

Development Programme.

- (2) Thirty-Eighth Report on action taken on 148th Report (8th Lok Sabha) on Avoidable expenditure on procurement of cartridge tapered roller bearings.

- (3) Thirty-Ninth Report on action taken on 165th Report (8th Lok Sabha) on Procurement and utilisation of track materials.

- (4) Fortieth Report on action taken on 166th Report (8th Lok Sabha) on Working of Land and development office.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Twenty -Fourth Report

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS AND DEPARTMENT OF OCEAN DEVELOPMENT) (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 18th December, 1992."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 18th December, 1992."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: We are not taking up

matters under Rule 377 today. We will continue the discussion on the No confidence Motion.

Shri Owaisi.

12.08 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

[Translation]

SHRI SULTAN SALAHUDDIN OWAIISI (Hyderabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit my views before the House regarding the Babri Masjid and the way the demolition has taken place. The Babri Masjid Action Committee was always ready to resolve the issue through negotiations. These were held during the Prime Ministership of Shri V.P. Singh and Shri Chandra Shekhar. We did participate in the discussion initiated by Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao. The negotiations were held three times. It has always been the Vishwa Hindu Parishad people who have brought it to the breaking point. Documents were exchanged. We have given them in writing. Three Ministers were associated in this work. You can very well imagine from one instance. It was asked whether Muslims would like to forgo their claim if it was proved that mosque was built by demolishing a temple. At that time we put a query. We asked them whether they would like to withdraw their case if it was proved that the mosque was not built by demolishing any temple. In return, the reply was that the question did not arise. You can imagine very well their attitude to this dispute.

The second question was as to why idols were kept there later on when the construction of this Masjid took place in the 15th century. The reply was as the Muslims had voted for Muslim League during the elections held in 1946, we had installed idols to make India a Hindu Nation. It was explained in a written statement. Now it has become clear what the matter was. The matter has been raised just to capture power and make

[Sh. Sultan Salahuddin Owaisi]

India a Hindu Nation. It shows the intensity of the situation.

Shri Sharad Pawar himself suggested to both the parties to exchange the documents and said that decision would be taken by the Government, we were ready to accept it in writing. But the people belonging to the V.H.P. were not ready to give it in writing. After that 6th of December was fixed for the 'Kar seva'. Now you tell us the logic behind it. It is said that they got some proof during demolition. But the point is that nothing was found during digging. But you say that these things were found only after digging. Now you are showing the pictures of those things. I would like to submit that you as well as the House should examine the way this matter has been raised. Time and again we have been drawing attention of the Government that their intention is not good and they will demolish the Masjid. Despite drawing attention of the Ministers, nobody paid any heed to it and the Babri Masjid was demolished. I would like to say that the Masjid should be rebuilt. In this connection, I would like to say that along with the V.H.P. The Congress Government is also equally responsible. The carelessness and negligence on the part of Government has caused demolition of the Masjid. When it is demolished you simply express regret. You tell us as to why the Muslims were fired bullets at either chest or head throughout the country. Have the Muslims no right to protest in India? Are we second class citizens? Therefore, we want that judicial inquiry may be conducted in every State. Muslims who have lost their lives and property worth crores or rupees should be given Rs. 5 lakh each as compensation. Guilty police officials must be transferred. Besides, we would like that the Masjid should be constructed at the same site. In brief I would like to say that the Government should suspend the chief Ministers of Bombay and Gujarat as large scale violence took place in these two States. More than 200 Muslims were killed there. Property worth lakhs of rupees has been destroyed. They were made targets and killed by bullets and their property worth

lakhs of rupees was looted. Are you not responsible for it...*(Interruptions)* Now you are clapping. But remember, tomorrow you will mourn. The rule of the B.J.P. is responsible for the entire destruction caused to us. The Government of the B.J.P. wants to capture power at the cost of Muslims. But they should be aware of the fact that these tactics will not last long. It should be understood that the way things are happening shows that on the one hand B.J.P. is doing something and on the other the Congress is encouraging them. Nobody understands what actually is happening?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I mean to say that the Masjid should be rebuilt there. If the Government really feels sorry, it should rebuild the Masjid at the same site. Undoubtedly it will prove its sincerity. If it does not construct the Masjid, it will be as per the Urdu couplet "*Too Mara Jaisa Kar, Main Roz Aisa Karta Hun*". Until and unless action is taken against those guilty officials who fired bullets at Muslims and compensation is given to them, you will not be able to assuage their hurt feelings. Remember one thing. A lot of tension has been created till now. It will have far reaching and serious repercussions. You will realise it later on. If such a situation continues, I fear what will happen in future. I would like that the present Government should take concrete steps and rebuild the Masjid so that the situation improves.

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH (Rajgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the judge asked the Attorney General, U.P. Government (B.J.P.) in the Supreme Court after the incidence of 6th December.

[English]

"Now what is the credibility left of your Government"

[Translation]

He made a humble submission:

[English]

"Nothing My Lord".

[Translation]

In a word he expressed the credibility of B.J.P. Government in Uttar Pradesh. I understand that it is the first incident of its kind when the Attorney General hung his head in shame and said that he was not ready to plead their case of his client. This was the credibility of the B.J.P. on which the State Government was surviving.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is not present here today. He said that he would speak truth and nothing but truth. Swami Chinmayanandji said that truth is spoken but it is spoken from different angle. Mr. Speaker, Sir, a man like Swami Chinmayanand who has dedicated his life and taken Sanyas looks at truth from a different angle. Then what type of Sanyasi he is?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you assess this, whenever any affidavit is submitted and wrong statement is to be made, Swami Chinmayanandji and Rajmata do this job. This task is not performed by Mr. Singhal, Mr. Morodutt Pingle of V.H.P. because they belong to Sangh Pariwar. False statement is not made by the Sangh Pariwar. Swami Chinmayanand and Rajmata make such statements. Mr. Speaker, Sir do they not belong to the Sangh Pariwar?

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): He is talking about the Sangh Pariwar. If he has knowledge, he may explain what does the Sangh Pariwar stand for?

SHRIDIGVIJAYA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, 'Sangh Pariwar' is such a family wherein women are debarred. Only People from the particular class can join it. More than 95 per cent of the Indian population cannot become members of Sangh Pariwar. 'Sangh Pariwar' only enrolls affluent people as its members but the leaders issue statements. If it is a matter concerning communalism then Shri Advani would speak and undertake Rath Yatra and if they wish to show themselves as liberals then Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee would speak.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a

mention of the incident that took place on 6th December, I would like to ask Swami Chinmayanandji to tell us whether they have demolished the Mosque or the temple. Then we would accept his statement. First he should be clear in his mind whether the demolished structure was a temple or a mosque. What is the reality. At least there should be no confusion in his mind on this issue. He may tell us what they think about it. If they have demolished a mosque it is very bad but if it was a temple then they did the worst. What sort of Hindu you are? Mr. Speaker, Sir, what sort of truth it is that at least one lakh people were listening to the speech there and only 500 persons were demolishing the structure, nobody bothered to stop them....(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are happy that Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is present in the House, otherwise we were feeling that what type of 'Motion' is this when the mover of the 'Motion' himself is not present here. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been saying 'Jai Ram Ji Ki' and 'Ram Ram' in place of Namaste but 'Jai Shri Ram' is no way of saying 'Namaste' This is simply a slogan to declare war. Sir they say 'Jai Shri Ram' in such a manner is if they are scolding someone. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the country would have to differentiate between religion and communalism. It is good to be religious but spreading of fanaticism and communalism is wrong. Unless and until we are able to differentiate between these two terms, we cannot succeed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, they pretend to be religious but in fact they are not religious. Had they been religious they would not have used Sadhus and saints in their political interests. They would not have used Swami Chinmayanand to tell a lie in the court. I am also a Hindu and I would like to say that some saints are sitting over here, I do not know that how much do they know about the Hindu religion but I would like to ask them whether any Shilanyas Ceremony is taken up during 'Dakshinayan'? No it is never done. But they did it. We have also constructed a number of temples and the Shilanyas of these temples were done at Garbhsthal, it is never done at Sinhdwar. It is written in Ved

Shastras. But they have nothing to do with the religion and the faith.

Advaniji says that this is a question of faith and he considers Bhagwan Ram as an incarnation of God. But if he is an incarnation of god than have you ever read Golvalkar ji, who has said in 'Vichar navneet' that Bhagwan Ram cannot be taken as an incarnation of God because at the time of abduction of Sita he had cried like an ordinary person. On one side he talks about the faith but he has not read Golvalkar ji. In this context, the name of Sadhvi Ritambhara has been referred to. She has polluted the atmosphere of the country to such an extent as cannot be expressed. At the time of demolition of the Mosque, people say that she was raising slogans - "One more push and demolish the Babri Mosque." Can you call it a religious?

Apart from this, the Government of B.J.P. gave land worth 40 crore rupees to Ritambhara in Vrindavan on 2nd December. it is to be remembered that she is the main instrument in spreading communalism in the Country. The land worth crores of rupees was given just for one rupee - is it their religiousness...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Mr. Speaker, sir, hon. Member just now mentioned the name of Sadhvi Ritabhara in the House and alleged that she was giving a slogan that there is a need of one more push. My submission is that when Ritambhara ji cannot give her clarification in the House then how it is justified to level such allegations against her. I would like to say that this sentence should be removed from the proceeding. You cannot level allegations against a person who is not present in the House...(Interruptions)

SHRIDIGVIJAYA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the country neither needs Hindu fundamentalism nor Muslim one. Whatever it needs today, it is only liberalism. Today Atal Bihari Vajpayee ji is considered as a liberal by the Countrymen and we too are convinced of his liberalism. Today it is the need of the

hour that people like Atal ji should come forward: Respected Chandra Shekharji has invoked his 'Guru', a disciple has invoked his teacher....(Interruptions) Today it is the need of the hour that Guru ji should respond to the invocation of his disciple. Bhondsi Baba also needs you today....(Interruptions) Today he needs you and you too need him.

In order to fight against communalism, all liberal Hindus and Muslims will have to come together otherwise this country cannot be saved. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the character of Shri Advani ji is entirely communal. On one hand he condemns the happenings there but while giving an interview to the B.B.C. at the time of his arrest, he added fuel to the fire by saying that 50 temple have been demolished in Kashmir.

