

vashri Girdhari Lal Bhargava, Rasa Singh Rawat, Astbhuja Prasad Shukla and Santosh Kumar Gangwar. I shall now put all the amendments to the Consideration Motion to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 1 to 4 were put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the motion for consideration to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1993, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 23 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 23 were added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no amendment to clause 24.

The question is:

"That clause 24 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 24 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 25 to 39 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 25 to 39 were added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title Stand Part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title were added to the Bill.

DR. ABRAR AHMED: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

17.13 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN AREA AT AYODHYA ORDINANCE

AND

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN AREA AT AYODHYA BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now take up items 12 and 13 of the Agenda together. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava may move his Resolution.

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA: Sir, I beg to move *:

"That this House disapproves of the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Ordinance, 1993 (Ordinance No. 8 of 1993) promulgated by the President on the 7th January, 1993"

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That this House disapproves of the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Ordinance, 1993 (Ordinance No. 8 of 1993) promulgated by the President on the 7th January, 1993".

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI S.B.CHAVAN): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition of certain area at Ayodhya and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

As the House is aware, there has been a long-standing dispute relating to the erstwhile Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid structure at Ayodhya which led to communal tension and violence from time to time and ultimately led to the destruction of the disputed structure on 6 December 1992. Following the demolition of the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid structure, the communal situation deteriorated sharply in various parts of the country. The wide-spread communal riots have resulted in a large number of deaths, injuries and destruction of property in the country.

The Government considered the situation at Ayodhya and took several decisions to pave the way for restoration of communal peace and harmony and the resolution of the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute.

Accordingly, the Government *inter alia* decided to acquire all areas in dispute in the suits pending in the High Court and suitable adjacent areas. It was further decided that the acquired area, excluding the area on which the disputed structure stood, would be made available to two trusts which would be set up for the construction of a Ram temple and a Mosque respectively and for planned development of the area.

Since the Parliament was not in session and there was urgent necessity to acquire the land at Ayodhya, the President of India promulgated the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Ordinance, 1993 (no.8 of 1993) on the 7 January 1993. This Bill is introduced in replacement of the ordinance. Section 1 (2) of the Bill provides that the Bill shall be deemed to have come into force on 7 January, 1993 the day on which the Ordinance had been promulgated.

By virtue of Section 3 of this Bill, the right, title and interest in relation to the acquired area stand transferred to and vest in the Union Government. The Union Government have appointed the Commissioner, Faizabad Division, Faizabad as the Authorised Person under Section 7 of the Ordinance and he had taken possession of the acquired area on behalf of the Union Government.

Section 4 (2) of the Bill provides that all the acquired properties shall be freed and discharged from all encumbrances affecting them and any attachment, injunction, decree or order of any Court of tribunal or other authority restricting the use of such properties in any manner or appointing any receiver in respect of the whole or any part of such properties shall cease to have any effect.

Section 4 (3) of the Bill provides that any suit, appeal or other proceeding pending before any Court, tribunal or other authority, in respect of the right, title and interest relating to any property which has been vested in the Union Government under Section 3 shall abate.

Section 7 provides that in managing the acquired property, the Union Government or the Authorised Person shall ensure that the position existing before the commencement of the Act in the area in which the structure commonly known as Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid stood, is maintained.

On 7 January 1993, the President of India made a Reference to the Supreme Court under Article 143 (1) of the Constitu-

tion for consideration and opinion in regard to the following question:-

Shrimati Girija Devi Not present.

"Whether a Hindu temple or any Hindu religious structure existing prior to the construction of the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid (including the premises of the inner and outer courtyards of such structure) in the area on which the structure stood?"

[Translation]

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (JAIPUR): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 16th August, 1993

In the Reference to the Supreme Court, it has been stated that the Government propose to settle the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute after obtaining the opinion of the Supreme Court and in the light of the said opinion. The opinion of the Supreme Court is awaited.

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): I beg to move:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 15th July, 1993".

The Bill closely follows the Ordinance with slight modifications in the Schedule. Certain consequential provisions following such modifications have been incorporated in Section 13 of the Bill.

[English]

Maj. D.D. Khanoria. Not present.

Prof. Rasa Singh Rawat: Not present.

