

hold the discussion tomorrow.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: We are ready to give statement in regard to both the issues. But let the discussion be over. Making statement while the discussion is going on creates interruption; we will certainly give the statement in regard to both the issues. (Interruptions). Mr. speaker, Sir, the Government has been postponing all the important issues on the pretext of Ayodhya issue.

MR. SPEAKER: No. It is not so, it is wrong.

[English]

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): This is very important issue. (Interruptions) This is a very important development.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): You please allow me just for ten seconds.

SHRI RAM KAPSE: When will we be able to know the time?

MR. SPEAKER: You have to give a notice to the Member also.

SHRI RAM KAPSE: I have given the notice.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The Member is not here now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has said that he is very keen to allow our subjects to be discussed...

MR. SPEAKER: No, all subjects.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, the sick public undertaking question is a very very important question and time has to be found out for discussing that... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We will discuss it in the Business Advisory Committee.

## DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

### Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute-CONTD

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now we shall take up Discussion under Rule 193 regarding Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid Dispute.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Sir, for approximately two and a half weeks, this House was without the leader of the House. I am welcoming back to the House one who had become practically a stranger to us.... (Interruptions)

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): He is not hearing.... (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He is hearing everything. I am saying this particularly because the hon. Prime Minister is a very consistent champion of the idea of consensus. He told us times without number that all important decisions, policy decisions and so on should be taken by consensus. It is a very good idea. But, unfortunately, Sir, in recent days on such vital matter as this Ayodhya affair, which was agitating everybody's mind and which had thrown the country into a turmoil-ultimately when some private discussions with some saints or mahants or sadhus and then it was announced that some understanding has been reached- I could not find any signs of consensus there.

There are two sides, which are primarily concerned with this dispute. There is a dispute whether somebody wants to recognise it or not. Two sides are involved in this dispute and out of them, the spokesmen or the representatives or the leaders of the minority community were not associated at all with these talks. So, what kind of consensus was reached, I do not know. Of course, since the minority community people, who

are not involved in illegal construction of anything there, perhaps the Prime Minister thought that it is enough to deal with those people who are directly there on the acquired site. Nevertheless some days have passed now. Three or four days have passed. I would be very happy to hear from him that during these three or four days atleast he has taken into confidence about these talks he had the leaders of the Muslim community, if not the leaders of the major political parties who were not brought into the picture at all throughout this period.

Sir, in the statement which he has made- I have read it very carefully- his whole emphasis is not on the Court, his emphasis is on the need for an amicable settlement through negotiations, which I welcome. Nothing is better if something can be brought out through negotiations, an agreed formula or a settlement between the two sides, whatever it is, provided the two sides agree; and nothing is better than that.

He has emphasised in four, five, six places in his statement as to what he really wants to do. And what he is hoping for is that there should be a new dimension given to these negotiations and an amicable solution should be found. He has talked about reconciliation of the views of the various concerned parties.

He reminded us about the Congress manifesto and he says- 'We are committed to finding a negotiated settlement of this issue which fully respects the sentiments of both communities involved.' He had again said that the purpose of this exercise is to bring out an amicable settlement through negotiations. So, this point is a main point which he has emphasised in his statement. If negotiations prove to be barren, if they do not yield any fruit, if no results can be achieved then, of course, the whole question will arise: what to do after that. For the time being it is good that the work has been stopped, even if temporarily, and I think that generally speaking the people of this country have a feeling of relief, some respite is there because the whole situation was going towards the point

of explosion. If something untoward had happened, then the consequences of that in various parts of our country would have been seen and there would have been bloodshed, there would have been riots perhaps causing great loss of lives and major disturbance of peace. At least we are spared, for the time being, from that. I am sure the overwhelming majority of people not only Muslims but ordinary Hindus also feel relieved that that danger which was coming ahead of a big conflict, clash and some kind of violence, which would lead to blood shed, has been averted.