With your blessings, I had been to Srinagar with a Parliamentary Committee....(Interruptions) Kindly listen to me. Shri Madan Lal Khurana was also a member of that Committee. In his presence I asked the Chief Secretary there....(Interruptions) you keep mum. I asked the Chief Secretary to tell as to how many temples were demolished there. Sir, at that time, the Chief Secretary told in front of Shri Madan Lal Khurana that only 4 temples were slightly damaged and these have since been repaired and no temple was converted into a Mosque. Mr. Speaker, Sir I would also like to say something about Bhopal....(Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, the conference of All India Jamayate-e-Islami was held in Bhopal on 11, 12 and 13th of November, the main speakers included the senior leader of B.J.P., the State President of V.H.P. and Pracharak, of R.S.S. and an Independent M.L.A. belonging to minority community, who are in jail in connection with the riots there. These people participated in Jamayat-e-Islami Conference and the chief of the organisation praised the R.S.S. I would like to ask people if Jamayat-e-Islami is anti-national, can they tell me one instance when panchjanya or the Organiser has criticized the Jamayate-e-Islami. If it is not correct, I am ready to apologise for that.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, today these fanatic

and communalist forces and hatching a conspiracy to disintegrate and divide the country, therefore we must boycott them. I would like to tell the Prime Minister that he believed most unreliable persons; this is his fault and by believing such people, he got deceived but now it is not the time to be deceived.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to request the Prime Minister to keep himself at a distance from these Hindu fanatics and Muslim fanatics and go ahead with constructing a temple as well as a mosque there....(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, now the masjid cannot be constructed there. (Interruptions)

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I demand that the Government should build both the temple and the mosque there. Thereafter the idols should be installed in the temple and then only it should be decided as to whether that structure was a temple or a mosque. Then the Government should do as it wishes. But today the need of the hour is liberal attitude and goodwill. Therefore, today it is necessary to cultivate these things more and more. With these words, I express my thanks to you.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH (Fatehpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, today it appears that the Indian republic has been suffered a blow and we are seeing our faces in the shattered mirror of Indian republic. We are seeing our cracked images in the mirror, but as far as I take it the image of all of us has been shattered.

It is of little significance as to whose face is more shattered and whose less, unless efforts are made to join together the pieces and build and integrated image.

I think the structure which was demolished was virtually the justice and glory of Indian Republic. It is beyond discussion by the Government, the opposition party and others. It is our duty to protect the Indian Republic and all other things. You can

give any name to those domes but it should be noted that one more dome has been demolished here. That dome is of the Supreme Court. This dome has been demolished and if some more *kar Seva* is performed, its walls will be demolished. but I do not think that this Government can dare to do this. It is a different thing if it is demolished automatically. Similarly, it cannot construct it either, it is different if something is constructed automatically. All the claims of the Government are meaningless. When glory is lost, the claims too are lost. the demolition indicates that the promise of the hon. Prime Minister given from the Red Fort on the Independence Day has been broken. Moreover, this Government too has been become a skeleton. It too has been shattered therewith. Sometimes it appears that the Government is some company. today the situation is that if Shri Ashok Singhal declares that they are going to Mathura to demolish the mosques there and Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao says that the Government will protect them, people will think in their mind that the mosques would not be saved and probably they will be successful in demolishing these. This situation is very grave for Indian Republic. Here the dome of supreme Court has been demolished, the promise of the leader of the House has been broken and promise given by the leader of the opposition was broken. When Shri Advani gave us assurance that the instructions of the court would not be violated, we were extremely delighted. That time it was realised that the House is unanimous on this point.

I do not want to level any allegation, but my heart is broken. Sometimes the question arises as to what this system is. We have such institutions like Supreme Court (the judiciary), the Supreme Executive body and the Parliament. Moreover, there is the National Integration council which may not be a powerful body from legal point of view, but it has tried to evolve some moral ethics through which the people from various walks of life in the country may participate in it. In the previous meeting in which the B.J.P. also participated, all were hoping that the court orders would not be violated. But the National Integration Council has been reduced to a

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

mockery. Therefore, being a citizen of the country when I look to the N.I.C., the Supreme Court and the Government, I seem to me that the country is very much disgraced. When things have come to such a pass, it is a horrifying situation for the country.

But we have great confidence in the people of the country and we are sure that a solution will be worked out. We have failed to evolve any solution, they may succeed. But sometimes when our mind is disturbed, we are struck with disappointment very intensely, because today a question has cropped up in the minds of the citizens whether they will ever get justice from this system or not. The Supreme Court issued its orders and the highest executive made promises to follow them. Even then justice has not been done. I do not say so only because my brethren have a question in their mind, I say in my capacity as a citizen of this country, that if such a situation comes in the country it is very dangerous and it is called alienation.

Today our republic is confronted from all sides with several problems like those of Punjab or Kashmir. I do not want to go into details. Whenever lawful rights are not granted and manipulations are done to achieve certain objectives, the country has to pay a high price for it, and feelings are hurt. This has been our drawback and weaknesses. We accept that we had our own shortcomings and faults when we were occupying the benches opposite, I would not like to go into that debate. But there is a question, whether we should defend the Republic of India or the Government. The Government can go out of power, but our Indian Republic should not collapse. Today the Government has survived, but Indian Republic has collapsed.

The more valuable thing which has been fragmented into pieces is our joys and sorrows. It will go down in history that everything ceased to exist, the Government the Supreme Court, the Parliament. The joys and sorrows of the people of the country

have never been divided and if such a situation comes that even these have been divided then there will be no way left to save the country. On the 6th December, some people celebrated the occasion of the demolition, on the other hand, others mourned it. Mahatma Gandhi had united us to share our sorrows and joys together. But today our joys and sorrows have been divided into different groups. This is the most dangerous thing.

Sir, if it is said that, that act was not a part of our civilization and our entire civilization has always remained opposed to it, this too demands our contemplation. I do not consider it as a fight of religion. Gandhiji had said that politics cannot be separated from religion. But what did that mean to say-

[English]

"there is no politics without religion, not the religion of superstition and the blind religion that hates and thrives, but the universal religion of tolerance. Politics without morality is a thing to be avoided."

[Translation]

He clearly referred to the other characteristic of religion that was to fight and hate people in the name of religion. I do not admit that it is a religious war. If we concentrate on religion only, it is said in the Rigveda, "*Ekam Satya; Vipra Bahuda Vadanti*". It means that wise men express it in different ways, but truth is one. But if we insist, "*Vipra Bahuda Vadanti*" and whatever I utter and do is correct, the religion of the Hinduism suffers a setback. It has been said in our Yajurveda also, that "*Mitrasya ham chakchhusa bhutani sameekshhe*". It means that every creature should be seen from the eyes of a friend. today if we look at somebody with an eye of a foe and not of a friend, then our religion is not referred to. In Islam also, Allah has not been considered to be God for Muslims only, it has been considered to be god for entire human being. Gandhiji too reminded it. From this point of view, certain views expressed in the Vedas also will be contradicted. Thus in the Islam also, the Almighty has been considered to be for all human beings. But

efforts were made to divide Him also. In the Sikh religion, Nanak was born. Nanak was called mentor (Guru) by the Hindus and *Peer* by the Muslims. Today the country is in the need of Nanak. but where did our issue virtually become complicated? It happened so when it was said that their religious faith was above our Constitution and Republic. I admit that the so called religious faith triumphed.

Much has been lost in the process of achieving this victory. You can celebrate this victory. But how is it possible to run the country by categorising faiths? Will the faith of majority community dominate the faith of minority community merely because of its strength. It won't help to run the country, so there should be harmony among all the communities.

I do not want to raise the other question because I don't have the solution to it. People have different faiths - faith in religion, faith in politics, faith in moral values and so on. Even a literature has his own faith. A question arises in my mind, but I do not any find answer to it. There had not been a great 'Ram Bhakta' than Tulsidas. He came to Ayodhya and also lived in he Masque. but had he a slight inclination that it was a Ram Janambhoomi and an injustice had been done with regard to it them. he must have had written something about it at some place or the other. If he had not written in Ramcharitmanas, certainly he would have written in Vinay Patrika or in any of his other works. I cannot think that a Ram Bhakat as great as Tulsidas can be a hypocrite. Since I consider him a litterateur, I have been unable to understand why he had not expressed his anguish with regard to it anywhere. I may not have the answer to it, but my submission is that the reality has come to the fore and my illusion has been cleared.

It is true that we fought freedom struggle together to realise a dream of attaining freedom. We were studying in high school in class eighth or ninth. It was Gandhiji's dream. But today, when we have grown older, our dream has also faded. This dream was not

belied even after the death of Gandhiji. Perhaps it was because of the fact that new generation had also nourished the dream. Gandhiji did not die at that time, he died when he was refused to be accepted as the father of the nation. A person may die physically but continues to live as long as future generations remember him. Gandhiji died physically in 1948. Today, he is being refused to be accepted as the father of the nation. and it is a conspiracy for his sentimental killing. If this fact is realised, Ayodhya issue will become easy to be understood. This is the actual problem of Ayodhya and we will have to understand it. We will have to look back, to the freedom struggle, when Gandhiji fought with the Britishers, his objective was to free the country from foreign rule. He knew that unless Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, the downtrodden in India were united, it was difficult to attain freedom of the country from the Britishers. Some people were there at that time too who did not consider this objective as Supreme, they we fighting with Muslim brethren at that time and are fighting with them even now.

All had united to make the country free and this led to the establishment of some institutions or organisations which were the historic requirement of the time. Secularism was the outcome of sacrifices made by them. but we knew that the forces who belong to the other stream and have different ideology would come to clash with the institutions created during freedom struggle. that is what we are witnessing today. These forces are clashing sometimes with the parliament, sometimes with the Supreme court and sometimes with the Executive. There were people having different faiths in the country and there had never been any clash among those faiths. I would like to ask why there is a clash now? If we go through the history, we would come to know about it. It is not a struggle of Hinduism rather it is a struggle for Hindu supremacy. Had the motive been related with Hinduism there would not have been any tussle. Gandhiji had realised this. that is why he had said that it was a struggle for Hindu Supremacy or domination. The feeling of Hindu Supremacy or demination comes by birth whereas Hinduism

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

is the creation of mind. Man does not know how to argue when he takes birth, he is not aware of what sentiments are. We are born in a particular religion, therefore we should have supremacy. I do understand the agony of Atalji, if he thinks that we have not understood his agony at all, he may make us understand. This would satisfy him as well as we people. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee cannot stop this dynamics even if he wishes to do so. This dynamics would stop by amending the Constitution and by handing the power of Hindu Nation exclusively to Hindus. They are heading towards achieving that goal and I do not think that any of them is capable to stop them. They had assured that they would see to it that the structure is not demolished but they could not stop the people from demolishing it and the structure was demolished. Today they say that they won't allow this country to become a the cratic State. But such forces have already raised their heads and it would be difficult for these people to check these forces.

Today we are turning back the pages of history. We sometime, set the video in reverse and sometimes forward, Switching it reverse shows all that which we had seen earlier. Likewise the history would repeat itself. Why the photographers were not allowed to take photographs of the historic event that took place in Ayodhya. A historic event was taking place. They had succeeded in repeating the history. But when photographer went to record that historic even, they were beaten. When I was returning by air on 6th I saw that all the media persons of voice of America, BBS etc. were injured. They must have been guilty conscious and thus wanted photographs not to be taken. If they were not wrong they should have courage to allow the photographers to take photographs. Anyway, these people felt that there was need to cover the entire episode, and now those things cannot be undone. Now let us turn to the history of the world. A similar incident took place in Germany in the name of alienation. Jews were considered as foes. We have witnessed what happened in Germany, so these people should not tread

the same path. What will be the identity of our new culture if we abandon our old culture? Will *trishul* and knife be the symbol of our new culture. All right industries are being closed, we will include these things in cottage industry under the new industrial policy. They may be having a great ambition to reach Lal Quila but it does not require shedding blood at large scale to fulfill this ambition, as there are many other ways also....(Interruptions)

SHRI PHOOL CHAND VERMA
(Shajpur): what happened in regard to Mandal Commission? (Interruptions)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
I am just coming to it. He has referred to Mandal Commission, I will certainly come to it. Sir, that is why I am submitting that they are doing all this considering the birth as the basis and not the religion. The basis of recommendations of Mandal Commission is also birth. (Interruptions) Since you are considering the birth as the basis and not Hinduism....(Interruptions)

The people who want the country to be a Hindu nation on the basis of their being in majority will be answerable to those to whom they had enslaved for thousands of years. In this context, I consider this idea or thinking not only against the concept of Hinduism but also against Hindu Society and the down troddens. The total percentage of backward classes in the country is 52 and thus Hindus constitute just 60 per cent. What was their strength in Uttar Pradesh. Shri Kalyan Singhji claims that he had provided for reservation. It hardly matters if a few persons belonging to backward classes are made M.Ps of M.L.As. They withdrew the notification providing for 27 per cent reservation. (Interruptions) They suppress 80 per cent of the total population and claim themselves to be the custodians of Hindu Society.(Interruptions) We would discuss Mandal Commission in detail on some other occasion. However we leave this matter at this point. Therefore, what is required is not merely the secular political forces but the identification of secular political forces. Secularism cannot be established in the country unless these forces are identified.