Shri Tara Chand Khandelwal. I am moving

It will be seen that the Bill will help in resolving the Ram Janma Bhoomi-Babri Masjid dispute, restoring confidence among the people of India and combating the forces of religious fanaticism and the misuse of religion for electoral and other such gains.

That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th August, 1993. (14)

I request the hon. Members of this esteemed House to consider all these aspects and lend their full support to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Ibrahimsulaimansait. Not present.

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the acquisition of certain area at Ayodhya and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be taken into consideration."

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMI (Badaun): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this Bill has been brought to replace the ordinance promulgated by the hon. President. It seems that this Bill would not achieve its objectives. It is said that this Bill has been brought to strengthen the communal harmony and brotherhood but it is not seen anywhere.

Now there are amendments to this motion for consideration. Those who want to move, may move their amendments.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say that by this Bill seeks to acquire, 67 acre of land, I remember that when 22.77 acre land in the same compound was acquired by the then U.P. Government, this House had expressed great concern over it and this was

Shri Syed Shahabuddin. Not present.

Shri Asht Bhuja Prasad Shukla Not present.

[Sh. Chinmayanand Swami]

protested throughout the country. At that time also my opinion was that the acquisition was right because its objective was to promote communal harmony and provide facilities to pilgrims, but this matter was challenged in courts. When the court held the acquisition, vid the first person to hail that decision was the Prime Minister. In that decision, it was held that the secular Government has no right to acquire public property for religious motives. I think, the present Bill seeks to do the same thing, whereas Kalyan Singh Government had acquired the land for promoting tourism. There was no hint of constructing the temple on the acquired land. But in this present Bill, it has been clearly stated that his acquisition is being done for constructing a temple and a mosque in that place.

17.22 hrs.

[SHRI RAM NAIK *in the Chair*]

In the Parliament on 18th December, from the side of ruling party it was said that a temple and mosque will be constructed there. What was the justification of such a statement? Today the question arises as to whether our Constitution permits any Government to form a trust and acquire land for constructing a temple or a mosque?

Hon. Mr. Chairman, Sir, when 22.77 acre land was acquired by the Kalyan Singh Government, only two temples namely 'Sankat Mochan' and 'Sakshi Gopal' were included in it but the present acquisition includes dozens of temples, dharmashalas and religious places. This Bill has made condition of these religious places very pitiable as these religious places have been locked from the day the ordinance was promulgated. The Bill states that this acquisition will provide facilities to pilgrims but functioning of dharmashalas have been forcibly closed and worship in these religious places have been stopped. I am unable to understand that at the time of first acquisition of 'Sankat Mochan' and 'Sakshi Gopal' temple

, the ruling party had opposed its acquisition including the demolition of the temple has been banned.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, through you I would like to say that when such act is done by U.P. Government, it becomes wrong and is opposed by ruling party but now the same thing is being done by the Central Government. So, what is its propriety?

It has also been provided in this Bill that a temple and the mosque will be constructed in that complex. But nothing has been stated in this Bill about the place where the temple will be constructed. Even for the place, which was Ramjanam-bhoomi and where the structure was located and about which the hon. Home Minister said that a dispute is going on since long for that place, it has not been stated that the temple will be constructed there. It has been stated that it will be left vacant and the status quo should be maintained as on 7th of January, 1993. I could not understand whether it was the bone of contention. What is the justification of this Bill if it can not solve that problem? That place will remain vacant and one either side a temple and a mosque will be constructed. When the devotees of Rama will come there, they will become irritated by seeing the place vacant, where there was Ramjanam bhoomi temple and where the devotees used to gather. When the Muslims will come to the mosque to offer namaz, they will also become irritated by seeing the place vacant, as once upon a time their mosque existed at that site. As a result, this will instigate the feelings of acrimony in both the communities. Through this Bill efforts have been made to keep the dispute alive between both the communities for a long time.