Now, we would like to know from the Prime Minister - I am only putting some points for clarifications, since he has emphasised so much the need for negotiations, to find an amicable and agreed settlement how best he proposes to set about these negotiations, who will be the parties brought into these negotiations because one running threat is that if the negotiations fail, there is no other course left except to resort to courts and to go by whatever the courts decide. I am sorry to say, Sir, that the speeches which we heard yesterday in the House from the Opposition, not all of them but many of them if I have understood them correctly, have ruled out altogether the possibility of taking this matter to the courts. It has been stated here quite clearly that these are the articles of faith which are not subject to any judicial review or decision. This is what has been said for several months past also. Therefore, even the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this House has issued a statement after the talks between the Prime Minister and the 'Sadhus' saying that there is no question of making this justiciable. This is not a matter which can be justified. The hon. Member from Varanasi who at one time used to wear the uniform of guardians of law and order, now seems to have along with his uniform, shed those ideas and is advocating a course which leads not to law and order but to lawlessness and disorder.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I was really

surprised the other day when the Home Minister after his visit to Ayodhya came back and made a statement both outside and inside the House to the effect that it was his *prima facie* view that at that time the High Court order was being violated. There was a big uproar here why a Minister should be permitted to make a statement like this because the matter is *sub judice* and he is trying in his own way to pressurise the court by giving this kind of *prima facie* opinion which he has no business to do. This is what was said here by many friends on my right. But Yesterday- you were very keenly following the debate, Sir- the whole speech of my hon. friend from Varansasi was nothing but an attempt to pressurise and influence the judiciary. What else was it? But nobody objected. We did not object, you did not object. So, he has already argued the whole case here on the floor of the House yesterday. According to him, those are the arguments which should prevail eventually. The matter is still to be heard in the courts. But here he put forward all kinds of arguments and views. We also heard a very long and learned dissertation, which I keenly heard, about the culture and the cultural history of our country. I do not want to go into all that now because this is not the place for it.....(Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): You are referring to Shri Sharda Yadav's speech

ANHON. MEMBER: And supplemented by that Sanyasi

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: No. Sir, we are all very very proud, everybody is very proud and will always be proud, of the great cultural heritage of our country. But there are many things which constitute our culture. It is not only the Taj Mahal or Khajuraho or various cultures and paintings and all that of course, the whole world knows; they are world famous and we are very proud of them- there are many other things also in our culture, including many aspects of Indian philosophy, the teachings of religious preachers, the teachings of great social reformers

*Bhoomi babri Masjid Dispute*  
who adorn the history of our country. All that is part of the composite culture of our country. So, I think that in the name of defending culture, it will not do to advocate the line which means that we want to construct a place of worship at the cost of somebody else's place of worship. This, I think, is not part of our culture at all. And in this country, which is a multi-religious country, anybody who, in any way or form, tries to lay hands on the religious place of worship of some other community to which he himself does not belong, is really playing with fire. We cannot exist as one country and one nation here without that much tolerance for each other's religions that all places of religious worship are left intact

I do not like to mention here but I am saying it in another context, completely different context. You remember what happened in 1984 when one particular community in this country was so much aggrieved, perhaps justifiably aggrieved, that the Government at that time for whatever reason, I do not know, history can judge whether it was right or wrong- sent the armed forces into a place of worship. And what was the fall out, what was the reaction among the entire community to whom that Gurudwara belonged? They did feel genuinely that their place of worship had been defiled, its sanctity had been violated, and they vowed even to take revenge for that. And we know what happened. Later on, one of the most tragic incidents in our history took place. Within four months or five months of that incident, the Prime Minister of this country had to pay with her life. This meddling with places of religious worship belonging to communities other than one's own, is something which will not ever be tolerated in this country. This is the bedrock of secularism. You have to tolerate each other's religions their places of worship, their religious practices, their faiths. Now we are talking about faith. Everybody has got some faith or the other. I respect whatever faith my friends here are professing. It is their faith that the birth place of Rama is situated in a particular spot. They say there is no need for any other evidence or proof or anything because the fact

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

that millions of people believe in their hearts and in their minds that that is the place, that is the Ram Janmabhoomi, is enough. Maybe.

But what about the faith of other people?

The other people in this country- professing other religions and other faiths- may also say that they have got some faith which contradicts that one. Then who is to decide this? How is this to be decided? I think the Prime Minister, of course, has not yet reached that stage, nor have we reached that state where if some kind of veiled threats- which were held out here that if an amicable settlement is not found within three months then they will again go there and state construction- are made, where do we go? That means that after three months we will be back to square one. Are we prepared for that? Is the Prime Minister prepared for that? Or are these friends of ours here prepared for all the consequences that may follow? I do not know. This period of respite of three or four months- somebody says it is three months, somebody says it is four months but somebody objects to four months because it is not auspicious and therefore, we must keep it as three months, whatever it is — must be utilised by all the forces standing for communal harmony, secularism and democracy in this country. They should be employed and utilised in order to create such a climate and such a public opinion in this country which will ensure that some amicable settlement or compromise is found. I know that the word 'compromise' is a word which is disliked by many.