Moreover, we will have to join hands and work unitedly. These forces have actually been enslaved for thousands of years from think point of view. The soul of these forces have also been put in shackles under the social system. It is easy to cut the shackles but it is difficult to unite the people shackles. But when we succeed in uniting them, then we would be able to find out a way.

I can say it with pride that Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav has shown the path (*Interruptions*) I would again repeat that it was a great challenge and Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav tackled the problem of Bihar. I was asked as to what is the alternative of the hon. Prime Minister, I said give a chance to Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav. (*Interruptions*) Everything would become clear. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, Shri Rajesh Pilot is there. I am mentioning the Minister and not the Ministry. Debate was going on that day and we expressed many apprehensions as to how the circumstances may take turn, Shri Kalyan Singh may resign etc. Deployment is not in his hands. But despite everything the hon. Prime Minister says that they have been cheated. How they have been cheated.

We lost power but we never used the word 'betrayal'. There was difference of opinion and we parted our ways, but we never complained that we were betrayed. You are betrayed only when you believe someone. What actually was going on between Advaniji and Narasimha Rao ji, was a sham wrestling based on mutual understanding. They had decided that none of them would win and the prize would be equally shared. They thought that thereby they would be able to save the country from a crisis and the credit for it would be shared by both of them equally. The problem was, however, that one wrestler was a bit more clever than the other. He saw that he was apparently having greater sympathy of the public than what was enjoyed by his fellow wrestler. So with the objective of encashing the sympathy of the public he thought of winning the state as well as getting the credit and that is how Narasimha Rao ji was

outwitted by Advaniji. This is the simple story. That is why Shri Narasimha Rao is saying that he was betrayed. I ask how it is a betrayal. He was getting the intelligence reports, and we had also apprised him of the developments. During the N.I.C. meeting we had also suggested that a receiver from the court should be appointed to acquire the place of dispute before anybody approached. We supported the Government on this issue because, you know, we are a secular force. The Government has been inviting all the secular forces to come to its rescue. This was the reason why we participated in the N.I.C. meeting. We never thought about the event of the 7th November when the Congress party was in Opposition and we were in power. Even then the situation was the same, the same issue was before us. The Congress party then opposed us on this issue. Yet we do not have any grudge against them. Today the situation is different. The Congress party is in power and we are in the Opposition. In spite of all these facts we did not oppose the stand of the Government, rather we supported the Government. This is simply because it hardly makes any difference to our policies whether we are in power or in the opposition. But the policy of Congress Party certainly changes with the change in its position. (*Interruptions*)

We all had raised this point as to what would Government do if Shri Kalyan Singh resigned at the last moment. At this the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, who is not present here at the moment said that in that case Atal Ji would appoint a new Chief Minister. You would recall that in the next day's issue of the newspapers the headlines screamed that the B.J.P. Government of Uttar Pradesh should be relied upon. You stood surety for them. When the Shilnyas was to take place the Government stood surety. Now once again the Government stood surety for them.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE
MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI KALP NATH
RAI): You had also relied upon them.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:
that is what I am saying. You stood surety for
the habitual offenders. You supported them

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

on all the past occasions. At the time of Shilanyas, at the time of raising the platform and at the time of the demolition of the mosque. (*Interruptions*)

Since it was a verdict of the court so I am not counting that, but this is very much clear that when the habitual offender whom the Congress Party supported did not act according to the wishes of the surety (Congress Party), then in that case the latter should accept responsibility and step down. Merely saying that we should not be punished for the misdeeds of others will not serve any purpose.

Further the hon. Prime Minister said that the demolition was preplanned. I simply wonder how does he say so in spite of the fact that he has the intelligence agency working for him besides that he has the support of the people of the country. How can we expect that he would be able to know about some foreign conspiracy being hatched against the country. Perhaps in that case he will come to the House and will say that he was unable to do anything because the army of that country was very large and he had believed that country. Our Minister of Defense keeps challenging. This is the scenario today.

The D.M. and the S.P. of the area were suspended. There were administrative lapses on the part of the top executive of the country. Will they not be placed under suspension for these administrative lapses?

13.00 hrs.

The hon. Minister of Defence should muster some courage to take some action. The hon. Prime Minister did not come to the House even after his (Minister of Defence) persuasion. Mr. Shakil Ahmed who is a Congress M.L.A. has written....

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH: The hon. Prime Minister enjoys the support of the entire Party.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I know that and that is why I am quoting from

the letter of an M.L.A. of the Congress (I). He is not an outsider. What he has written to the hon. Prime Minister is as follows:

[*English*]

"The demolition was either the result of your incompetence or the silent desire of your heart to cooperation".

[*Translation*]

Shakil Ahmed is an M.L.A. of the Congress Party. There can be no greater indictment of the hon. Prime Minister than this. You know, what he has written is very much right which all of them concede in their hearts but I know they cannot speak it out. This is their limitation. I had been with them for 22 years.....

THE MINISTER OF WELFARE (SHRI SITARAM KESRI): Mr. V.P. Singh, this is not true. You know I spoke on the Mandal issue. When there was a difference of opinion between Jai Prakash Narayan Ji and Indira Ji, at that time I asked Indira Ji not to speak against Jai Prakash Narayan Ji. You are a witness to that and I would like to say that there are persons in the Congress Party who can protest and speak out.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Shri Kesri is the only bold person among them. When we made the announcement regarding the implementation of recommendations of Mandal Commission Kesri Ji said in the Rajya Sabha that here was a bold man whom all should support.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Kesri ji, be bold enough now as you have done it in the past also. Do it again. Remove him and sit on the Chair of the Prime Minister. Think over it.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: What I say is true. They are talking of Ram, But I do not do so. We believe in 'Hey Ram' not in 'Shri Ram'. There is no need of referring to a Ram in whose name there was so much blood shed. I do not believe in it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH:

Sir, our demand for the resignation of the hon. Prime Minister was not politically motivated. The nation was facing a crisis. Had the hon. Prime Minister resigned on moral ground as penance on behalf of the country it would have created a sentimental effect throughout the country and abroad. Anyway we cannot resign on his behalf. He has the right to refuse to do so. But now it should be clearly borne in mind that his continuation as Prime Minister is only like taking a medicine whose expertly date is over. And which has out lived its utility. The hon. Prime Minister was first a victim of in action, but now he has started taking action. In the beginning he was so cautious in taking action that it was like administering chloroform to dead bodies before operating on them for the fear of a possible pain to the dead body. Now when he initiates action, he does not even think of the consequences that might follow. He is much worried about the effect and appeal of his action. General firing order has been issued in the affected areas. We had been just going through the notification banning R.S.S. According to the provisions of the Act the reasons for banning a particular organisation have to be recorded. In the normal course the matter should have been referred to the tribunal. The ban should have been made applicable only thereafter. But, of course, the Government enjoys the right of imposing a ban immediately and it did it. Nevertheless, the reasons for imposing the ban immediately should have been made clear. Well, the Government has provided the reasons for the ban imposed on the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal, but the reasons for banning the R.S.S. have not been provided. Does it not suggest that the Government has some secret understanding with the R.S.S. according to which the ban applies vide that notification but only to be referred to the Court of Law owing to the lacuna in the notification itself. When the case is taken to the Court by the R.S.S. Government would say that now it is to examine for the Court exdamine. All these things suggest that the Government went on committing mistakes one after the other under some compulsions to cover up a historical blunder. If the Government would

have been able to replace its helplessness by strength then this tragic event would not have occurred. The Government did not take any action at the proper time when we were pressing for it.

I would not take much time, but I would of course like to refer to certain events. There was a report of misbehavior with women in Surat for which we have to hang our head in shame. We had gone there. We found that the 80 per cent of the people killed died in police firing. The events, that took place in Assam are also painful. No complaints have been registered against the State forces nor the central forces. But generally the people said that they were trigger happy. In my constituency, a lady was sitting on the roof and she was shot dead. but no inquiry was conducted to ascertain as to what actually happened and who has behind it. people are certainly tormented. The Government takes recourse to the firing of bullets to curb terrorism in Punjab, Kashmir and elsewhere, all in the name of upholding the provisions of the Constitution, whereas at a different place for the same cause of protecting the constitution the Government makes use of rubber bullets. Here I would say that the Government is free to make use of rubber bullets. Three children came out in curfew. When their mother came to save them, they were shot dead. In such circumstances the forces can use rubber bullets but sometimes ferrous bullet are used. These are also fatal. Strictness may be tolerated but partiality, also ever little, cannot be condoned.

Temples have been destroyed in the neighbouring countries. It is a matter of great concern. It is a matter of principles and it is a question of minorities. The local journalists and also others here have refuted such reports. It seems that certain things are infillrating in this manner. Actually, the killings symbolise the struggle of the poor farmers. Price rise is not an issue for discussion in today's debate. Shri Manmohan Singh was working hard to bring down the prices. if the prices come down, this struggle would come to an end. When this problem will be solved Dunkel will say that he was waiting for a year and you are engaged in other activities. Has

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

the issue of providing fertilizers to farmers on subsidised rates been solved? Labourers have organised a big rally. Has the issue of retrenchment and unemployment been solved? It is a simple solution and it goes in the favour of some vested interests. I don't say who they are. But the best course is divert the attention of people from economic disparities by raising the bogey of religion and forge the unity among mill owners by raising the issues involving the clash of interest between Mill owners and labourers. Nobody gives even a penny extra in the name of religion. The debate on it has ended. therefore, I would like to say that all these things have been said to put an end to the debate. We are discussing Dunkel proposals. There was a report in the newspapers the other day that Shri Narasimha Rao was the best bet for the West. Is he a horse, who is staked in the race. He is our Prime Minister. We are sorrow to know that our Prime Minister has been called the 'best bet'.

In the end, I would like to say that we should create an awareness among the people to fight against hunger. It will put an end to communalism. We have also to fight a big battle for revival of the Republic. We will have to make efforts to create confidence and faith in the Republic. Our Constitution enshrines the words secularism and socialism but along with these words the phrase "Fraternity of India" are also there in our constitution. We have to make efforts to establish fraternity of India. With these words I conclude.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA (Nagaur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Through you, I would like to thank Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for presenting this Motion in the House because the House which was not functioning for last one week has now started working. He has presented the Motion and it is being debated upon. I have listened attentively to all the member who spoke on it. I would like to request the hon. members of Bharatiya Janata Party...

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Members of your party do not want to hear you.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I don't care for anybody. The world will listen to me. I would like to tell you whatever you are doing is not befitting the time. Time was different when Babar had came to India 475 years ago. Whatever he had done at that time is all none a part of the History. Is all that relevant today? It is worth considering. Today the world has come closer. One can go from one end to the other end of the world within minutes. There was not such thing during that time. At that time, weapons were different and wars were fought in a different way. Different kings used to rule and give judgements in a different way which all is recorded in the history. Suppose there was a temple and it was converted into a mosque then why have you converted it again into a temple? Why have you polluted the atmosphere of the country only in the name of that temple? The world can not forgive you for this repetition. The world is heading towards advancement in its own fashion. But India, having a population of 85 crore is the biggest democracy in the world, which has got its own constitution. If that constitution is neglected what will be the fate of the country? Today this is the question before us.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when country got freedom this party was known by the name of Jansangh Party. After that gradually this party became Janata Party and then the BJP. At that time the people of this party used to say something. For example I can quote the name of R.S.S. I would not like to go into details because today this organisation is banned. All the hon. Members know well about its culture and way of functioning. Today, you are thinking in the terms of the Hindu Rashtra. Who are those Hindus and what is their number? How many Hindus are with you? You should define the term Hindu and then the Hindu Rashtra will be formed. In spite of being Hindu why are we not with you? Because we both have different paths. You will talk of cow-slaughter but will not take care of cows. But, we who have cows are not Hindus, but you are Hindus? What difference? The temple will be constructed for Schedule castes but they would not be allowed to go near it. Is it your definition of Hindu Rashtra? You have alienated or separated the Muslims

and now you are alienating the Schedule Castes. You have alienated Hindus like Yadavs. Who talk of Mandal-Kamandal are not Hindus. Then how many people are with you? You should announce. What sort of Hindu Rashtra are you going to form? After that you should contest the elections. Your party came into power in assemblies due to our hardwork. We are not power hungry like them. they cheated us and ousted us from power. They have violated the law even after filing the affidavit in the Supreme Court. These people know me and I know them well. Shri Chinmayanand Swami said emphatically that saints are guilty for this. Is he not responsible for it? Now when 12-13 hundred people have been killed and their widow and children are helpless, will Chinmayanand ji say that saints are guilty for this?

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): Who is behind the killings in Delhi?

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: We will pay the price for that. It does not mean that if one murder is committed, You have been licensed to kill. If mistake has been committed then why are you committing another one? Don't do that because it is not in the interest of the country. Therefore, I would like to submit that old mistake should not be repeated any if the mistake is repeated then the country as well as you will be ruined.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV: What do you mean to say?

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I am addressing the Members of B.J.P. and those hon. Members who are sitting in the centre. Don't change your attitude. Don't be power hungry. People are delivering speeches. After a long speech ultimately they will say that they will not vote.

[English]

Otherwise, wrong signal will go to the people. Don't commit this mistake.

[Translation]

The congress had also once committed

a mistake, when we and you together were in power. At that time they were asked not to vote with B.J.P. but they voted. if you will also commit the same mistake here then you will have to repent for that.

[English]

Don't send wrong signals to the people.

[Translation]

Ram Vilas ji, you should also not make haste. The power will also come to you but it will income gradually.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: When power will come in our hands then you will come to our side.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I will not be there when power will come in your hands. I am speaking in the interests of the country. The country is above everyone. There are more than 85 crore people in the country and other problems have become secondary. where have we reached today? 1500 people have been killed but the result is nil. Today people living in several countries of the world have faith in Islam. The number of Hindus is limited in India, but there is a large number of Muslims in the world.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: Are you afraid of that?

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: There is no question of fear. But you people who are posing themselves as lions are virtually the lions in the cage. And these lions lack carouge. I am not that sort of person as you think I have understood the world well Mr. Speaker, Sir, how many Muslim countries are there in the world? What will you do if they stop supplying oil to us? We are producing only 25 million tonnes of oil and from where will you import 52 million tonnes of oil? From where will we get it? Oh, you are not realising the truth. There is a dire need of oil and power in the country....(Interruptions)

You killed Muslims and killed them in a way that the Muslims, in turn demolished

[Sh. Nathu Ram Mirdha]

Hindu temples. These people manipulation and come to power in four States. They had no majority in Rajasthan Legislative Assembly....(*Interruptions*)

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer): Lakhs of people have condemned you. 'Lalkar-Diwas' was adserved yesterday,

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I will cut you down to size.

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): You should read the statement made by Shri Chenna Reddy. It has been clearly stated that the Government of Rajasthan was a clean Government. Why don't you expel Shri Chenna Reddy.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: It was the worst and most immoral Government. You had wooed my 24 men to your side and made 16 of them Ministers. You inducted 16 people in the council of Minister and(*Interruptions*) *

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: That is not going on record.

[*Translation*]

SHRINATHURAM MIRDHA: They have done a great service to the people of Rajasthan. If they had not done so, they would have rebuked us for four long years.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: What have you done here?...(*Interruptions*) *

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever they are speaking will not go on record....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: He may be asked to make his speech separately. I will hear it. I will not interrupt him.

MR. SPEAKER: Mirdhaji, time is very

short.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: You please, ask them to keep quiet. I shall conclude very soon. I make a small speech. I was submitting that they came to power in four States. With their dismissal now, the problem has been resolved. Now, it has become clear that they will never be able to come to power. I can give it in writing. Remember, what I say....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Whosoever will speak without my permission will not go on record, (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Whatever you are speaking is not going on record.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: That is why it was essential to dismiss these State Governments because the Chief Ministers of these States have had no fair intention to implement the decisions taken by the Government of India. The Government of India dismissed all those governments after guessing their intention. A good job was done. I think action against banned organisations can be taken only in President's Rule. That is why dismissal was necessary.

Now I will say one thing more. The masjid was demolished. After demolition, these people are asking as to why Shri Narasimha Rao kept quiet. why did this Government remain silent. I think before making this allegation against our Prime Minister...

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): The hon. Member was speaking just now wearing a cap. Now he has removed his cap from his head. Is removing a cap like this, which is an ornament of head, in accordance with the rules. I want to submit only this thing. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: My head was sweating.....(*Interruptions*) You should listen to me at least. You have made your point, now let me make my point. I was

submitting that first of all the supreme Court of India trusted the Government of Kalyan Singh. It thought that since an affidavit has been submitted, whatever they do, will be right. The Supreme Court even appointed its observer and sent him there vesting in him every power. At that time, had our Prime Minister dismissed the U.P. Government, it might have amounted to the violation of orders of Supreme Court by our Prime Minister. In that situation, the Prime minister would have felt ashamed before the supreme Court. When Shri Kalyan Singh was in power, the C.R.P.F. and other para-military forces were sent there. there was no arrangements to ensure as to who will supervise them and who will issue orders to them. That is why the Masjid was pulled down. when the Masjid was being pulled down an unprecedented situation emerged. I apprehended that such a situation would emerge there because one to two lakh people were invited there and then the leaders said that the mob was not under their control. The emergence of such uncontrollable situation tarnished their image. The structure was demolished in the presence of these leaders. Here I shall not blame Shri Vajpayeeji because he had not gone there. Many members who are sitting there, had not gone there. But the Members who had gone there, lost their power of influence as the mob went out of control. When one and a half lakh people went out of control, suppose 50 thousand people create disturbance tomorrow and the Government does not resort to lathi charge, then the problem may become still worse. So, if the Government taken action, it is criticised and if it does not take any action, then again it is criticised. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the time allotted to me over. What do you think? .

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I will not speak even for a minute in violation of your direction.

MR. SPEAKER: If you have to make a point or two, please make them.

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: I don't

want to repeat those points which I have already made. It was a right step to dismiss these State Governments. Some organisations were banned. Even if these people continue to have their sympathy with them, they will suffer. If they leave all this and move ahead in right direction, as Vajpayeeji has said and the Minister of Home Affairs has replied, then everything will be all right....*(Interruptions)* I have spoken in Jaipur throughout my life....*(Interruptions)* I have guts to speak at the Chaupal of your Kota....*(Interruptions)*

[English]

1330 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Now it is. There are Members who wish to speak. I think, we should continue speaking here and those who want to take their lunch, they can avail of this opportunity and take the lunch and come back.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we perfectly agree with whatever directions you give from the Chair. there is just one request that I have to make and I am sure entire House will concur. Party Managers will be better enable to arrange the presence of their Members if a rough idea could be given about voting.

MR. SPEAKER: Around 4.00 P.M. voting should take place.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Thank you.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri): In British Parliament, whenever Mr. Edmund Burke stands up to speak Members go for lunch, calling it a Dinning Bell. Is it also like that here?

You have asked everybody to go for lunch, then a lto speak Now? *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, will there be no lunch?

MR. SPEAKER: Lunck will be there but lunch hour will not be there.

SHRI TARA CHAND KHANDELWAL (Chandni Chowk): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say one thing. Members are using the word 'Masjid' in their speeches where as it is still a disputed structure. It is still a disputed structure. Shri V.P. Singh, has exercised reticence and used the word 'Disputed structure'. I would like to appreciate him for it. But the members who are using the word 'Masjid' should not go on record. Because it has not been decided that disputed structure was a mosque.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): You are not even showing that much honesty that a temple has also been demolished there. None of you is accepting this fact. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): You too have failed in this regard. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Joshi, you are again and again rising from your seat. this is not proper. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI E. AHAMED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the no confidence motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, not only as a member of Muslim community, who is very much hurt of what happened in Aydhaya on December 6, but more importantly as a citizen of this country who is threatened by the danger looming large on the nation.

Sir, what happened in Ayodhya on 6th December was not only demolition of a Mosque, which was symbol of secularism of this country, but at assault on the secular fabric of this country, for all the values for which we have stood all these years. It is a beginning of a journey from modern nation State to medievalism.

If we fail to defeat designs of these fascist forces, no doubt, India as a nation will meet the very fate of Babri Masjid. As an Indian I am hurt that the prestige, the honour and the glory of this country for the past

thousand years have been shattered into pieces by the act of vandalism by these fascist forces.

13.34 hrs.

[SHRI TARA SINGH in the Chair]

I have my anger and anguish, pain and shock over what happened in Ayodhya. *

This anguish, anger, pain and grief of the Muslim community on the dastardly act of vandalism which resulted in the destruction of Babri Mosque are immeasurable. The Government was guilty of idiotic inaction, passivity and inaction of the administration at Ayodhya on December 6 are a shameful commentary on their commitment to uphold the rule of law.

The Fascist forces have time and again declared and made it known that judicial verdict, or no, they would not budge an inch from the pulling down of the Mosque at Ayodhya. had the Government taken these factors into serious consideration, the situation could not have gone out of control.

Even now, I am at a loss to understand - dear friends of the Treasury Benches-why the Prime Minister of a secular party like Congress did believe the representatives of the Fascist forces. May I say with all humility, that our prime Minister has allowed himself to be betrayed by the Fascist forces?

The Muslim minority has shown commendable restraint and patience in the wake of the Babri Masjid tragedy and it is also the time for us not to aggravate the situation.

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): I am on a point of order. He is referring the RSS as the assassins of Mahatma Gandhi. it is a proved fact that the RSS had nothing to do with the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. It should not go on record. (*Interruptions*) It is amply proved that the RSS had absolutely no connection with the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. That should not go on record.