It has been said that a temple and a mosque will be constructed side by side. It is a good proposal, but the temple and the mosque are built with bricks and namaz and puja are linked with sentiments. If our sentiments are not clean and controlled and a feeling of brotherhood is not created, the temple and the mosque standing side by side will not bring goodwill, but will only give

way to clash. If a big temple and a big mosque is constructed there, there will be lakhs of devotees to worship at both the places and the azan at the masjid and the sound of Arati bells and conch from the mandir will be heard at the same time. This will result in arati becoming "maha-arati" and namaz becoming "bari-namaz". The hon. Minister is well aware what happens in the country when these things take place, as this is the issue of his state also. So, the background of sentiments should also be looked into and the temple and the mosque should be constructed accordingly. The mosque should certainly be constructed. There is no question of temple there. The struggle which is going on there is for the janambhoomi. I have repeatedly said in the House that temple and mosque can be constructed any where, there sites can be changed, but the janambhoomi cannot be changed. Even a single inch of that place cannot be shifted. Even Lord Rama cannot change the janambhoomi because he had born there. If one has faith, he should accept this fact and should give up the idea of changing the place of janambhoomi. Where the idol of Ram Lala is installed today, our cultural faith and faith of crores of Ram devotees accept that place as the janambhoomi and a temple should be constructed there. The mosque should be constructed at the place available near the tomp of Mr Baki at Sahanva. Land should be acquired there and a mosque should be constructed there with the Hindu-Muslim cooperation. Government should not under take the work of constructing temple or a mosque. I have said hereon the 18th of December last year that whenever the Governemnt takes up renovation work or construction of any worshipping place, we are aware of its implications. We have seen the results of Akal Takht. So, we should not say that the temple and the mosque should be constructed at the Government expenses and under its supervision. It should be left for both the communities to create an atmosphere of peace and cooperation and undertake construction work as a joint venture. There is already a Ramjanam-bhoomi Trust registered in 1989. At that time, Congress was in power at the state as well as the centre.

This Ramjanam bhoomi Trust had organised the Ram-shila puja programme and bricks were brought from the entire country. People had given donations of Rs. 1.25 each to the Trust for the construction of the Ramjanambhoomi Temple and total amount was more than Rs. 8 crores.

This Trust enjoyed the support of society, saints and the Governemnt. Today, a ban has been imposed on Vishwa Hindu Parishad, but there is no ban on this Trust. Under the supervision of this Trust, work of carving on the stones for the construction of the temple is going on at one place in Ayodhya. When this Trust is undisputedly working for the construction of the temple and it has the support of the Government, the society and the saints, I do not understand why another Trust is being set up for the construction of the temple. The Government is also making efforts in this regard.

Recently, a convention of the saints was held. A lot of hue and cry was used to be raised whenever the Bhartiya Janta Party or the Vishwa Hindu Parishad held any convention or any legislator or Minister of the BJP attended any Conference. But recently, a big conference of saints was held at Madhya Pradesh. It is being said that a lady Member of the ruling Party has attended it and a Minister has indirectly helped in making the conference successful by extending some help from Jagnath Puri. Whatever you are doing in the name of secularism (dharam-nirpecksha or panth-nirpecksha) will create disintegration in the country. You are thinking of dividing the saints also. First you divided the soecity, then the communities and now you have an eye on the unity of the saints. You want to divide them also. I respect secularism (path-nirpekshta) and understand that its roots are much deeper in our country than any other country. But panth-nirpekshta and dharam-nirpeckshta are two different things. Dharma-nirpeckshta can never be panth-nirpeckshta. This House should atleast understand the difference between dharam and panth, because this is the highest body of the country and the entire nation have faith that the persons sitting here are week experienced.....

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: In view of this the term Panth-nirpeckshta has been used in the Constitution.

SHRI CHINMA YANAND SWAMI: Jha Ji. I am also saying that it is being openly used as dharam-nirpeckshta today. Everywhere, whether it is newspapers, magazines or the Government media, dharam-nirpeckshta is being used. I have said it last time also and I thank you for supporting me, but I do not know why the difference between dharam-nirpeckshta and panth-nirpeckshta is not being understood or made to understand.

The meaning of dharam-nirpeckshta is being established as no-religion today. I would like to say that this country has always remained panth nirpecksha and will remain so in future also. It has never been dharam-nirpecksha and never will be. This country has always understood the values of religion properly. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, whose birth day is being celebrated today, was a socialist leader. He wrote a book named "Ram Krishna Shiv" and he had started the tradition of 'Ramayan Melas' in this country. He had started Ram melas in Chitrakoot and Ayodhya because he was aware of the fact that to revive and strengthen the cultural links, social set up and to establish ideals for the society, it would be necessary to establish ideals like Rama. His ideals should be established here with full reference. I would like to submit that secularism is not the spirit or thought of this country. Equal regard towards all sects is certainly the spirit or thought of this country. Religion is not a way of worship. A Bill has been introduced in the Rajya Sabha, copies of which have been circulated to us also. That Bill has been introduced by an hon. Member belonging to the ruling party and he has used the word 'Dharma' (religion) in the sense of a way of worshipping. I would like to state that Religion is not a way worshipping. (*Interruptions*) 'Panth means a way of worship Religion is a way of life and way of life is essential for all those who are living, whether it is a community or a nation. Man needs a way of life. Religion is a way of life and it needs neither a 'Guru' (teacher) nor a 'Granth' (scripture).

A religion can survive without a 'Guru' and a 'Granth' (*Interruptions*) But a 'panth' (sect) requires both a 'Guru' and a 'Granth' to survive (*Interruptions*) I am talking of 'Panth'. It is up to you if you don't want to understand it. A 'Panth' survives under the guidance of a 'Guru' and 'Granth'. This is what I want to convey to you. That is why Khalsa Panth was formed a long ago. There has been a reference to 'Nanak Panth' and many other Panths including Kabir Panth. Panths were referred to as communities afterwards. Religion has been a way of life. Therefore, irreligiousness cannot be thrust upon this country in the name of sēcularism. Equal regard towards all sects has been respected in this country and it should be respected.

Mr. Chairman Sir, in this context, I would like to submit that Ram and Ayodhya cannot be associated with a particular sect or cult. Ayodhya is a place which was visited by Guru Gobind Singh and Guru Nanak Dev. It is the place where Mahatma Buddha, Mahavir Swami went. Memories of all of them are associated with this place. People of all religions realised the greatness of Ayodhya and gave due respect to this place. Therefore, I would like to state that if at all the Government intends to restore communal harmony and amity through this Bill, Ayodhya could prove to be a very useful medium for it. The only initiative the Government should take is that the land acquired for building temple should be given to the Ram-Janam-Bhoomi Trust. So far as the question of building to mosque is concerned, Government may acquire land in Sahnawan and building the mosque with the cooperation of the people of both Hindu and Muslim communities. A solution to the problem can be found easily in this manner. This can pave way to creating conditions for communal hāmony in the country. Mr Chairman, Sir, with these words, I thank you.

[English]

17.37 hrs.

SHRI A CHARLES (Trivandrum): Sir, it is with great agony and pain and with a sense of shame that I stand to support this sensitive

piece of legislation, that is, Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Bill, 1993.

Paragraph 2 of the Bill is dealing with the purpose for which this Bill has been brought forward. It is said:

".....that the dispute has affected the maintenance of public order and harmony between different communities in the country".

It is not the public order and harmony between the different communities in the country alone that has been affected, but it has its repercussions all over the world. We know how, all over the world, the above dastardly act of the demolition of the disputed structure has been condemned. The 6th December 1992 is the darkest day in the history of independent India. What has been demolished is not only an old disputed structure. You may call it a mosque and another person may call it a temple. But, as has been stated by Shri Indrajit Gupta on a previous occasion, it is a place of worship. It is a place of worship that has been demolished on the 6th December. Sir, I may even say that what has been demolished is not only a place of worship, but it is the demolition of the pristine Hindu faith which has influenced the Indian thought process from time immemorial and continues to hold the Hindu society even today. I do not, even for a moment, believe, that the perceptions and consciousness of the bulk of the Hindu brethren have changed from the above sublime faith, the basis of which is tolerance. But, quite unfortunately, the religious fundamentalists under the RSS, VHP, BJP combine has brought disgrace, discredit and shame to such a noble faith and to the vast majority of our Hindu brethren. What is the essence of Hindu faith?

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHAN-

DRA KHANDURI: If an experienced parliamentarian like Shri Charles has to read out his speech, it only shown how weak their case is and his heart is not in what he is saying. This is my point of order.

SHRI A CHARLES: I am making a speech; I can very well do otherwise. Please do not teach me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me give the ruling. He has raised the point of order. His point of order is correct. You can refer to your notes. You should not read it verbatim.

SHRI A. CHARLES: I am only referring to the notes. I am not reading it verbatim. I shall not read the entire thing. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not disturb him.

SHRI A. CHARLES: There are certain quotations to which I have to refer. If my knowledge is correct, the Rig Veda is perhaps the oldest of any literary work of the human race. In the *Samahita of Rig Veda*, pure faith has been enunciated. It is said and I quote:

"Ekam Sat Viprah Bahudha Vadanti"

that is, "Reality is one. Seers describe it in different ways."

From this original source flows the stream of tolerance and respect for different faiths which is the essence of Hinduism. We on this side of the House totally respect such a religion. We totally respect the sentiments of the Hindu faith. The deep inflow of the thought has influenced the country all through the centuries.

Again it is this noble faith which finds expression in the *Bhagawat Gita* also. Here, Lord Krishna tells

Arjun:

"In whatever way people approach me, I appear to them in the same way. All those paths which people

[Sh. A. Charles]

follow to reach me as my paths."

It is this brand of Hinduism which Swami Vivekananda expounded before the first Parliament of Religions in Chicago on 11th of September, 1893.

I may say in all humility that was the first World Religious Conference that had shaken the entire world, that had shaken the faith of different religions, and there flowed a stream of common faith.

Before the assembly of saints and leaders of all faiths, Swami Vivekananda said that he was proud to be the follower of a faith that had taught tolerance, acceptance and universal brotherhood. He told the august gathering the Hindus not only tolerate other faiths, but also believe in their correctness.

It is really sad that hardly a century after Swami Vivekananda gave such a great leadership and expounded the real essence of Hindu faith in such a great gathering, on the 6th of December, a mosque built around 1528 was demolished in independent India by the fundamentalists and obscurantists of a religion. It is a disgrace on the Majority of the people of the noble faith.

I come from Trivandrum. Eighty per cent of my electorate are Hindus by faith. I belong to a minority community. This is the third time I have been elected from this prestigious constituency. I respect them. I bow before the electorate. It has a religious culture of Hindu faith. In all humility, let me ask my friends on the other side: what is the essence of Hindu faith? I have been listening to the speech of the previous speaker, Shri Chinmayanand Swami. He asked: can any secular Government acquire land for the construction of a temple?

What is the manifesto of the Congress Party? I will bring this to their notice. It is not the basis of this manifesto that the present Government functions. Our manifesto says that we are for a negotiated settlement. It is

is not possible, the verdict of the court has to be accepted. If that is not acceptable, we are for the construction of the temple without demolishing the mosque. This is our manifesto. It is the manifesto of the Congress Party. We are governing this country. It is the manifesto that has been accepted by the people of this country. In a democracy, it is that manifesto which prevails. So I may say in all humility that this Government has every right to acquire the land to construct the temple and the mosque. This is the mandate given by the people.

Sir, a complaint has been made that several temples have been demolished. I was a member of the Parliamentary delegation that visited Ayodhya; that was a great day for me. I saw the old structure. I saw the neglected land. The people of that area were not bothered about what was happening there. But people from Kanyakumari and Kasargod were bringing each brick for the construction of a temple for Lord Ram. In all humility, may I ask a question to the friends on the other side? I have quoted this once before also. We have also learnt Ramayana in our younger age. Bhagwan Shri Ram was approaching Valmiki's hut and when he reached there, he asked Valmiki, "Where should I stay for night?" And immediately the answer came from the great Maharishi, "Where there is no lust, where there is no light, where there is no enemy, where there is no anger, where there is no fight, where there is no ill will and where there is no war, in such a heart, Oh, Chief of Love, Thou should abide." If Lord Ram is to come again, will he go to that disputed land which is full of enemy, war and jealousy? I think my friend is also one of the leaders of the Saint. He was complaining about the demolition of the temples. I have myself seen as to how many idols have been removed at the time of Kar Seva and before that. So, you are at liberty to demolish the temple. You can demolish many places of worship. But when the Government is trying to construct the temple, you are very unhappy about the whole thing. Sir, they say that when the UP Government acquired the land, we were not supporting that. It is very fantastic to say that the UP

Government has acquired the piece of land for tourism. So, do you say that Bhagwan Shri Ram is coming there for tourism? I am afraid that you need not construct a temple for Bhagwan Shri Ram is coming there for tourism? I am afraid that you need not construct a temple for Bhagwan Shri Ram for tourism. We are constructing the temple for the believers who worship the Lord. My friend on the other side is not present here. He said that Shri Ram was born at Ayodhya and that it is a question of faith. I am really shocked to hear such a statement from religious leader. The point whether Shri Ram was born there or not is a question of fact. It is not a question of faith. This question of faith is a deeper faith of the Hindu and that is the rich culture of the Hindu, that is, tolerance and brotherhood. This is faith. Sir, one thing is very surprising. The three domes over the Babri Masjid were small constructions.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): How will you prove the birth place of any Saint or God?

SHRI A. CHARLES: I will tell you. Shri Ram should live in the mind of the people and not in the building and to say that centuries back, a birth took place in this part of the room and not in that part of the room is a disgrace to womanhood. Sir, excuse me for saying this. You say that centuries back, a particular birth took place in this part of the house and not in that part of the house. I do not have any language to explain it. This Government gave them permission to construct the building. The depth of the inner wall is only ten feet. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Minister of Home Affairs was not present at that time. Through you, I would like to bring to his notice that this morning when Zeor hour was going on, the disturbance created by pigeons had disrupted the proceedings of the House, as a result of which their Cabinet colleagues had left the

House. Now the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has arrived. He may please get it investigated wither disturbance was caused by pigeons or something else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is good that you have reminded, this building is under the contrve of the hon. Speaker.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Through you, I have just submitted to him.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Speaker must have given some direction in this regard.

[English]

This has nothing to do with the Bill. Mr. Charles, you kindly continue... (Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES: Again, a point has been raised that the Government should construct the temple. The Government is not constructing the temple! The Government has offered a package and a trust is formed. One hon. Member has also said that we must try to arrive at a consensus. This is exactly what the Government is trying. We are for consensus. As a matter of fact, that is the first thing that we want and it is clearly mentioned in our manifesto also. All that we appeal to you is that you should all come together and find out a way as to how the temple is to be constructed. It my hon. friends can prove that centuries and centuries ago, Lord Shrirama was born at a particular spot and not ten feet away from that spot, I assure that the Government will immediately take steps for the construction of the temple exactly on that spot. If you can produce concrete proof, Government will surely accept it. But in all humility, may I say that it is a disrespect to the metherhood of our country?

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY (Jagatsinghpur): Then, what is the logic of referring it to the Supreme Court to see whether there was a Mandir or not?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S.B. CHAVAN): I reply to that point also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Choudhury, when you get your turn, you can raise all your points. Please do not interrupt.

SHRI A. CHARLES: I can reply the hon. Member's query too. We are only trying to arrive at a consensus and for that purpose, we are collecting the opinions of all. We are seeking the opinion of the Supreme Court also. There is not the final say. We are trying to arrive at a consensus and we are collecting facts. The opinion of the Supreme Court, which is sought by the Government, will also be evaluated. There is no problem about it. If somebody is confused, I am sorry, I cannot help him. I can only present facts and explain them. But I cannot make one understand.

Now Sir, what is the purpose of Rath Yatra, Ekata Yatra, Kar Sewa and so on? All these have resulted in communal hatred and communal ill will all over the country. My friend was telling that they want only communal harmony and nothing else.... (Interruptions) I am concluding Sir. I would request the hon. Members not to disturb me.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: I am on a point of order. Please allow me.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT) AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): Sir, in the name of point of order, they cannot keep on intervening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can take care of it. If he is making a frivolous point, I will not allow it. Please leave it to me.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Mr Chairman, Sir, the Minister is

absolutely right. He is only saying that hon. Members can intervene without raising a point of order!

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Such intervention on the part of the Minister is very bad!

MR. CHAIRMAN: All Members and Ministers are equal in this House. No Member should raise unnecessary points.

Yes, Mr. Anna Joshi, what is your point of order.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, Thank you, the House should not be misled by what the hon. Member has submitted here at this moment. In order to keep the record straight I would appeal to him.... (Interruptions) the information to be furnished to the House should not be misleading. It is on record that during the Rath Yatra there was not even a single incident throughout the country right from Kashmir to Kanyakumari..

MR. CHAIRMAN: On what basis you are raising your point of order? Under what rule?

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: Hon. Members' statement that communal disturbances took place following the Rath Yatra is not correct. There is no such record.

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. Please sit down.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: But Sir, he is making a misleading statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: If I have the permission of the Chair, I request that Shri Nitish Kumar should withdraw his remarks. (Interruptions)

SHRI A. CHARLES: Kerala is the one State where we had communal harmony but unfortunately after the aftermath of *Kar Seva* and 'Rath Yatra' dozens of people were killed on the streets. That is why I am saying that the result of this 'Rath Yatra' was only communal hatred and ill-will among others. (Interruptions)....

[Translation]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon'ble Member, Please do not interrupt him. He is just concluding.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI A. CHARLES: So, I would like to know the BJP's stand on the whole issue.

If you just go through the records of the proceedings of the House, more than half-a dozen times different statements were made by the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Shri L.K. Advani, while participating in the debate on a previous occasion said, "Babri Masjid cannot be demolished but it shall be removed." I do not know how it can be removed without demolishing it. And then he said, "The decision has been taken not by the court but by the people of India."

Has this party any respect for the Constitution of India? If this party has any respect for the Constitution of India, can the Leader of that Party say in the House that the decision has to be taken not by the court but by the people of India? Is it their argument that 'might is right'? Are we going back to the barbaric days when there were no laws? Have we got any respect for the law? Sir, for the large interest of the country, for the protection of secular fabric of our country, I only plead let us come together, discuss together and come to an understanding.

If you go through the proceedings of this Session only, you will come to know how much time has been wasted on non-issues. There was a complaint that the Railway

Budget has not been taken up. Sir, the whole agenda is now centred on Ayodhya alone. In humility I would ask my friends on the other side to search their heart and tell us is it their anxiety or is it their faith to build a great temple for Shree Ram or is it a politically motivated approach?

There are no houses for the people of our country. Our economy is in shambles. We are unable to provide employment to our educated unemployed people. We are not able to provide health care for our people. A man on the street is not cared for. Without bothering about these problems they are concentrating all through these years only on one agenda that is to build a temple for Shree Ram. I am sure even if they build a temple like that Shree Ram will not be present there because I remember the words of Rabindra Thakur. He said, "God is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground where the path maker is breaking the stones." So, he is found among these people only. You go to the common man in the street. Try to share his agony. Try to take away his pain. That is the only thing one can do.

With these words I support the Bill. And, I congratulate the Minister for bringing forward a Bill so that the great problem which has eaten away the body politics of our country can be removed.

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is almost 6'0 clock. I would like to bring it to your notice that this is a month of Ramzan. Some of our Muslim M.Ps. had requested and even I had got an opportunity to visit the hon. Speaker. Shri Shahabuddin and some Members of Janata Dal were also there. All the hon. Members had pointed out that if the proceedings of the House continue after 6 0' clock neither he would be able to hear the views of the hon. Members nor the Members would get an opportunity to express their views. Thereupon the hon. Speaker had agreed that the discussion on this subject would continue tomorrow, though it is to start today itself.

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

Therefore, we would like you to seek the opinion of the August House and let it be adjourned at 6 P.M. in consultation with the Members of the House.

18.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The opinion of the House would be taken into account but it has already been decided that the House would sit till 7 P.M. today (Interruptions) Please listen to me first. (Interruptions) Please sit down. Let Shri Nitish Kumar conclude his statement.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: It had already been decided that the discussion would be completed tomorrow. Today when the debate is going on even after 6 O'clock you may well realise the importance of the Ayodhya issue. A number of hon. Members are likely to speak. Neither a particular side is being given an opportunity to speak nor other side is getting an opportunity to hear. Tomorrow the discussion on it would continue throughout the day and keeping this fact in view, I would request to stop this discussion now and resume it tomorrow.

KUMARI UMABHARTI (Khajuraho): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is the opinion of all. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please express your own opinion. After listening to the opinion of all, I shall consult the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Please speak one by one.

KUMARI UMABHARTI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank a lot. As Shri Nitish Kumar has said just now that this a matter of national importance and several hon. Members in-

cluding those who want to express their opinion as also those who want to hear the views of others would be deprived of the opportunity. Therefore, my submission is that the debate on this issue should be stopped today and be taken up tomorrow.... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): A special request to you, Sir that this is a very important Bill and many Members who want to speak on this Bill are not here. They also want to hear the speeches of the Members. So, this can be taken up tomorrow. This is our special request. Speaker has also agreed to this proposal to adjourn it today at 6 O'clock and this can be taken up tomorrow. You also declare 26th as a holiday... (Interruptions)....

[Translation]

SHRI VIJOY KUMAR YADAV (Nalanda): Sir, I do agree to what is being suggested here. Keeping the opinion expressed by the Members in view and it being a month of Ramzan, the discussion should be stopped today and be resumed tomorrow.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT) AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the whole House seems to be in the mood to go at 6 O'clock. Moreover, I heard that a Member of our Panel of Chairmen has mentioned that he has spoken to the Speaker and is informing the House that the Speaker has agreed to their suggestion. In this background....

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN: May I request one thing, Sir? Tomorrow again, not only this Bill but there are other Ordinances also which have to be passed and I am sure after the discussion tomorrow, again the same problem will arise. Now, it is 6 o'clock, tomorrow all the business should be over.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: You also declare 26th as a holiday.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMAN-GALAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, everybody is in rush. I think we must realise that we have done work. It is not that we have done no work. We have passed a lot of Bills quickly in the last few days. There is one more important Ordinance which is being passed in the Rajya Sabha, which is coming to this House and which has to be passed. I am informing for the purpose of information. Let it not be considered as the last Ordinance. There is one more left.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: You have to re-schedule the whole thing. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs should appreciate this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we do like this. If you want, you can have a discussion within yourself.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMAN-GALAM: If they so insist that we should adjourn the House at six o'clock, I have no objection except that tomorrow we should not lengthen this discussion endlessly. We should also think within the limitations and do it quickly. Tomorrow, we must do at least two more Ordinances; otherwise, we cannot finish our work; at least that they must agree.

The Speaker has indicated that we should keep our rate of three Bills a day; otherwise, we cannot complete our busi-

ness, because 31st March, we have two Budgets to pass; We have the Finance Appropriation Bill to pass; we have the Railway Budget to pass. (*Interruptions*) we shall decide in the Business Advisory Committee about the holiday on the 26th, not here. We must evaluate our work; and let us take a consensus on it. (*Interruptions*) Then we cannot do any work. I am sure, the House is supreme; but I am sure that the House would not think that we should not work at all. If that is the suggestion, please understand that we have a statutory limitation. By March 31st, we have to finish the Ordinances and the Railway Budget. (*Interruptions*). We need your cooperation. If you say, every day is going to be a holiday, we cannot.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: Every day cannot be a holiday. Kindly yield and I will give you a solution. The solution is very simple. (1) Let 26th be declared a holiday for the sake of the Minorities Year. It is their biggest festival; if we do not allow them to go home, that will be a slur on us. (2) What needs to be passed before the 31st March are the vote on account only - both for the railways and for the general budget. Let us try not to do anything else but pass the Ordinances and pass the vote on account and do not try to indulge in a general discussion on either the Railway Budget or the General Budget; all that can be held up till the recess ends.

The general discussion on the budget cannot be rushed through like this. On 29th, 30th and 31st, we will pass the vote on account, we shall pass all the Ordinances so that the Government's work is not halted. But for a general discussion, the Constitution permits you to have it as almost all the States do to have the discussion after the recess either in April or in May. And 26th should be declared a holiday in view of these constructive suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far as this sugges-

tion for any further holiday is concerned, the BAC will decide about it; they know it; and your representatives are also there.

So far as today is concerned, it appears that there is a consensus that we should not work after six o'clock. The Parliamentary Affairs Minister is also agreeable this time.
(Interruptions)

SHRI NIRMALKANTI CHATTERJEE: I made this suggestion on behalf of those who cannot come in the BAC being a small

Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That has been noted by your Leaders as well as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11. A.M.

18.09 hrs

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, March
24, 1993/Chaitra 3, 1915 (Saka)*