I submit that no settlement can be found unless both sides are willing to make some compromise. If both sides stick rigidly to their declared positions, there can never be an amicable settlement. It is not for me to suggest what compromise may or may not be possible. The talks have not yet begun. Let us see what comes out of them.. But I must say that in every step of that process of negotiations, the Prime Minister will see to it. I hope- that those parties which are associated with these negotiations, who are vitally

concerned are included and none of them are left out or excluded. Otherwise how can there be an amicable settlement?

I was in Lucknow last Saturday and Sunday, not because it is my friend Shri Vajpayee's constituency, not for that reason. (Interruptions) I have gone on some work of mine. Yesterday he was saying to me that I went to Lucknow, in such a way that I hope I am not prohibited from going to Lucknow. On Sunday Morning I saw the papers including the Hindi papers at Lucknow. About press statements, I am quite conscious of the fact that there are such things as press distortions and incomplete reports and all that. Therefore, I am saying this subject to correction. I have read a news report of a statement of Mahant Avaidyanath- who was one of those who were associated with those talks- saying that now there is no other way left except to resort to the courts and the whole thing will go to the courts and whatever the courts decide that will have to be accepted. I was very pleasantly surprised to read that statement. I do not know whether it was authentic or not. It is for him to say. But it is there in black and white.. I can bring the paper and show you.

Then came another statement by Shri Ashok Singal who I think was not present at the talks. He must have been present in Delhi- I do not know- but not in the talks. Shri Singhal says in that statement that what was agreed on with the Prime Minister is that a committee will be set up with one Supreme Court judge as Chairman and the job of that committee will be to try to find out whether any temple existed there before the mosque. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether what Shri Singhal has said is actually what had happened. Is that the understanding reached? I do not know.

Then we have Shri Advani's statement here in which he has forcefully reiterated that in any case it is not a justiceable matter, and, therefore, the role of the courts is to be ruled out.

Where do we go? What are we sup-

posed to do? So many contradictory statements are there.

It is no use asking the Prime Minister whether the Sadhus gave him any assurance about the Court's verdict. It does not make much sense, because I think, they are not the people who are immediately and directly concerned with this. It is the other people who are concerned with this. The Prime Minister said in his statement that the Congress is for the construction of the temple without dismantling the mosque. What is the meaning of dismantling the mosque? Does it mean that nobody will lay any hands on the mosque? It can be shifted without being dismantled. Many time we were told that there are modern techniques in the world by which the entire building can be shifted. That would not require dismantling.

Sir, earlier, a plan as to how they propose to construct the proposed *mandir* was colorfully printed and circulated. In that we saw that the temple was proposed to be constructed in such a manner that it covers the entire mosque. The mosque will remain inside and the temple will be all around. In that case, there is no need to dismantle the mosque. But, will it not amount to encroaching on the mosque?

[Translation]

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): We will construct it there only (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMANATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): They are saying that the temple will be constructed there only

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: So, we should be quite clear as to what the Prime Minister has discussed with them and what kind of assurance, if any, he got from them.

Sir, the exercise of having regular consultations with all the political parties has also been given up, for a long time on this issue. I hope it will be resumed. We can also

*Bhoomi babri Masjid Dispute*  
make some suggestions occasionally which will not be of any harm to him. The plan of the temple is not produced before anybody. Now, the Courts have also asked for the plan of the temple, but, I believe that has not yet been made available I think the minimum we can ask for, is the plan about which they are saying '*aves hi hoga. wyse hi hoga*'. so, that plan should be made available to the people. Let us know how they purpose to construct the temple. Of course, now the position has become complicated, because they are not supposed to do anything there, they are not supposed to do any building activity there.

I believe the hon. Member from Varanasi was also a signatory to the 1989 agreement which was signed under the aegis of Sardar Buta Singh. He and the VHP leaders signed an agreement relating to *Shilanyas* and one of the signatories to that was Mr. Dixit also and I believe that is available now.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Varanasi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since my name is mentioned, I must be given a chance to explain. I never signed any such agreement.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, as far as I know that signed agreement was also never honoured. It was violated. So, what is the worth of this kind of agreement if somebody is determined to do something else? They sign something, say something and do something else, which is just the opposite. So, I just want to have a clarification on some of these points.

Sir, as far as the whole political background of this issue is concerned, my friend Mr. Saifuddin has made a very eloquent speech here in which he mentioned about the implications of this continued attempt to connect politics with religion. As I had said earlier, Mr. Advani, whom I greatly respect for his clear-headedness, lucidity of thought and expression and his forthrightness, has been saying consistently the same thing. He has said it so many times in your chamber also. Am I allowed to refer it here?

MR.. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He said : what was our party? What was our party before the last elections. What was our party in UP? It was nothing. Then, how has it come to power through one election and got so many votes and esats? He did not even hide the fact. He said, it is because of the temple. I do not know whether it violates electoral laws to say openly- we used a religious symbol in order to campaign, get votes and come to power-whether this is permitted under the electoral laws. Any-way, he said it very clearly:(Interruptions)

[English]

They can do it, who else will do it?

I do to expect the hon.Prime Minister to be able to clarify just now- it would be unfair to expect him just now to clarify all these questions or doubts or various things.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V . NARASIMHA RAO): Thank you..

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am always considerate. But if you think that now you are confident enough to clarify all these things just now, I would be very happy.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That I cannot do it and that is what I am going to say.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am speaking on the basis of what you have said in the other House where apparently you have said, "I am as confused as some of you are."(Interruptions.)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is all joint confusion!

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Has the confusion now been removed, I would be very happy to hear..

That is all I wish to say. I would like

these points to be explained by him at the end.

I want to conclude by saying, if these here months or four months are not utilised in a positive way by all forces in this country and parties which stand for communal harmony, peace and secularism, to create that kind of political climate and public opinion.. then at the end of that period, we will find ourselves one again in a crisis situation, back to square one again there. Then, I doubt, whether you would possibly get respite like this time. So, it is an extremely serious situation. We are all prepared to cooperate. Our friends here- I am sure, many of the,- are also prepared to cooperate. But let us get round the table at least and find out by pricking each other's brain, whether some sensible way can be found.

I do not know what the other countries and the peoples of other countries are thinking about it- not that they are angles of perfection and purity. I do not say that. But a vast country like India for weeks together seems to have forgotten all other problems. All other problems and issues of the people are relegated to the background, Mr. Advani has said, we have done it deliberately because we do not want to discuss Scam. No. The tragedy of the situation is like that. The Scam will be discussed, do not worry. A big country like this for weeks together is concerned with nothing but all this dispute between a temple and a mosque. This is the situation which I think, is peculiar and people in other countries- I am not taking only about the Muslims countries- I am not know what the reaction there is. You will not bother about it.- A friend of mine who came last week for some medical treatment from Bangladesh has told me that the people in Bangladesh are very much concerned reading the news from here (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): A large number of temples have bee damaged recently in Bangladesh; are you not worried about it?(Interruptions)



SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Both the sides can play the game you are playing (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Look, don't be have in this manner, he intends to say that such incidents will have negative effect in other countries. Please listen, and give reply to it, if you want.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You may recall that last year when the same movement had reached quite a high crescendo and when Mr. Advani was riding his *rath* in the *rath yatra*, there were some deplorable repercussions in Bangladesh

There were some deplorable repercussions in Bangladesh and a number of Hindu temples were damaged and broke by communal ruffians there.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is justified.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You are saying "It is justified." It is justified or not justified. Why don't you observe the judgment of that court? Will that justify you in not observing any court's judgment? What about Shah Banevs case? It is a despicable thing that the Government did. Did we not protest and fight against it? Because the Government was a party in subverting the judgment in Shah Banu case, therefore, you also are free to flout the case! What kind of verdict is that! No. (*Interruptions*). My friend from Dhaka was apprehending that if people there are given an impression that there is a movement gaining momentum here that in some way or the other we will encroach upon the mosque or damage it, then those communal fellows there, the counterparts of the people here, will start attack Hindu minorities. Are we prepare protect them? We are custodians of everybody. What about Hindu brothers and sisters there in Bangladesh? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): They consider that they are not Hindus.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Last time when President Ershad was in Power, he gave a public assurance that those damaged temples and all that would be repaired at the cost of the Government. But by fried told me that nothing has been done. Those damaged temples are still lying there in a damaged condition. Now if this kind of thing is built up here, this atmosphere and movement, they apprehend that there may be some handle given to the communal elements there, to start attacking the minorities there again and attacking their temples. When we do something, we should be cautious about the repercussions not only in our own country but in other countries also. I do not say that this is the primary consideration. But that has to be kept in mind.

Therefore, I would say that the hon. Prime Minister was under heavy pressure. I know we will also pressurise him to take strong action and all that. The other side was saying "You take any action you like. We are prepared to shed our blood. But we are not prepared to leave that place." But neither blood has been shed nor they have remained there nor anything. It seems that there is a possibility of people hanging their mind. People do change their minds under some compulsions and pressures. I do not know when and how the process of negotiation will be initiated. But I hope that it will lead to some positive results and we are prepared to give our full cooperation for an amicable settlement and I hope the Prime Minister will clarify some questions and points I have raised.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY (Kulaba): Mr. Speaker, Sir. it is not a matter of pleasure but it is a moment which is very agonising. No patriotic Indian will be happy at the things that have been happening and certainly patriotism is not monopolised by any particular group, individuals or community. It is a part of life. So far as the Muslims are concerned, there is a saying of Prophet

[A.R. Antulay]

which is almost an anijunction, that MINAL EEMAN that love of the country is a part of faith. If one does not love his country, he can never be called a Muslim. In the cortex of whatever has been happening, do we really take it to be a struggle, a quarrel, a dispute between a Temple and a Mosque? With due respect, I submit that I do not think any time in the past in our history, in our culture — since thousands of years and especially during the past 1500 years—there had been a dispute or a quarrel or a fight between a temple and a Mosque. Indeed, at any time, to the best of our memory, has there been a quarrel between a Hindu and a Muslim? I am now 63 years of age. I have witnessed heart-rending communal riots and the beastly happenings in 1946. I was just a boy then. Those dreaded days, that nightmarish period, do we really want those days to be back to return when Hindus were from killing Muslims and the Muslims killing Hindus at that time? No. For a thousand years or a little more, Muslims and Hindus have been living in this country as brothers and sisters. There had been no occasion whatsoever when a particular person was killed by a person belonging to a different faith simply because he owed religious allegiance to that particular belief or faith. It is the animed in human who unfortunately creates frenzy, and whosoever creates frenzy, he is enemy number one the of common man—be that a Hindu, be that a Muslim. This animal etement in human must not be aroused.

Sir, who is the loser? I had an occasion to speak somewhere. Suppose, a frenzied situation is created and the lives of thousands of Muslims are irminetly to be lost in the villages, who will protect them? I do not think that any Government worth the name can do it. Even though whoreas it is certainly the responsibility of the Government to keep peace and to restore the condiois where all the committees can live as brothers and sisters. Should we not help the Government in creating those conditions? I do not think the Government, either with the force or might of the police or the military can create conditions of Peace. I am

afraid, this issue has been highly politicised. Let me be very honest in submitting that no party can say, putting their hands on their own conscience, that they have to—at one time or the other time — taken benefit of such issues for the furtherance of their political cause and interest. I congratulate the Prime Minister for having defused the situation. What would have happened today? Would we have been sitting here in this temple of democracy? Would we have been sitting in this apex democratic sever-sign institution of the country there. With due respect I pose this question to one and all to all of us. Suppose the situation had not been defused, then we would not have been in a position to debate or discuss as we are now doing. No solution can be found in a frenzied situation. It was defused by the Prime Minister. Whether it is 'A' party or 'B' party, it is absolutely irrelevant, according to me. Today, India is calm; today, India is quiet; today, the country can witness a scene where its negotiations can take place. I feel it is the biggest achievement during the year that the Prime Minister has to his credit. I really congratulate him from the core of my heart. Nobody could think and I also could not think too that to soon after from 34, calm waild. Take back yourself descend to your mind to five decade ago. Yes to avert such tragedies Prime Minister held discussions he discussed with *Sants* and *Sadhus*. Why should he not? He should discuss with anyone and everyone if that can bring peace to this land. He should not shim anybody, he should not feel that 'a' or 'b' or 'c' is an untouchable. We have hardly come out successful out of disgrace of our human of one untouchability. Let us not create another class of untouchables in this country — the political untouchables. *Sants* and *Mahants* did meet him and see the result what is the result? The result is, the *Kar Seva* was stopped. The millions and millions of Muslims of this country, and I know their pulse, are happy; they have heave a sigh of relief. They were under great tension. They did not know what will happen to their life, what will happen to their property, to their liberty. And if life, liberty and property is safe today when we are debating this very issue, the entire credit,



we should not be hesitant to concede, goes to the Prime Minister. We should concede to him what is his due. We must now help him. Now that the situation is created whereby negotiations can take place, let us sit with him and say, "Mr. so and so needs to be associated, this group needs to be associated." Let us find a solution which is permanent and lasting. We do not know— with due respect and I hope I will not be misunderstood; I have not been afraid of anyone except God nor shall I ever be afraid of anyone except God because I know I am answerable to Him and to nobody else what the verdict of the court will be assuming the verdict of the court is given, who will go to explain whatever that should be, that to the millions and millions of people in this country persuading them to respect that verdict. In the process what will happen? I, as one, both as an Indian and a Muslim— of which fact I am proud— will call upon the Prime Minister in all humility to see that a negotiated settlement is arrived at, that there is no tension at all, there is no misgiving, there is no malice-love towards all. Of course, everyone knows that the court's verdict has to be accepted. I also think so. But the court verdict has to be accepted only when the court verdict will be acceptable to the common man who has already been put to a situation of frenzy. By whom? All of us know it. The political parties and their leaders can not save their skin. Let the Leaders march this country and let the common man first be made receptive. They are now becoming the great friends of minority community here during the discussion when it takes place. But when Muslims get massacred, they are being massacred for all these forty years, how many of us went there to save our own lives? How many of us went to their rescue? How many of us laid our lives to save theirs? We did not stir. We have therefore, to give a sermon these sermons become very costly to the minorities of this country no right. I, both as an Indian and a Muslim will, through you, sir request the hon. Prime Minister to carry on the negotiations that has been engaged in to reach a conclusion which is peaceful, which will

give the sense of security and belonging to the Muslim community for this security and sense of belonging to their home land, to this country which they have been yearning for the last more than forty years. I think, we should not apportion blame. It is wrong to say that 'a' is wrong and I am right. The point is that a man who is killed is not sitting in riots within the scale of justice and that is the end of it. He is killed. He is killed for his family. He is killed as a bread earner of his children. Are we going to take care of these widows and children? How many widows and oppressed children have we taken care of during the past forty years? Whenever any riots have occurred, they have occurred on flimsy ground. And could we not have visualised those flimsy grounds and removed them? Unfortunately, we did not do. Let us honestly admit it. Let us not fight shy in confessing that certain lapses have occurred at our hands certain mistakes have been committed on the part of one and all. We should not only say that the other person is wrong and I and my party is right. I think a new ground is broken by the Prime Minister let us work with him. I only wanted to remind this hon. House through you Sir that let us discuss this also from the point of view of that other party to which Indira Gandhi made a reference who is that other party to be invited for negotiation in villages with scattered seven house, ten houses, fifteen houses get burnt. They are the other party who need to be invited, they alone know. Whenever riots take place and whenever bloodshed takes place, they are the sufferers and not we. I have not heard of a single riot since 1947— or 1946 rather— in which a single leader has been killed of any community whatsoever. We are all discussing here in air conditional chamber away from houses on fire. We were there in 1946 and have been there since 1946: most of us are living and healthy but none of us have been killed in the riots. Those who are the victims all left alone we become their guardians only in this cosy chamber where we want to be crusaders for their rights which have often been massacred and trampled upon. So I only want to tell you and through you to this

*Masjid Dispute*

[Sh. A.R. Antulay]

hon. House to think in calmer moments as to what will be the repercussions of what we do here and decide today. Before we take any action we must think of the consequences. If we are not going to foresee the consequences, it is not the court verdict which will save them court's verdict is alright for against an individual. An individual may be bound by a court verdict. If some people say, which certainly is the matter of great sorrow for a person like me, that they, the leaders will not accept the court verdict, But are the people at large and the people in general and the common man in millions who have been put in a particular frame of mind going to accept the court verdict? It take a little time. Time is no matter of concern if it proves the best healer if it is used to put the agitated people back to their normal human nature that is the time to Why should the Prime Minister have said four months, I really do not know. I would rather go to the extent of saying that even if it takes one full year and the conditions of peace prevail and ultimately the question by negotiation is solved amicably to the satisfaction of all, as the Congress manifesto is rightly quoted and cited says. I think we shall have done a great deal of service to the cause of country.

Let us not go for scoring debating points. Let us think of the lives, the integrity of the country and the nationhood the India. Let us also think of the future of the country with which is bound our own future. If we really can do so, I think we shall have done our sacred duty and destiny's job. Thank you very much.

[Translation]

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that there is peace. More gladdening is the repeated assertion of the hon. Prime Minister that there would be a ray of hope in four months. However, I would not like to get any clarification from him in this regard. As my friend Shri Indrajit Gupta put it, in three or

four minutes, I would also like to place on record my apprehensions in this context. These apprehensions have not suddenly appeared from the blue. Rather they have been there for long time. Our friend, Shri Antulay delivered an emotionally charged speech. It is true that it is the man on the streets and not us, who die in the riots, but it is equally true that we as Members of Parliament are equally responsible for the establishment of the establishment of the Rule of the law and the maintenance of law and order. Our friend Shri Antulay seems to forget the fact that if so many people are trying despite the existence of laws, how many people would lose their lives, in the absence of the guardians of law? That is why, it is repeated time and again that every-one should abide by the law. Nobody urges the Prime Minister to take stern steps to implement the law. The Prime Minister has been repeatedly saying that the problem should be solved through the means of dialogue but so far the entire nation and this august House is in the dark about the understanding reached upon with the concerned parties or the manner in which the dialogue is proposed.

As our friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta correctly observed, contradictory statements are being issued from both the sides. The Prime Minister has stated that the Court verdict should be accepted by one all, which Antulay Ji doesn't seem to agree with, as he apprehends that some killings would take place. On the other hand, (Advani ji assert) that this matter can not be solved by the Courts. The saints have said that they won't remain silent after three months and that it is a question of their faith and belief. The courts cannot do anything about it, then how a dialogue is possible? If the situation is such that there is mutual mistrust and issuance of contradictory statements, then the matters are bound to get complicated. I would not have felt sad, if the saints had delivered some fiery speech. I would not have felt distressed, if some mahant had said something, but doubts and apprehensions arise in my mind, when Shri Advani says something.

So, the statement made in this House, acquires a different connotation. May I submit to the hon. Prime Minister whether he can assure this House and the nation that until the commencement of the dialogue, no side would issue statements against each other. If statements against each other. If even this is not possible, how meaningful is your mutual understanding? Mutual understanding or agreement is not something unheard of.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, references are being made to our culture. Our culture provides ample illustrations. The battle of Mahabharata also took place in this great land of ours. Both Bhishma and Krishna abhorred the war, both disliked the idea of killings. In the entire story of Mahabharata, we find that no heed was given to the sane counsels of Bhishma and no attention was given to the appeals and pleas of Krishna. Advaniti should ponder over the reasons behind the occurrence of the Mahabharata war. One Dhritarashtra was at the helm of affairs. He was indecisive. Therefore, please remember that our culture provides many examples. Thus, these papule who are in a position to take decision, don't take decision on account of their indecisiveness and thus fail to prevent the bloodshed, that could be averted. Are we repeating the Mahabharata? Are we going to do those very things again? Development was not unknown then also. Inderprastha, Khadavprastha, the golden Palace all were burnt to ashes. Krishna and Bhishmapitamah could just sit and watch helplessly. People died in large numbers, the country has ruined and brothers were compelled to shed each other's blood. Those very apprehensions are there in my mind. Therefore, any dialogue in this regard should involve one and all. Similarly, the dialogue should not be such that one draws a different meaning, while another draws another inference, because this will ultimately lead the country to destruction.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret that the

peace observed in the last three days is being unduly trumpeted around and the same suspicion and dilemma lies behind the peace, which is being applauded by our friends. These doubts have risen, because we have not been able to understand each other's feelings. The Prime Minister has got a grace period of three months to solve this problem and if a dialogue is initiated during this period, then perhaps the country can have a sigh of relief. It is not a big achievement, if a frightened person heaves a sigh and relief. People fear that bloodshed will take place. If the execution is delayed by three or six months, then every person who has been sentenced to death will hope that some body will come to rescue him. If God is the only saviour, then there is no need to have this House. Whether God saves the situation or not, the leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition should see to it that a provocative situation is not created within three months. I regret that there is an attempt to create a tense situation right from the day some semblance of peace was restored. The Prime Minister is keeping mum and this could lead to destruction.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we rise for lunch?

MANY HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: We meet again at 2 p.m.

1300 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at two Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

(MR. SPEAKER in the Chair)