SHRI E. AHAMED: I am say, even now these people have not recognised mahatma Gandhi as the Father of the Nation. Even now in the heart of their hearts they have the antagonism to Gandhiji (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Shri Ahamed. This is a part of the investigation which has been decided. That will not go on record.

SHRI E. AHAMED: This commendable restraint on the part of the Muslims was due to the Sympathy and also the solidarity shown by the secular forces in this country.

It is worth mentioning the fact that the wounded hearts of the Muslims were assuaged by the expression of sympathy by the first citizen of this country the President. His statement on the evening of the 6th, deploring and condemning the act of vandalism of anti-national elements will remain as a red lettered chapter of Indian history.

The expression of grief by the secular institutions, especially the Media of this country has also been taken by the Muslims as a ray of hope and it is a silver lining in the communalised dark horizon of India.

I am pained to hear the argument of my learned friend Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. He was pleading ignorance of what had happened in Ayodhya on the 6th December and he was trying to wriggle out of the situation. May I with all humility say - I am sorry Shri Vajpayee is not here - that he was looking like a man accused of killing his father and mother and pleading before a court for mercy as he was an orphan!

This is what we have seen from his speech. Whatever Shri Vajpayee may say, the country will not absolve him and his party of their complicity, their responsibility of what had happened.

I may just refer to some of the special leading articles which appeared in the national media of this country on the 7th December. The *Indian Express* has called it as "A Nation

Betrayed" and I am quoting.

I Quote:

"The outrage Ayodhya witnessed on Sunday is an affront to our national honour. India's principal opposition party now stands exposed as one only too willing to resort to deceit and distardliness in its frenetic pursuit of a religious goal.."

This is what the *Indian Express* has said on 7th December. It further says:

"Much as BJP leaders disown responsibility for whatever has happened in Ayodhya, no one is naive enough to take them for their word.."

Sir, *The Hindu*, a paper of lakhs of people in this country, has called it as 'unforgivable'. This is also on 7th December. I quote:

"The disputed mosque was razed to the ground with a barbaric savagery reminiscent of the crude traditions of settling scores in medieval history. The demolition of the Masjid has delivered a lethal blow to the image of a secular and democratic India... The BJP's claim to be a defender of the national interest lies in shreds today. Much as Mr. L.K. Advani and his colleagues would like to disown the savagery of Sunday, they cannot escape the responsibility for having whipped up passions to the extent that it reflected in the blind mob hysteria which culminated in the attack on the Babri Masjid"

Again, I would like to quote what Shri H.K. Dua has said in *Hindustan Times*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everyone has read all these papers.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): We have read these papers.

SHRI E. AHAMED: Your leader Shri Vajpayee has said here that they have no

[Sh. E. Ahamed]

responsibility. But the country has not accepted it. To substantiate it, I would quote here again *Hindustan Times* which has called it as 'national shame'. It says:

"The responsibility for Sunday's gory events at Ayodhya should rest among others on men like Lal Krishna Advani who chose to ride the 'raah' without a guide it would lead him and the country to and Murti Manohar Joshi whose rigid posture could not be explained by any factors other than party compulsions and myopia. Mr. Advani perhaps was bothered more about personal ambition to be the Prime Minister of the country than concerned about national unity. Dr. Joshi was more bothered about his second term as President of the BJP than anything else."

Again, Sir, *The Times of India* has described it as follows:

"To achieve its political ends, the Sangh parivar has not only exploited religious sentiments. Its brand of nationalism, far from uniting the Hindu community, has sown seeds of distrust and divisiveness. This would be all too evident from the consequences of the destruction of the Babri Masjid: the rift between India's largest communities has widened; the Indian state has been thrown on the defensive and India's face has been blackened. The horrendous irony of it all is that such misery has been perpetrated in the name of Lord Ram, a name which in the hearts of millions of Hindus evokes sentiments of valour, justice and tolerance..."

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Ahamed, your time is over.

SHRI E. AHAMED: Sir, I may be given some more time.

Sir, when Mr. Vajpayee was speaking here on absolving his party from the responsibility, nobody believed him. I would

just remind him and his people what Abraham Lincoln had said: "You can fool some people for many times, many people for some time. But you cannot fool all the people all the time". That was what exactly Mr. Vajpayee was doing.

Again I just want to refer what exactly Mr. Vajpayee has said about other issues. I am not taking much of valuable time of this House. He was accusing the Prime Minister for his assurance to the nation and the international community that the Masjid will be rebuilt. Mr. Vajpayee is also an ex-Minister of External Affairs. He knows what was the international repercussion of the destruction of Babri Masjid. The only commitment and the assurance given by the Prime Minister is that Babri Masjid will be reconstructed assuring the feeling of comity of nations. India could now at least stand as a nation of justice and peace among the international community and P.M. to implement it. I cannot really understand what Vajpayeeji who was also a member of the India's delegation to United Nations has said. Many of the things have happened after the Babri Masjid demolition. I do not want to go into the details due to paucity of time, but one thing that I would like to mention is that what happened was more the police brutality than the type of fight between the two communities. Police was the first accused in this crime, I should say. In Kanpur only, 137 people have lost their lives. But I salute the seven Hindu brothers who have made the supreme sacrifice, who have given up their lives in defending and protecting their Muslim brethren. That is the India's ethos, India's amity between the communities. But unfortunately, the administration has not taken it seriously. Again, there were the words of pleading from the Muslim leadership also, asking the Muslims to show restraint and patience. I will just say one thing that we have gained from Kerala. Kerala is a State where some time back when there was a fire accident to Guruvayur temple, it was the Muslims of that locality who first reached there to help their Hindu brethren to put out the fire. From the distant Kerala, we had a very sane voice. That voice was of the leader of the Muslim community, the President of

the Kerala State Muslim League, Syed Mohd. Ali Shihab Thangal Saheb. He, in a statement issued on 9th December, urged the Muslims not to do anything to desecrate the Hindu Places of worship, instead to protect the sanctity, and urged telegraphically to the Muslim leaders of the neighbouring countries to protect those brethren who are living with them, as well as to protect their places of worship, following the great model of the Holy Prophet. I just read his statement here for the sake of all the hon. members. I quote:

"To attack or despoil others' places of worship is repugnant and inconsistent to Islamic tenets. Prophet Mohd. was the great model to every Muslim who taught us to show love and affection to the minority even under great stress and strain. Prophet declared that it was the duty of every Muslim to protect the places of worship of other communities and to preserve the rights and privileges of the minority section under Islamic regime. No Muslim can forget these hard facts from Islamic history."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now.

SHRI E. AHAMED: I am concluding, Sir. In this country we cannot have a Hindu India. I am also not for a Muslim India either. We cannot have a Christian India or a Sikh India also. We must have our India where Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs and all sections of the people should live in harmony. That is what we want.

In India, we must have universal umbrella where all creeds could be able to flourish. This is what we want.

What happened in Ayoonya is something which has brought shame to this country from all over the world. Therefore, it is the duty of every Indian in a secular India to live up to the expectations of the noble secular ideals of this country. These fascist forces have to be isolated. These fascist forces have to be put down. I, as a Muslim League Member of this House, may say that my party is for the unity and integrity of this country. It is the duty of every member of my

party to uphold the Constitution and secular principles of this country and also to protect and preserve the sovereignty of this country.

Therefore, irrespective of the fact that one is a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Christian or a Sikh, but as Indians, we must all come forward to face this challenge which is the result of these fascist forces.

With these words, I oppose the No-Confidence Motion moved by Shri Vajpayeeji.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay-North) Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the no-confidence motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. First day, when the hon. Minister of Defence who hails from Maharashtra was speaking, I felt as if I was watching repetition of a scene of the Maharashtra Assembly. Because, thirteen years ago on 4 April, 1979 a motion was moved in the Maharashtra Assembly to ban the Shakkas of the R.S.S. which conduct public drills. Such a motion was moved by an hon. member of the Congress Shri Yashwant Rao Mohite. That time hon. Shri Shivraj Patil was in the Chair of Maharashtra Assembly and now he is the Speaker of Lok Sabha. Shri Sharad Pawar, the then Chief Minister of the State was replying to the debate. Today he is the hon. minister of Defence. Shri Shankar Rao Chavan was a Minister in that Government of Shri Sharad Pawar, who is now Hon Union Minister of Home Affairs. We were also there. With me Prof. Kapse and Anna Joshi were also in the Assembly. At that time we were listening to the debate and I was feeling pity on him. Hon. Shri Sharad Pawar delivered a rhetoric speech in which he proposed to ban the R.S.S. and termed its activities those of fascism. But I failed to understand at that time that who is the real Sharad Pawar. One who is delivering a speech here or that who delivered a brilliant speech in the Vidhan Sabha that time. Such a doubt arised in my mind.

However, it is not for the first time or the second time that the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh has been banned It is for the

[Sh. Ram Naik]

third time that the R.S.S. has been banned. In 1948 when Mahatma Gandhi was assassinated the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh was banned as its activities were increasing. On this pretext, the R.S.S. was banned. A baseless allegation regarding assassination of Mahatma Gandhi was levelled on it. The most popular man Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was the Prime Minister of India at that time. That time also the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh continued its movement. All over the country, the jails were filled. We put forth our opinion before the people of the country and the Government was compelled to lift the ban. I would like to point out to this august House that in the years 1948 and 1949 there was not a single member in this House to support the R.S.S. The Bharatiya Janasangh was formed after that. When the popular leader Jawahar Lal Nehru was the Prime Minister an allegation was levelled on us for the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. There was nobody in the House to support us. At that time also the Government had to lift the ban. Second time when Smt. Indira Gandhi was the Prime Minister the R.S.S. was banned in 1975. Today it is being said that the Court Order should be honoured. When her election was announced illegal by the Court, did she obey the Court? Show imposed emergency all over the country, amended the Constitution and laws and banned the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh as well. Many hon. members of our organisation were in jail for 18 months. That time there were nearly 10 or 15 M.P.s of the Jana Sangh in the Parliament. They too were put in jail. But the movement lasted for one and a half years, and as a result of that Shrimati Indira Gandhi was defeated in the elections. Thereafter came a new Government which lifted the ban on the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh. That movement was led by Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan who said that it were the people of the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh only who put their life at stake for the cause of this movement in protest against the emergency. (Interruptions). He had himself said that if the people of the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh were communal, he too was

communal. And thus, the second ban was also lifted.

Now this is the third time that the ban has been imposed. (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Member has just now said that Shrimati Indira Gandhi lost the case in the Allahabad High Court and did not tender her resignation. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi lost the case in the Allahabad High Court, the Supreme Court had granted a 'stay' within the period allowed by the Allahabad High court. It is not correct that she violated any instructions or the decision of the Court. But the Supreme Court had given the 'stay order' within the period prescribed in the judgement of the Allahabad High Court.

SHRI RAM NAIK: You may be right, but when the Court gave verdict against her, instead of complying with it, she imposed emergency in the country which neither you nor any Indian can forget. Therefore the Government cannot alter it. (Interruptions). It cannot give the distorted picture of the facts.

It has been banned for the third time. What is the situation in the country today? In 1948 there was not a single Member from our organisation to speak here. The people of India have elected we 119 Members. The Government might have dismissed the Governments. But the four States Governments were duly elected by the people of India. Today the Bharatiya Janata Party is the main Opposition Party in all the States of India and it enjoys the mandate of the people. the Government might be thinking that our speech has importance here. But what is the situation in the country today? Just now an hon. member of the Muslim League told that he went through some editorial columns of newspapers and when I asked him the date of the publication of the Indian Express, he mentioned the date 7th. We too have said about the incidents that whatever has happened there was not desirable. But what the Government is doing thereafter is against

the public opinion. The Indian Express of the said date has published the opinion of 6734 English knowing people. The Government might be aware of the number of English knowing people in the country very well. The opinion of 6734 English knowing people which has been coincides is as under:-

[English]

"72% of the respondents strongly assert that the mosque should not be constructed at the site.

67% say that the Narasimha Rao Government has lost credibility due to his inept handling of the Ayodhya issue."
(Interruptions)

I am quoting from the *Indian Express* only. they have condemned us on 7th. That *Indian Express* is saying on the basis of their readers' reactions.

"59% feel that the decision to ban RSS, VHP, ISS Jamit and Bajrang Dal was unwarranted."

[Translation]

So this is the present situation. A detailed discussion has been held regarding the riots that took place in Bombay.... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker has directed that all the members who are desirous of speaking should be given five minute each. There are many members who want to speak. So you should speak in brief.

[English]

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: He is from Maharashtra, specially from Bombay.
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM NAIK: I would abide by your decision. The maximum number of people have been killed in Bombay city i.e. two hundred and two people have been killed there. I would like to submit something in that

regard. People count the killed persons in terms communities to which they belonged. Just now a question was raised as to how many of them were Hindus and how many of them were Muslims.

14.00 hrs.

Shri V.P. Singh has stated that 85 per cent of the persons killed belonged to Muslim Community. This has not been the practice to refer to the name of the community to which the persons killed belonged. We do not mention the name of the community. Similarly, when a temple or a mosque or a church is demolished, we always say that a place of whrship has been demolished. We have never gone into the religion of a deceased persons. But today, a wrong information has been given here. I have got with me the figures of the people who have been killed in Bombay. Two hundred and two people have been killed there and sixty five per cent of them belonged to Muslim Community and thirty five percent belonged to Hindu community. but the question is that what has been done in this regard. Shri Ahulwalia, a member of Rajya Sabha and Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad were sent from here as central observers. I would like to demand that the report which they have submitted to the Minister of Home Affairs should be presented in the House. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you would be surprised that they have said in their report that police picked up the Muslims and made them their targets. But on the same day Union Home Minister Shri Shankar Rao Chauhan went there and said that police had done an excellent job. who is speaking truth-Sh. Shankar Rao Chauhan or Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad? People of Bombay demand that Government should prosecute the persons who try to divide the people in this way.

Now Government has decided to give one lakhy rupees, Where four of the six policemen were killed with the sword. How do you expect from the Police personnel to have patientce? Can you run the administration of the country, the way allegations are being made? Inspite of all this, Maharashtra Government would not be dismissed, the

[Sh. Ram Naik]

Gujarat Government would not be dismissed. Only Himachal Pradesh Government would be dismissed where not a single person has been killed. This is how the Government is running. This is the position in the country.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, fifty five percent of the people have fallen prey to the private bullets and not to the police bullets. There is a large scale smuggling of illicit arms to Bombay city. People have been killed with AK-47 rifles. I would like to give a suggestion in this regard. Maharashtra Government has also accepted my suggestion. A time-limit should be announced that illegal arms should be deposited in the nearby police stations within that specified time. Stringent action should be taken against those people who fail to do so. Maharashtra Government has accepted my this suggestion. Central Government would also accept my suggestion and take stringent action against the people who possess illegal arms.

Shri George Fernanades is not present in the House at the moment. He has also made the same observation that people of a particular community have been picked up by the police and killed. I don't think that our police personnel, who do not even know how to tie their belts have become so efficient that they can judge from a distance of fifty metres that a particular person is a Hindu or a Muslim. It is therefore, not correct to make such inciting statements. Such statements must be banned.

One more thing I would like to submit that people are being arrested due to the ban imposed on some organisations. Home Minister made a statement this morning. Let us see what happens in future. A sixty four year old man in my constituency, who was bed ridden and could not walk was handcuffed and taken to police station because he was a worker of Bhartiya Janta Party. Such incidents should be checked. Similarly, person named Mahesh Joshi belonging to Prof. Kapse's constituency of Thane, who was married on 29th November and whose

marriage reception was held on 4th December and who had returned from Honeymoon on 13th December was asked by the police to report to the police station because he had gone to participate in the Kar Seva. What a fun? What is this all going on? There is a limit to everything. Such repressive steps would give rise only to resentment and dissatisfaction among the public.

It is good, Mr. Pilot is present in the House. He had referred to some training and he had also mentioned the name of the Brigadier. Now the whole information has been provided by an organisation named India Welfare and Research Foundation. He was referring to some brigadier. We had stopped him from mentioning the name of that brigadier. Afterwards, Mr. Speaker had expunged the name of that brigadier from the proceedings of the House. But that Brigadier Shri Mahipat Singh Jadeja belongs to Congress. After retiring from service he joined Congress. Later on he was made the chairman of the Pollution Control Board. You would charge BJP for everything. Mr. Vinay Katiyar never went there. In that training course eighteen boys and thirteen girls had participated. If the Minister would speak on the basis of newspaper reports.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): All this has appeared in the newspapers. The day before yesterday I had mentioned it in my speech. There is always a limit to the trust and the faith. You were showing the newspapers in which the statement of Vinay Katiyar had published that mosque will not even be touched. Shri Vajpayeeji was showing that paper. We all believed that. But that happened afterwards? We are also human beings.

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): You would say that Shri Vinay Katiyar was present there. This would not prove the point. Vinay Katiyar has said that he was not present there. The House should believe his statement.

SHRI RAM NAIK: At least we can expect from an hon. Union Minister that he would

speaking after ascertaining the veracity of such reports. I can understand that it is an attempt to bring a bad name to BJP. If others speak without verifying the facts, we can understand but if a minister speaks in such a way, it is very pitiable. Now the country will not debate upon this issue further. The mosque has been demolished, whether it was right or wrong would be discussed. You have violated the spirit of Constitution by dismissing the three Governments, kar-Sevaks had acted in certain provocations, but you got the report from Governor as you wished and first took the decision in Congress working committee and then in cabinet and dismissed the three Governments. You have caused damage to the well built structure of Constitution but the structure which has been demolished was a disputed structure. How long would you go on blaming for demolishing it you would have to answer it one day or the other?

Mr. Chairman Sir, Congress submits that everything should be done according to the laid down procedure. I had proposed that House should start its sitting with 'Vande mataram'. In the meeting of G.P.C. it was decided that national song would be sung in Lok Sabha on the first day of the session..

14.08 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

It was a unanimous decision. Did you implement that decision? A member of the Muslim league raised some objection and you cancelled that decision. Go and tell the people of the country as to why have you insulted the national song? People of the country are watching all these things. He should not remain under the impression that whatever he says, is right. Everybody has his own opinion. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would at the moment, refer to one and only one thing and I would seek a reply from the Government thereto.

I am holding in my hand an issue of 'Nawa Kal' which is a famous daily published from Bombay. 6 lakh copies of this news paper are circulated everyday. An interview of the Minister of Defence Shri Sharad Pawar

has been published in this paper. It was a special interview given to that newspaper on the eve of his 52nd birthday. Shri Sharad Pawar says:

"Mashid Tyaach Taygi bandhnaar Ase Nawhe".

He says that the reconstruction of the mosque may not necessarily be done on the same place. Here I would like to know as to what is the ultimate decision of the Government in this regard. "Nawa Kal" has a seventy years long history of its publication. We know Shri Krishna Prabhakar Khadilkar is considered to be the Pioneer of journalism in Maharashtra. He held the same position in Maharashtra as was held by Lokmanya Tilak. His grandson Shri Nilkanth Khadilkar runs the aforesaid newspaper. When the Britishers were torturing the common people in India, Shri Lokmanya Tilak wrote in his lead article - "Is the mind of the Government working properly?" Similarly, Shri Khadilkar who runs that paper has written-

"If some one pronounces the word Hindu, it is like scorpion bite". the another heading of the newspaper reads- " Shri Narasimha Rao Ji should work with proper mind". So, what I want to say is that the Government has to get nothing if it proceeds with an attitude of confrontation. The Government is moving on the wrong path. The Government may come on the right path from the path of confrontation, what is required for it is to seek the fresh mandate of the people. Only this can decide as to who is on the right path.

[*English*]

Let us go to the people, let us face the people boldly and let people decide.

[*Translation*]

If the Government thinks that its stand is right then it should at least be ready for a referendum whether the proposed mandir should be constructed or not. If the Government does not come forward for this then it will be presumed that the Government does not have an honest intention and that it

[Sh. Ram Naik]

is working under some pressure. The sentiments of the people cannot be suppressed through ban. In this context, I support the motion brought forward by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK (Buldana): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our head hangs in shame for the event of the 6th of December. This is not merely the demolition of a mosque, it is a slur to the image of India. I condemn the incident, moving the No-Confidence Motion. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee had also sought to know as to who were these five to six hundred persons who were indulged in the demolition work of the mosque. I think this is not a very difficult thing to know. Everything is well recorded in the video cassette. Shri Atalji also said that the demolition of the mosque pained Shri Advaniji much. However, the video cassette shows that no leader made even least efforts to stop the ongoing demolition work. If any effort was made at all, it was only to demolish the mosque. This was the only effort being made during that time....

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KAPSE: I have seen the video cassette about which the hon. member was referring to. I saw it at the residence of Shri Sharad Pawar. The video cassette makes it amply clear that efforts to protect the mosque were constantly being made for hours I have watched it through my own eyes.... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: There are various video cassettes.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Not more than one thousand persons were present at the time of demolition, it is evident through watching the cassette. It is, however, said that lakhs of people had assembled there. It was not so.... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KAPSE: They were attending a meeting in a nearby area.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You please do not refer to that video cassette about which we do not have any knowledge.

[Translation]

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: Sir, I hold that if the leader like Advaniji had strongly stood before the 500 to 600 Kar Sevaks, who participated in the demolition of the mosque, then no Kar Sevak would have dared to touch the mosque and the mosque surely would not have been demolished. But Advaniji remained standing at a distance and in his very presence the mosque was being demolished. A slogan was raised around him. -

"Ek dhakka Aur Do Babri Masjid Tor Do".

Is it not true? Amidst all these slogans no leader made any effort to protect the mosque from demolition. Shri Vajpayeeji said that the Kar Sevaks responsible for demolishing the mosque should be punished. But I hold that only 500 to 600 Kar Sevaks are not responsible for demolishing the mosque. It has not been done by a chosen few. Who actually participated in the demolition? The persons who started Rath Yatra and who through their speeches spat poison in regard to Ayodhya issue are also responsible, I ask if Advaniji who launched Rath Yatra is not responsible for the demolition of the mosque. I would like to ask Vajpayeeji as to when he protested the Rath Yatra of Advaniji, what was the reason for that protest. Could he foresee that Rath Yatra would create tension in the society that the situation might go beyond control? If Atalji accepts this fact then he should not hold that 500 to 600 persons responsible for demolition of the mosque. I would like to submit that all the leaders including Shri Advaniji who have polluted the atmosphere of the country should all be held responsible.

Question are now raised as to why Shri Advani and Shri Murli manohar Joshi were arrested and why the State Governments of

Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh were dismissed as also why the R.S.S., the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal have been banned. Here I would like to mention that a conspiracy was watched to demolish the mosque. All these dismissed Governments too and the men of all the three banned organisations were responsible for hatching up the conspiracy in respect of demolishing the mosque. Those people gave the material shape too to this conspiracy. I support the steps taken by the Central Government under which the three B.J.P. State Governments were dismissed and certain organisations were banned. I believe that if the Government tackles with the situation strongly in the days to come then it will certainly be able to control the situation.

Mr. Speaker, sir, the Bhartiya Janata Party has submitted a memorandum to the hon. President. It has been stated in that memorandum that the British Government did not hold Mahatma Gandhi responsible for the Chauri-Chaura incident of 1921. But Advaniji is being held responsible for the incident of Ayodhya. Here, first of all I would like to say that there is not even the slightest similarity between Mahatma Gandhi and Advaniji. Secondly, the agitation of 1921 was launched against a foreign rule. Even during that period the non-co-operation movement launched by Mahatma Gandhi was a non-violent movement whereas the present movement has been engineered with sword, trishul and other similar weapons in the hands of the workers belonging to the B.J.P., the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the Bajrang Dal. So this movement cannot at all be compared to the movement of Gandhiji. When the non-co-operation movement of Gandhiji took a violent turn, he then owned all the responsibility therefor and he stopped the movement. Crores of people of India during that period were of the opinion that the movement should not be stopped. People held the opinion that the movement should continue till the Britishers were removed from the country. But as the movement turned violent Mahatma Gandhi stopped the movement. Now I ask Shri Vajpayeeji whether Advaniji would agree to own the responsibility as was by Gandhiji. Has the B.J.P. owned

the responsibility for the happenings as was done by the Congress leaders during 1921? I would also like to ask whether the Bhartiya Janta Party is ready to stop the movement in Ayodhya as was done by Mahatma Gandhi in the past? Should we hope any such announcement to be made by the B.J.P. leaders in the House? If not, then they should not try to compare their movement to the non-Cooperation Movement of 1921. Shri Vajpayeeji rightly said that the issue of Ayodhya was pending in the court for a long time. How the issue which was lying pending for 40 years in the court can take a shape of a movement.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You do not have the time to reply to each of the points made by the members. You please take your own line.

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK:
I will take only two or three minutes.

[Translation]

When Atalji was the President of the Bharatiya Janata Party the Ayodhya issue was pending in the court even at that time. During his tenure as the President neither there was mass movement on Ayodhya issue nor it was made an election issue. I would like to know whether Atalji is not a devotee of Lord Ram? When there was no agitation on this issue at that time then why it is now? If the reason behind it is not the temple but the politics alone, as the public knows it, what ever may the Bharatiya Janata party propagate, people will not fall prey to it. Moving his motion the leader of the Bharatiya Janata Party said that he had put a proposal before the hon. member Shri Shahabuddin few years back the honouring the sentiments of Hindus, Muslims should give that land to them because their sentiments are attached with this land, while in turn the Hindus should tell that since they have expressed such feelings, we honour it and we shall construct the temple at some other place. Atalji, I would like to say that circumstances have changed today. Today you have demolished the mosque and have hurt the feelings of Muslims

[Sh. Mukul Balkrishna Wasnik]

as well as of those people who have faith in secularism. Keeping in view this situation, Atalji, would you please tell Muslims that since we have hurt your sentiments, we give this land to you. Construct a mosque there. And if in reply to it, the Muslims say that since you have respected our sentiments and in spite of demolition, you have handed over the land to us for the construction of the mosque, we honour your feelings and we will construct the mosque at some other place. If such feelings would have been exchanged, and if the formula, presented by Atalji in this house, is reversed, then even today this issue can be solved.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to take more time but I would like to submit that in spite of such deterioration in the situation and in spite of the atmosphere in the society being so vitiated, if the Government tries to solve this issue through negotiations along with taking stern action, I feel that the issue may be solved definitely in future. I shall conclude with quoting the couplet read by the hon. President in his Address. he said.

"Shaheedon ke Watan Ki Kabra Se Ye Awaz Aayee

Wahi Hamse Akar Mile Jo Apni Jan Par Khele Hain,

Udhar Duniya Ki Rahat Hai Idhar Lutfe-Shahadat' hai,

Yeh Sauda hai Tere Aage Too Jo Chahe Wahi Le Le".

The need of the hour is to make efforts to solve this issue rising above party politics. In case we fail in solving this issue, the coming generation will never forgive us.

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Sahasra): Mr. Speaker, Sir, today we are discussing the issue of masjid and Mandir on which we have had discussions in these supreme bodies of the country ten to fifteen times in each session of Lok Sabha for last three or four years and that too throughout the day, and what is the net result, the B.J.P. has demolished the Masjid on the 6th

thought to solve this issue whole-heartedly, then this is not such a big issue as we could not have solved it. I would like to say if the B.J.P. plays vote politics, then we, other leaders are not less capable than anyone. We do play vote politics. With the demolition of mosque in the country today, feelings of millions of people, having faith in secularism, have been hurt, their hearts are filled with deep agony and their heads hang in shame. Today a country-wise review of the situation is being made. Who will catch votes. How many votes one will catch. This is politics Advaniji and Murli Manohar Joshi, who had performed Kar-Seva on the 6th, had announced and their Kalyan Singh had also announced after filing an affidavit in the court that no harm would be done to the mosque. Here, Vajpayeeji has moved No-Confidence motion in the House. He had also said that no harm would be done to the mosque. You are also a witness to it. The kar Seva started there on the 6th and there is evidence that the mosque was pulled down with the help of tools. Kalyan Singh tendered resignation on the ground that he is extremely sorry and Advani Saheb resigns his office of the leader of the Opposition on the ground that he is extremely sorry. I would like to ask, if they are really sorry, why then they are creating obstacles to reconstruction of the demolished mosque there. A proposal of reconstruction of mosque has been received. The Government states that the mosque will be reconstructed which has been demolished by some miscreants. You welcome that proposal. But you will not do that. Vajpayeeji has said there that 500 people, Kar-Sevak have demolished that mosque, identify them, but how to do that because you yourself know them well. Whom are you asking for making an identification.

Therefore, I insist that the Government should tell the country in clear terms how to solve this temple-mosque issue. I would like to place only three solutions to this issue before you. Since you have rung the bell, I require two or three minutes' time as I have visited some riot-affected areas. So, I would like to put some facts before you.

Sir, if the leaders sitting here would have

MR. SPEAKER: No, you have been

given only five minutes' time.

SHRISURYA NARAYAN YADAV: if you say, I will sit down. But through you I would like to place three suggestions before the Government. The first suggestion is that the Government should acquire all the disputed land there. After that, the Government should construct both the temple and the mosque itself - in that case there will be no bone of contention. In case the Government fails to do so and if any obstacle is created to it, then constitute an all-party committee of Lok Sabha and get it decided through it. If some leaders of some particular parties do not arrive at some unanimous solution, then the committee should take a decision unanimously. My third suggestion is that Lok Sabha is a supreme institution. There is democracy in the country. You may get voting here to elicit public opinion. We are elected representatives of the people. If public opinion goes in favour of reconstruction of mosque, then mosque should be constructed there and if there is a unanimous decision in favour of construction of temple, then temple be built there. And if it goes in favour of both the temple and the mosque, then both should be constructed. So, first of all you should decide all these things. Had it been thought earlier on these lines, then the issue would have been solved long ago by Lok Sabha but no serious consideration has ever been given to it.

Just now hon. Shri V.P. Singh was speaking. He is secular and he is our leader. I realise it. But he said that the Narasimha Rao Government should resign. The B.J.P. is also demanding resignation of the Narasimha Rao Government and dissolution of Lok Sabha and fresh elections. I would like to ask Shri V.P. Singh whether he is not extending internal support to B.J.P. by supporting this demand under these circumstances. Which party will come to power and which will not is an internal matter of the Congress. We have nothing to do with it whether it allows the present Prime Minister to continue or whether elects some other Prime Minister.

Today the need of the hour is that all the

secular force in the country should move ahead jointly and should face all the fascist elements and anti-national forces together. This is my demand.

I can't sit smugly unless I have econgatulated my colleagues of the Left Front, particularly Shri Jyoti Basu, Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri Somnath Chatterjee for they have called upon all the secular forces of the country to face these fascist forces jointly under such difficult circumstances of the day. Since they have initiated this step, I congratulate these leader of the leftist parties.

Sir, I had visited the riot-torn areas in Delhi. I observed there....

MR. SPEAKER: Time allotted to you is over.

SHRISURYA NARAYAN YADAV: After making his last point, it shall sit down. (Interruptions)

Sir, in Seelampur, all the Muslims were harassed. Ornaments, jewellery and cash were snatched from their women, and they were subjected to police excesses. The police also fired bullets on them. No representative of the Government has visited these places and no survey of the affected area has been made as yet. Tytlerji and Pilotji have visited a number of places, but they have not visited the affected areas of Seelampur. No survey has been made there so far. neither the list of affected people has been prepared nor any relief has been provided to them. Therefore, I urge upon the Government that a survey of all the riot-affected areas, should be made.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): I would like to inform the hon. member, since he used my name and said this, that I was the first person who reached the spot, even when the CRPF went, even when the curfew was there and also when the curfew was relaxed. I was

[Sh. Jadish Tytler]

there everyday. So, please make your facts very clear before you speak. I do not say that I have done some favour.

MR. SPEAKER: You had gone there.

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: It was my duty and we have been there, right at the spot. One of the reasons which I concede is that I did not let the BJP come and make more noise on this.. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Now you please conclude. Whatever you want to speak, you speak and sit down.

[English]

There are many other members and there is no time. So, please conclude now.

[Translation]

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV: Sir, I am taking my seat, but I would like to request the Government that it should get the survey of all the riot-affected areas and make a list of the affected people and immediately start providing relief to them.

Since you are not giving me much time and you have a shortage of time I am taking my seat. Sir, I heartily congratulate you that you have given me an opportunity to speak on such an important issue.

SHRI AYUB KHAN (Jhunjheenu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to express my views on the No-Confidence Motion moved by Vajpayeeji on behalf of the B.J.P. I am very sorry to state that we have created such a situation in the country that it is on the verge of disintegration. We have initiated the process of dividing the Indian society into two groups under these circumstances, is it not possible for us to work for the betterment and progress of the country instead of involving us in the Mandir-Masjid dispute and moving on the path of destruction which may

disintegrate the country? Can it be proved a better way for the people of the country?

Our B.J.P. leaders whom I pay much respect said that it was a Babri Masjid. Although it was a Babri Masjid yet puja of Lord Rama was also being performed there. If puja was being performed and the idols were there, it means there was a temple too; then why was it demolished? It was a great crime to remove the idols from there, but they did it and demolished the Masjid easily. I would like to know as to why you have demolished your own temple? The persons who can demolish Mandir or Masjid cannot be faithful to anyone. They are the enemy of the country. To demolish a Mandir or a Masjid is an act of sin. If any Hindu demolished the Masjid or any Muslim demolishes the mandir, he commits a grave sin. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that these people want to capture the power who have demolished the Masjid and the Mandir in this way. Sir, I would like to ask as to why injustice is being made to poor people. Why are they made targets of bullets? Why are they called as traitors? Why are the Muslims not treated at par. What crime have they committed? You do not provide them job, you do not provide them education, you do not provide them anything but at least, you can provide them the right to live, wherever the riots occurred it was not between the Hindus and the Muslims. It appeared that it was between the Muslims and the police on whose instance the police people burnt the houses of the Muslims only? It is the fault of all of us. We should have a look on this aspect. If we continue to fight between ourselves, what will be the fate of our country and our society.

I would like to appeal that still there is a time that should be utilized for creating the harmony in the country. We should work for the betterment of the country and realise the grievances and sufferings of each other. We should not take the country towards destruction. We should not spread ill feelings against Muslims in the society in such a way as they may not have to think as to where they should go to take shelter.

I hail from Rajasthan. It is such a glorious

state where such incidents do not occur. I have been in military service when Pakistan attacked India in 1965, the President of Pakistan was Gen. Ayub Khan and I was serving in the military. We challenged the Pakistani forces that they would be ruined if they tried to keep their feet on the sacred land of India. We had not thought that these Pakistanis were our Muslim brethren. It is our conception that we have taken birth on this land and it is our holy mother land. We can make the biggest sacrifice for the sake of our mother land. I am not afraid of anybody except the God who has given us birth on this land which we call India.

I would like to appeal that we may not take the country to the path of destruction so that Hindu-Muslim could live amicably in the country. Now it is the high time that we should not disintegrate the country on Mandir-Masjid issue. We may still adopt the peaceful way. If you go on repeating type of action. Our future will have to face the music of our today's action. If Babar had committed a mistake in the past, what is the use of committing the mistake today.

If one is true Muslim, he can never demolish the temple. Mandir can not be converted into a Masjid. As per the teachings of Islam, the Masjid cannot be built on the site of a temple or anybody's land or on a piece of land borrowed from somebody. It is the Hindu society which has absorbed all of us. Our ancestors were Hindus. but today we are Muslims. We are proud of our principles. We don't hate anybody. We equally treat everybody. We equally regard the Mandir, as well as the Masjid.

I would like to appeal that we should now think about our country and its progress and never give any opportunity to enemies to enable them to take the advantage of the situation and to disintegrate this country. We should not create such a situation as may create the feelings of hatred among the people. We should always try to all avoid such situation as may create Punjab and Kashmir everywhere. We, all should try to make India great and to close the chapter of Mandir-Masjid issue once for all.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Roseria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, No-confidence Motion has been moved in the House today. I have been in this House since 1977 and 'No-Confidence Motion' has always been moved on the question of basic problems of the country. I feel that this is the first occasion when this motion has been moved on the question of building of a temple and not on the basic problem of this country. Prices are soaring high corruption is at its peak, poverty is everywhere. I raised a question in this House on the 16th of this month and wanted to know the per capita income of all the countries in rupees. The reply was that the per capita income of India was Rs. 6120 while that of Pakistan was Rs. 6650, Srilanka Rs. 8225, Indonesia Rs. 9976, Saudi Arabia Rs. 1 lakh 23 thousand, U.K. Rs. 2 lakh 81 thousand, France Rs. 3 lakh 41 thousand, USA Rs. 3 lakh 90 thousand, Germany Rs. 4 lakh 4 thousand, Japan Rs. 4 lakh 45 thousand and that of Switzerland was Rs. 5 lakh 71 thousand. Even after 45 years of independence, per capita income of India is just Rs. 6 thousand 125. Only one country is poorer than ours and that is Bangladesh. Pakistan, Srilanka, and Indonesia are richer than us. This matter should have been taken up in the House today. But you are trying your level best to take up Eighth Five Year Plan in the House today. We want that important matters like Bank Scam and price-rise should be discussed but everyday temple issue is raised and the result is that the House cannot discuss the basic problems, the focus of attention of the people. It is not that those matters are being ignored deliberately, but the circumstances are so created that those problems are not discussed.

I heard the speeches of all the hon. members and all of them, whether they belong to B.J.P. or Congress party, have disapproved of the incident of 6th December. Today, the entire House should condemn the incidents of 6th December. This message should be conveyed to the entire world. At least we should agree to one thing. (Interruptions) There are certain Resolutions

[Sh. Ram Vilas Paswan]

which are passed unanimously in the House and there are certain resolutions which are passed by majority votes. I would like this House to pass a unanimous resolution.

Just now, the hon. members laid emphasis on speaking the truth. An example was also quoted from Mahabharat. There was a reference in Mahabharat "Ashvathama Hatau Narau Va Kunjara" Yudhishtira was made to utter these words that Ashvathama had died - wither the man or the animal was not known - and thus Dronacharya's son was killed. I want that if the House wants to reveal the fact then truth should prevail and not 'half truth'. My belief has been that religion and politics religion and nationality are separate from each other - (Interruptions). He suggested to include the caste. I do include it into it. The caste for which Ram Vilas Paswan advocates, is a part and partial of Hindu Society. But you should be ashamed of that we plead for 75 percent of the total population whereas you plead for 25 percent Hindus. (Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: That word will not go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: When we refer to Mandal Commission we do not mean Hindus, rather we mean Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Classes and the poor. I would submit to the Government also that if it has that much courage, it should bring about an amendment to provide 10 percent reservation to the economically backward sections among upper castes. Why does it not do so? They were making so much hue and cry at that time and were abusing us. We would support if they bring such a Constitutional Amendment Bill. Whereas they oppose everything including Mandal Commission, poor people amongst Hindus etc.. (Interruptions) that is why I have

said that the incident in it must took place....

DEFENCE MINISTER SHRI SAWARAD PAWAR: As long as Kesri ji is there, you should not worry.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Why do you rely on what Shri Kesri submits. So far as he is concerned, whenever the Parliament session begins, he assures that an amendment will be brought in the House with a view to fill up the vacancies reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.... (Interruptions).....Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would bring a privilege Motion against him in spite of the fact that he is my friend. Because he never fulfils his promise of bringing about a Constitution Amendment Bill.

I would like to point out two things in view of the incident that just took place. Firstly, it is the high tune to constitute Anti Communal Riots Force and it hardly matters that reservation is provide to minorities, Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes in that force but representation to every section must be given. Otherwise, the situation in Uttar Pradesh is an example where minorities are scared by the name of PAC. About 90 or 85 percent of the total persons killed there have been killed in police firing. Therefore, now is the time that Anti Communal Riots force should be set up and representation to the people of every religion be given in it.

Secondly, an announcement made by the Government of India and the Hon. Prime Minister says that a Commission will be constituted. My submission is that the Commission should be at the national level - National Inquiry Committee / Commission and it should clearly spell out the extent to which not only Uttar Pradesh Government but also the Government of India fulfilled its responsibility.

Our colleagues talked of cassettes. I have seen a cassette and it gives me an effect - please don't mind I express my feelings that we should neither remain neutral

nor absent, rather we should vote against you. There is no example in the history of India of the misdeed you committed. The way 500 persons took law into their hands and demolished the structure and tattered the constitution. But I would not like the name of our party to be linked with B.J.P. We shall cross the bridge when it falls. That time is expected very soon. JPC report is about to be submitted. It will be presented in the next Parliament session. You said that we dismissed the Government of Uttar Pradesh..... (Interruptions)....

I had said that I would take only 15 minutes. I will conclude exactly at 3 P.M. I started at quarter to three, I am watching the clock.

Hon. Defence Minister, you dismissed the Government of Uttar Pradesh. But this incident reminds us of a story. A thief was detected while stealing the things. He thought that people would punish him. So he committed suicide by taking poison. Then police came, and claimed that they have apprehended the criminal and started firing bullets at him and make it a case of encounter killing. Kalyan Singh resigned at 3 P.M. and at 6 P.M. you started making fiery remarks against him. Everybody knows that Central Force or the administration was not there till mid night. Somnath Babu, sitting here, knows it.

New laws are being enacted everyday. Ban is imposed sometimes on RSS, sometimes on Bajrang Dal, one or the other Government is dismissed on one ground or the other. I would like to quote another example. A thief was detected while making theft. People gave him three options - either to bear 25 lashes at his back or eat 25 onions or pay a fine of Rs. 25/-. He agreed to eat 25 onions. But when he finished 10-12 onions, he offered to have 25 lashes at his back and when he had 10-12 lashes....

MR. SPEAKER: Paswan ji, there is no time for such stories.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: I am just concluding. After that he offered to pay fine

of Rs. 25/-. My submission is that the government accepted all the three punishments. We finished just by paying the fine. But you are going to do these three things. Therefore Mr. Speaker, Sir, that day in your presence I had asked Mr. Jaswant Singh of B.J.P. that how they will control the situation. Which Sansad, do you consider greater, this Sansad or the Dharam Sansad. We have this debate of 3rd December in which the Home Minister had asked not to make any presumptions, nothing would go wrong, we would not disclose our strategy but we would protect the constitution. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, today the Constitution has lost its value. The journalists were beaten. Therefore, today also I insist that this is not an issue of Mandir and Mosque. Our colleague was talking of Muslim India. That day Atal Ji had said that if you ask for Muslim India then why not a Hindu India. But if you ask for a Hindu India then some others will ask for Khalistan. If you raise slogans in favour of Hindu Nation, others will also raise slogans favouring some other nation. If you start your politics for mandirs, then others will do the same from Gurdwaras. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will have to give attention towards the basic problem. There was an incident at Chandur, at other places also, people belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are being killed, the poor are being killed, you were praising the Rajasthan Government where 25 people.... (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: In Bihar.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: There is nothing in Bihar. At least 25-50 persons were killed in Kumbhar but no action was taken, I therefore say that you may raise a slogan in favour of a Hindu Nation but at the same time you also think that what will happen to the poor people in that Hindu Nation. In this House, I, at least want to appreciate the gesture shown by the Government of Pakistan by criticizing the demolition of temple there and at the same time to reconstruct those temples with the Government's assistance as well as giving compensation for the loss of the human life. But I ask what is the cause of all of this? Unless you clean

[Sh. Ram Vilas Paswan]

a drain, the mosquitoes would go on increasing their population. You took a step without considering the reaction of it in the foreign countries. U.K. and U.S.A are not Muslim countries. Today temple, Gurudwaras and Mosques are being demolished in England also. Who is responsible for it? You are responsible for it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir therefore, we would like to say one thing. The Congress Government will also have to make its policy clear. Jayalalita openly declares support to B.J.P. but you say that she is supporting you. Mr. Pawar, Shiv Sena openly killed the people in Hospitals. In a Bombay Hospital, Shiv Sena..... (Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAN RAWALE (Bombay-South Central): No such incident took place (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: You are not even speaking a word against Shiv Sena. You will have to make your intentions clear then only you can talk about secularism and just now you said that on mentioning an M.P.'s name he got angry. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a photograph which was taken after the demolition of the structure and one M.P. was dancing in the joy and saying that you have done a wonderful job, I do not want to mention his name. (Interruptions) You may go through 'India-today'. I will not read out all that what is written in it but I will definitely say about the photograph. I would like to tell the Government that if you have a clear intention and you want to come along with the secularist forces then you must make clear your image. