fear that one may kill me. But every man has his weaknesses perhaps it can be my weakness, I would not feel hesitation in accepting it but it does not mean that I had no information about riots. Wherever riots have taken place, we have contacted either the Chief Minister of the district magistrate or the S. P. of that place after every hour.

Saifuddin Sahib talked about Aligarh incidents. I know that at many places officers were negligent and he knows it but he does not mention about another aspect that the district magistrate and S.P. were transferred from there within 4 hours. I was very much aware of it and steps have been taken in this regard. It is not a fact that we have not taken any step, wherever it was possible to send force and police by aeroplane, we have done that.

It is also said that promises have been made, I do not know how many promises have been made. The people raised the issue about forming the riot police but there are some problems in doing so. Our colleague Shri Subodh Kant has said many times that there is a problem in it as many State Governments, excuse me I do not want to crisis

anyone or threaten anyone, perhaps many state Governments are not ready for it and people have no faith in them. Then how can they work. Some days ago a proposal came to us. The proposal was that just as we have national security guard and during emergency they can be sent in any part similarly if this House approves then we would like that our officers may think of forming a riot police so that wherever riots may take place, this police could be sent there within 3 hours, but House's support and permission of state Governments are must for it. If you approve it, then the matter will not take anytime, this riot police can be formed before commencement of the next session. But you have to give acceptance for it and should ponder over it. But do not think that I am saying something new. National security guards are already there. The central police deals with the high-jacking cases or such other dangerous incidents. Where ever they take place in the country similarly if we may think over it and I feel that we should think over it, if riots take place anywhere the responsibility of dealing with it should be that of the Centre and State Governments should give their assistance for it but magistracy should be there and police should be given full authority to tackle the situation. Some conditions can be imposed that police will not stay at the same place for more than 3 or 7 days. It will come back after controlling the situation. Such conditions can be imposed. What will be the machinery which should remain impartial. We have to take decision regarding holding of test, recruitment and other procedural things. It will take a lot of time. Today there are many police organisations with us, we can make such arrangements by taking some people from them.

So far as the question raised by Shri Indrajit in connection with judges is concerned, we can say that we can think over it and can take any decision with mutual discussions or we can take decision through judiciary. This issue was criticised very much and has been said that Congress President approved it and I was bound to accept it. Daily newspapers and eminent newspapers

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

also criticised it and wrote editorials on it. that Shri Chandra Shekhar accepted it due to pressure of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you can ask from Justice Krishna Ayyar, Vergesese Saheb and Swami Agnivesh, They are my old friends. They are neither our supporters nor they are the members of any party even then first of all they approved this proposal. Same proposal was made by Shri Rajiv Gandhi in refined form and I also accepted that we should think over it and consider it. There can be some objections if supreme court takes decision on it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir somebody asked whether both parties are ready to accept it but there is no doubt that no body has opposed it. We have tried to consult the leaders of both parties, at least Babri Masjid Samiti has said that we would accept the decision of the court. We will accept the decision. I hope that the people of Vishwa Hindu Parishad also will also make such announcement. This is the only way to save the country and to develop country. If such decision is taken once then it can also be suggested that no changes can be done at other worship places. The date may be from 1947 or 1950 when constitution was implemented. It should be done by moving a proposal in Parliament or amendments may be made in the Constitution. It should be finally sorted out. If we are not able to do so we will not have escape from it and we would like to assume you that we are determined to do it and we will do whatever is required for it. There is nothing more important than the life of a man. I feel that few people may die due to bullets of the police, but nobody will die due to stabbings. After all for what is this political power? This political power is the collective power of the people. The man has entrusted his power to the rules and the Government, when he found himself unable to protect himself. Our protection lies in the collective power, collective energy and the political power encourages the strength of the collective power. If this it would be a great thing if the political power is not used in the country of Ghandhiji and Budha. But if there are some compulsions and man is after the

blood of other man, then the Government would not sit idle. I am surprised to hear the news from different places that army is being sent there and such and such Government is being dismissed. But neither the army is being sent anywhere nor any Government is being dismissed, all have there limitations. All have to work under their limitations. Government of India has its own limitations and we have no right to interfere in the working of state Government but wherever State Government violates its limits it becomes the responsibility of Government of India to do its duty with regret and sometimes it has also to take strong steps for it. We know it very well and similarly Governments duty is to give protection to the people but if some body threatens the security of another man then it becomes the responsibility of the Government to bring such people on right path by making them afraid of law and to maintain order. I feel that we would have to test the powers of religion so far as the question of communal riots is concerned. Religion should not be used for raising the passions of the people through objectionable slogans. In fact, I know the fear and pain of the people. I would also like to appeal to them that in anger we must not say anything which may give any excuse to others. There are certain forces which are always in search of a pretext to start riots. I would appeal to you, urge you not to allow any excuse to such forces. I want to assure you that the Government is eager to protect your interest. I would like to say to the people that it does not mean that the minority or anybody is above law or the Constitution. I am surprise and pained at the attitude of some people, our friend Khurana Saheb and Vijay Kumar Malhotra Saheb know about my attitude during communal riots in Delhi.

I don't want to mention those things in my speech but when it is alleged that Government have failed and remained inactive...

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: What did the Delhi police do during the Delhi riots.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Sir, through you, I would like to submit to the

House that there are several speakers in the House who say that when I became the Prime Minister there was peace all around, there was no tension and all were happy and no sooner I became the Prime Minister, than the disturbances started. Did all this happen in merely one and a half months?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That was your Government.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: It was our Government, that is why I say this, I take it as a national responsibility. Therefore I am not prepared to level any charge against anybody. I reiterate what I said earlier that one who is tied to the past cannot forge ahead in the future. We cannot build a new future by repeating previous mistakes I would like to submit to the House that in order to build a new future we should assure the minorities that the entire country, the Government there to protect them. All the Members of this august House should resolve that they would live like brothers. I don't have much knowledge of the rules and regulations of this House but if all the Members say in one voice that they will protect the minorities, that we will live like brothers, then there would be no communal riots. That way we will be serving our country and will raise the dignity of the House. If the message of unity goes from here it will help maintaining unity and integrity of the country. Shri Santosh Mohan Dev of Congress (I) suggested that a motion should come from the chair which all of us must support. It will help develop a new sense of confidence in the minds of people, and communal tension will come to an end and a new beginning will be made. I also welcome it....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: What about the cassettes?

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: In this connection I don't want to mention a particular person. The cassettes which are being dis-

tributed are very bad. We have been repeatedly urged to take some legal action in communication with these cassettes. The police cannot seize them, cannot go from village to village to seagethen because they are very small and can be carried in the pockets. If we seize them, these will be played in the courts. So we have not seized them whatever has been said in the cassettes is not proper in any way. It will be better if the circulation of these cassettes is stopped- (Interruptions)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: What action is been taken by you in respect of those cassettes which are being played in Kashmir? (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not say that these are the only cassettes. But they are more objectionable. The people who play them live across our borders they have no representation. in this House.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Kashmir is within the boundaries of our country

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI: Have you ever heard the cassettes which are played in Kashmir. They have a number of objectionable things. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I know that whatever is happening in Kashmir is really very unfortunate. However we are taking measures in that regard. Indrajit Gupta is anywished we are not taking any action in to the what is happening in Delhi. But we do not want to repeat here what we had to do in Kashmir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to mention one thing more before I conclude. Many Members including of course, Shri Vijay Kumar were concerned over the vigorous propaganda being done by the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. Secondly, Chaudhary ji has pointed out that a news item in certain newspapers appeared that Muslim doctors killed 28 persons in a hospital in Aligarh. This is totally baseless there is no truth with. This news created riots in Vanarasi.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Kanpur also.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: In Kanpur also, riots erupted what can be done in this connection. After all, press is free, and eminent intellectuals are involved in it. But my bad luck is—(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI: In Kanpur, riots took place due to a conspiracy—(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, during riots a lot of rumors spread, but at least 3 to 4 newspapers published this irresponsible news item. Through this House, I would humbly request such press people not to indulge in such activities, otherwise action will have to be taken against them which will be painful both for them and for us. They must not repeat it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I respect Rajmata ji. She had stated that hundreds of dead bodies packed in bags were thrown in the Saryu river, in Ayodhya. I have been constantly urging the people to give me the names of even ten such persons so that we could enquire into the matter. Similarly one of the most respected Muslim leaders said that 1500 Muslims were killed and buried in Bijnor. Such responsible statements are being made by responsible persons. Rajmata ji must have heard it from somewhere else. I have twice urged those who made these statements to give me the names of even ten persons whose dead bodies were thrown in the Saryu river; or even 5 persons whose dead bodies were not handed over to their relatives. But till this day, I have not received any information in this respect. We too, have certain constraints.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to submit to the House that I am from that category of people who have very little self-restraint. However, in view of the prevailing bad circumstances if I also do not restrain myself, the situation may further deteriorate. Therefore, my self-restraint patience should not be considered as my weakness. I am silent lest the situation may

worsen. The person who considers this silence as my weakness are mistaken. I do not want any confrontation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I assure you that whatever steps are required will be taken in order to maintain law and order and to create a sense of confidence in the minds of minorities, and I am confident that the House will cooperate with me in this connection.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Will the Prime Minister set up a Committee to go into and settle the allegations and counter-allegations being levelled in this House? (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I agree with the Member and I am ready to do this. I entrust this responsibility to Shri Advani. He may give the names of any five Members of this House and I am prepared to set up a five-member committee under his chairmanship. I will also accept the report which they may submit after examining the whole matter. (Interruptions)

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: I think that it would really be very good if the Government is prepared to hold an enquiry in regard to the happenings of Oct 30 and November 2 in Ayodhya, because the whole issue is related to them and the Prime Minister..... (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I understood what Shri Advani has stated. However, I cannot announce that in the House, but the Government of Uttar Pradesh will probably not object to this. In regard to the incident in which you said that dead bodies were thrown—(Interruptions)

I am ready to bring all the aspects in the purview of that committee, including the faction responsible for creating tense atmosphere—(Interruptions)

I am ready to enquire into all these aspects.

SHRI SHOPAT SINGH MAKKASAR: One of the aspects to be enquired should be

as to what the Government did in this regard....(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I am ready for this also.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, what about the enquiry?

SHRI R. N. RAKESH (Chail): The incidents sicut from 'Rathiyatra' to Ayodhya should be enquired into.

[English]

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU (Balasore): I would like to invite the attention of the Prime Minister to one thing. It is a very important matter. The Prime Minister has agreed to institute an enquiry in the whole gamut of the communal violence. It is a very good thing. And he has given the responsibility to Mr. Advani, the Leader of the Opposition. But I do not know whether Mr. Advani has agreed to accept the responsibility. I would like to suggest that on this matter let all opposition parties be consulted and the method and modality of conducting this enquiry be established. This should not be done in such a hurry and in a huff. That is my humble request.

DR. RAJENDRA KUMARI BAJPAI (Sitapur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, before extending support to the Mulayam Singh Government we had put a condition that a high level judicial enquiry would be held in regard to the Ayodhya happening and the riots taking place in Uttar Pradesh, and this was agreed to. However, no judge has been appointed so far. Through this House, I urge the Hon Prime Minister to appoint a judge immediately.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am ignorant of the pact between them and Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav.....(Interruptions) But I would humbly tell Bajpaiji that today Shri Mulayam Singh has announced the enquiry. Probably he has written to the Chief Justice of High Court to appoint a judge for this purpose.

This step has been taken in view of your demand. I don't have details. However I have this much knowledge and I will inform you after I get the whole information.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, my submission is that the hon. Prime Minister should announce here that a Supreme Court judge or a judge of similar rank will be appointed to enquire into all the riots....(Interruptions) what abjection do you have in regard to the Supreme Court judge?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: We don't have any.....(Interruptions).....Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am advising Shri Madan Lal Khurana to leave the Ram Janam Bhoomi issue to the Supreme Court, why doesn't he agree.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, these riots should be enquired into by a Supreme Court Judge. Why do you laugh. A Judge of the Supreme Court should enquire into these riots.....(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUBHASHINI ALI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform the House through you that in the enquiry announced by the Uttar Pradesh Government will not only cover the Ayodhya incidents but all the other communal riots which took place in the state.....(Interruptions)I must submit through you, Sir, if any Parliamentary Committee is to be constituted for enquiring into these riots, it should also enquire as to whether present Constitution permits any State Government to organise attacks on another state. This aspect should also be enquired into.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: I also want to say that these riots should be enquired into by a Supreme Court Judge.

SHRIMATI SUBHASHINI ALI: Can a State Government direct its administrative officers in writing to organise people to attack on another state.....(Interruptions)..... This aspect should also be covered by that enquiry.....(Interruptions).

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): Not only in Uttar Pradesh, but these riots took place in Gujarat, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh also. An enquiry should be made by a Judge of Supreme court in this regard. If the reasons behind these riots which took place in the last 3-4 months, have to be ascertained this matter should be caused to be enquired into by the Supreme Court.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRIPRAKASH KOKO BRAHMBHATT (Baroda): Has the Prime Minister deputed Chandraswamy to look into the issue of Ram Janam Bhoomi.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: This is not so, I haven't assigned any such job to Shri Chandra Swami from my side. Shri Chandra Swami is a saint.....(*Interruptions*) lot of people in the country are taking interest in this issue and Chandra Swami is also interested in this matter in the same way.....(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Sir, I am on a point of order. Mr. Chandraswami is not a Member of the House and the Prime Minister has no right to characterise him as a Sadhu. Therefore, Sir, that should be deleted.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Yes, it may be deleted.....(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will not take much time of the House, as it is already late.....(*Interruptions*)I feel somewhat assured because the response of Shri Advani to the speech of the hon. Prime Minister seems to me to be quite optimistic. Shri Advani has himself asked for an enquiry into this matter and naturally the enquiry can be made by the Court, not by one of us.....(*Interruptions*)Therefore, response of Shri Advani to the Prime Minister's speech has given me a hope that may be

Shri Advani will understand now the validity of the Court, which is highest authority in this country.....(*Interruptions*)

Now I will not be impertinent because I have to appeal to Shri Advani in the end. When the Hon. Prime Minister raised this and spoke on it with open heart, I am happy to note that he did not choose the part of confrontation and did not criticise any of the political parties.....(*Interruptions*)

The Hon. Prime Minister has kept the doors of negotiations open. I request Shri Advani to restrain Shri Khurana. Sir, I had 2-3 important points to make, I am happy that Shri Chandra Shekhar has mentioned in his speech that he is keeping the doors for talks open. I welcome the talks that has taken place between him and Rajmataji or Shri Advani, because all disputes can be settled, if the doors for talks are open. The response shown by Shri Advani though it was not very open, may disperse the clouds of darkness.

I call your attention to one or two points and in the end, I will deal with Shri Advaniji.....(*Interruptions*)

Please rest assured that I won't criticise anyone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, Shri Malhotra is an educated person, but he has made certain statements which are not correct, and which are there in the record. For example, he has stated about the population. I had been a student of economics and I figures also. Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan come under the Hindi belt or Hindi belt, where the total population is only 2.9 per cent of the entire population. Kashmir where the Muslims are in majority joins with Kerala in view of the population. So the facts should not be ignored. In the same way, Shri Malhotra stated that so many Hindus and so many Muslims had been killed. This is wrong. Blood has only one colour, whether it is shed in Ayodhya, in Kashmir or in Punjab. It is the question of human lives and we should express our concern for that and the B. J. P. should pay

attention towards some things. I don't want to go into details, as it is already late. Yesterday, as soon as the Governor of Kashmir released, 18 innocent persons from the jail, the B. J. P. leader of Jammu district gave a statement, that it was a wrong action of the Government. This means that wherever a muslim gets relief, the B. J. P. feels irritated. Shri Advani has got an important post. In democracy, the role of the leader of the opposition is not less important than the role of the ruling party. Therefore, Shri Advani should look into the matter. This is in the records, how Shri Chaman Lal Gupta opposed the Governor in Jammu, although a Committee is there. This is a very wrong thing.

In the same way, you say that cassettes have been released in Kashmir, which is wrong. Whether the cassettes are in Kashmir or in Ayodhya, there can be many. I myself have two of them.

[English]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I think this is a serious objectionable expression. This communal situation should not be compared with the Kashmir situation. He wants to give an impression outside that Kashmir is a communal problem. It is not a communal problem; it is the problem of insurgency. So, the Hon. Member should understand the implications of both these things. I am sorry that in one problem, he tries to bring another problem. This is altogether a different situation. Whatever is being done in Kashmir, has nothing to do with the Muslims or Hindus.

[Translation]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I request that the B. J. P. should keep an eye on its policy and should not add fuel to the fire by uttering such things in Kashmir. I have difference of opinion with the Hon. Prime Minister on the question of cassettes, two of which, I have presented here and there are more.

At least a Parliamentary Committee should look into the cassettes of there contents. The Prime Minister wants that the Supreme Court should enquire and give its judgment on the whole issue including the Ayodhya dispute under Article 138 of the Constitution of India. I support his contention.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have not followed the procedure. Please conclude.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He is speaking to get the motion defeated.

[Translation]

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Lastly I would like to make a submission to Shri Advani. If his objective is to ensure unity of the country, then that objective is dear to the hearts of all Hindus, Buddhists, Muslims and Jains. Therefore, to bring about that kind of integrity in the boundary, I request him to forget the past and take a vow that from today, from, tomorrow morning solution to the Ayodhya dispute would be found only through negotiations, through the Supreme Court verdict. Let us take a pledge today that we will unitedly wage a war against extreme poverty, which is the bone of the country. If you are prepared to lead that struggle, we are prepared to follow you. I am satisfied with the Prime Minister's speech and I am not pressing the motion.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as far as the appeal is concerned, it is perfectly in order. Later on, we can adopt any resolution from the Chair. That is different. Let us not mix up this resolution with adjournment-motion.

As you know very well, as far as rule 339 is concerned, it very clearly says that even if the mover wants to withdraw the adjournment-motion, even if there is one voice opposing it, there is single dissenting voice, in that case, the motion has to be put to vote.

We do not want to mix up Prime Minister's appeal with the adjournment-motion. Adjournment-motion has its own place and it has to be voted upon. As far as the general appeal is concerned, the whole House will be one with him. Separately a resolution has to be passed.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: So far as the procedure in respect of this motion is concerned, what Dandavateji has said is precise. So, even if the mover wants to withdraw the motion, it has to be put to the vote of the House.

But I feel in a way, what this morning my friend, Harish Rawatji did or what Mr. Saifuddin Soz has done now only emphasised the responsibility of those who bring into being a Government and it is the right thing. I am not saying, it is a wrong thing. But it only emphasised the role of the Congress Party and its allies as that of supporting party and they cannot assume the role of an Opposition Party. This adjournment-motion has served a very useful purpose from that point of view also.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is called dual membership!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A suggestion was given that unanimous resolution in this respect should be moved by the Chair and passed by this House. Such a resolution can be passed with the full agreement of the Members of the House. Such a resolution could also be out of joint with the adjournment-motion. Hence on some other occasion, if possible and necessary, we avail of such a resolution.

PROF. P. J. KURIEN: There is a precedent.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There is not a single occasion on which it was passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was passed on a motion under rule 193.

Now, there is a dissenting voice. So, I

put the adjournment-motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those against will please say 'No'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the 'Noes' have it. The 'Noes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The 'Ayes' have it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you very serious about the division?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be cleared—

Now the Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn."

The Lok Sabha divided.

AYES

Division No. 1]

20.00 hrs.

Acharia, Shri Basudeb

Advani, Shri L. K.

Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra

Ali, Shrimati Subhashini

Argal, Shri Chhaviram	Dome Dr. Ram Chandra
Baig, Shri Arif	Fernandes, Shri George
Baitha, Shri Mahendra	Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar
Bala, Dr. Asim	Giri, Shri Sudhir
Banatwalla, Shri G.M.	Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Basu, Shri Anil	Hannan Mollah Shri
Basu, Shri Chitta	Hansda, Shri Matilal
Behera, Shri Bhajaman	Harsh Vardhan, Shri
Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal	Heera Bhai, Shri
Bhattacharya, Shrimati Malini	Hota, Shri Bhabani Shankar
Bopche, Dr. Khushal Parasram	Jangde, Shri Resham Lal
Brahmbhatt, Shri Prakash Koko	Jaswant Singh, Shri
Chakravorty, Shri Susanta	Jatav, Shri Than Singh
Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kanti	Jena, Shri Srikanta
Chaudhary, Shri Rudrasen	Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Chavda, Shri Khemchandbhai Somabhai	Jorawar Ram, Shri
Choudhury, Shri Lokanath	Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin	Kabde, Dr. Venkatesh
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu	Kale, Shri Sukhdeo Nandaji
Danwe, Shri Pundlik Hari	Kalka Das, Shri
Das, Shri Anadi Charan	Kapse, Prof. Ram Ganesh
Dasgupta, Dr. Biplab	Kataria, Shri Gulab Chand
Datta, Shri Amal	Khan, Shri Sukhendu
Desmukh, Shri Ashok Anandrao	Khanoria, Shri D. D.
Dhumal, Prof. Prem Kumar	Khurana, Shri Madan Lal
Dikshit, Shri Narsingh Rao	Kundu, Shri Samarendra

Lodhi, Shri Ganga Charan	Phundkar, Shri Bhaosaheb Pundlik
Mahadik, Shri Vamanrao	Pramanik, Shri Radhika Ranjan
Malhotra, Prof. Vijay Kumar	Prasad, Shri R.S.
Malik, Shri Purna Chandra	Prem Pradeep, Shri
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar	Raghavji, Shri
Montosh, Shri Paul R.	Rai, Shri Lalbaboo
Meena, Dr. Kirodi Lal	Rai, Shri M. Ramanna
Meena, Shri Nandlal	Rajveer Singh, Shri
Meghwal, Shri Kailash	Ram Dhan, Shri
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh
Misra, Shri Satyagopal	Ray, Dr. Sudhir
Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy	Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan
Munda, Shri Karia	Ray, Shri A. K.
Naik, Shri Ram	Roy, Shri Haradhan
Nitish Kumar, Shri	Sai, Shri A. Larang
Pacherwal, Shri Gopal	Sait, Shri Ibrahim Sulaiman
Pal, Shri M.S.	Saroj, Shri Sarju Prasad
Pal, Shri Rupchand	Scindia, Shrimati Vijayaraje
Pandey, Prof. Yadu Nath	Selvarasu, Shri M.
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan	Shah, shri Babubhai Meghji
Paraste, Shri Dalpat Singh	Singh, Shri Har Govind
Paswan, Shri Chhedi	Singh Shri Pratap
Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas	Singh, Shri Ram Naresh
Paswan, Shri Sukdeo	Singh, Shri Ram Prasad
Patel, Shri Ram Chandresh	Singh, Shri Ramashray Prasad
Pathak, Shri Harin	Singh, Shri Ramdas

Singh, Shri Tej Narayan

Bhagat, Shri H.K.L.

Sur, Shri Monoranjan

Bhagey Gobardhan, Shri

Tarif Singh, Shri

Bhakata, Shri Manoranjan

Thakore, Shri Gabbhaji Mangaji

Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram

Tiwari, Shri Janardan

Bhatia, Shri Ram Sewak

Tyagi, Shri K.C.

Birender Singh, Rao

Uma Bharati, Kumari

Brahm Dutt, Shri

Vijayaraghavan, Shri A.

Chand Ram, Shri

Yadav, Shri Devendra Prasad

Chandra Shekhar, Shri

Yadav, Dr. S.P.

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati M.

Yadav, Shri Satyapal Singh

Charles, Shri A.

Yadvendra Datt, Shri

Chaudhary, Shri Ram Prasad

NOES

Agarwal, Shri J.P.

Chauhan, Shri Prabhatsinh

Akbar, Shri M.J.

Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai

Amat, Shri D.

Chennithala, Shri Ramesh

Anbarasu Era, Shri

Chidambaram, Shri P.

Antony, Shri P.A.

Chinta Mohan, Dr.

Antulay, Shri A.R.

Chowdhary, Shri Dasai

Arunachalam, Shri M.

Commander, Shri Mohd. Hassan

Asokaraj, Shri A.

Das, Shri Bhakta Charan

Baga Reddy, Shri M.

Dennis, Shri N.

Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari

Deora, Shri Murli

Balaraman, Shri L.

Deshmukh, Shri Anantrao

Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh

Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan

Bansi Lal, Shri

Dhankhar, Ch. Jagdeep

Dhawan, Shri Harmohan

Dinesh Singh, Shri

Gadgil, Shri V.N.

Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
Nanasaheb

Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath

Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai Devjibhai

Gandhi, Shrimati Maneka

Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya

Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Gowda, Shri D.M. Putte

Jag Pal Singh, Shri

Jai Parkash, Shri

Jamuna, Shrimati J.

Janardhanan, Shri Kadambur M.R.

Jawali, Dr. Basavaraj

Jayamohan, Shri A.

Jeevarathinam, Shri R.

Kalimuthu, Dr. K.

Kalvi, Shri Kalyan Singh

Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram

Kamson, Prof. Meijinlung

Kaul, Shrimati Sheila

Keshari Lal, Shri

Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali

Kotadia, Shri Manubhai

Krishna Kumar, Shri S.

Kumaramangalam, Shri P.R.

Kuppuswamy, Shri C.K.

Kurien, Prof. P.J.

Kushwaha, Shri Jagdish Singh

Mahajan, Shri Y.S.

Mallik, Shri Mangaraj

Marbaniang, Shri Peter G.

Mathew, Shri Palai K.M.

Mishra, Shri Janeshwar

Mishra, Shri Raj Mangal

Muraleedharan, Shri K.

Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna

Muthiah, Shri R.

Naikar, Shri D.K.

Nandi, Shri Yellaiah

Narayanan, Shri K.R.

Nayak, Shri Nakul

Netam, Shri Arvind

Odeyar, Shri Channaiah

Oraon, Shrimati Sumati

Palanisamy, Shri K.C.

Pande, Shri Rajmangal

Pandian, Shri D.

Panja, Shri Ajit

Patel, Shri Arjunbhai

Patel, Shri Shantilal Purushottam Das

Patil, Shri Basavaraj

Patil, Shri Prakashbapu Vasantryao

Patil, Shri Shankarrao

Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal

Poojary, Shri Janardhana

Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram

Prabhu, Shri R.	Shakeelur Rehman, Dr.
Purohit, Shri Banwarilal	Shakya, Shri Ram Singh
Rahi, Shri Ram Lal	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Rajeshwaran, Dr. V.	Sharma, Shri Dharm Pal
Raju, Shri M.M. Pallam	Shastri, Shri Kapil Dev
Rakesh, Shri R.N.	Shekhada, Shri Govindbhai Kanjibhai
Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.	Shingada, Shri D.B.
Ram Prakash, Ch.	Shukla, Shri Vidyacharan
Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally	Silvera, Dr. C.
Ramadass, Dr. R.	Singaravadeivel, Shri S.
Rama murthy, Shri K.	Singh, Shri Dhanraj
Ranga, Prof. N.G.	Singh, Shri Dharmgaj
Rao, Shri K.S.	Singh, Shri K. Manvendra
Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha	Singh, Shri Lalit Vijoy
Rao, Shri R. Gundu	Singh, Prof. N. Tombi
Rao, Shri V. Krishna	Singh, Shri Ram Bahadur
Rathod, Shri Uttam	Singh, Shri Uday Pratap
Rawat, Shri Harish	Singh, Deo, Shri A.N.
Reddy, Shri B.N.	Sinha, Shrimat Usha
Reddy, Shri P. Narsa	Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu
Reddy, Shri R. Surender	Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath
Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya	Soz, Prof. Saif-ud-din
Sahay, Shri Subodh Kant	Srikantaiah, Shri H. C.
Saran, Shri Daulat Ram	Sultanpuri, Shri K.D.
Sarwar Hussain, Shri	Suman, Shri Ramji Lal
Scindia, Shri Madhavrao	Sundararaj, Shri N.
Selvam, Shri Kanci Panneer	Sunil Dutt, Shri
Sema, Shri Shikiho	Thambi Durai, Dr.
Shah, Shri Jayantilal Virchandbhai	Thapa, Shri Nandu

Thomas, Prof. K.V.

20.01 hrs.

Thomas, Shri P.C.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—*CONTD.*

Thorat, Shri S.B.

**Statement giving reasons for immediate
legislation by the Finance (Second
Amendment Ordinance, 1990**

Tiwari, Shri Brij Bhushan

Umbrey, Shri Laeta

[*English*]

Venkatesan, Shri P.R.S.

Venkatswamy, Shri G.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI
YASHWANT SINHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the
Table an explanatory statement (Hindi and
English versions) giving reasons for im-
mediate legislation by the Finance (Second
Amendment) Ordinance, 1990.

Verma, Shrimati Usha

Wadiyar, Shri Srikanta Datta Narasimha
Raja

Yadav, Shri Baleshwar

20.01 1/2 hrs.

Yadav, Shri Chhotey Singh

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Yadav, Shri Hukumdeo Narayan

Seventeenth Report

Yadava, Shri Ramjilal

Yazdani, Dr. Golam

[*English*]

Yuvraj, Shri

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY
(Katwa): Sir, I beg to present the Seventeenth
Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

Zainal Abedin, Shri

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Subject to
correction,* the result of the division is :

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House
stands adjourned to re-assemble tomorrow
at 11 A. M.

Ayes : 120

Noes : 171

20.02 hrs.

The motion was negatived

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December
28, 1990 Pausa 7, 1912 (Saka)*

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

Ayes : Sarvashri Sivaji Patnaik, Ajay Singh, Joss Fernandez and Yamuna Prasad Shastri.

Noes : Shri Devi Lal, Shri Oscar Fernandes, Shri Bega Ram Chauhan, Shri Balgopal
Mishra, Dr. Bengali Singh, Sarvashri T. Bala Goud, Sarvashri R. S. Prasad, Piyare
Lal Handoo, and Mohammad Singh.
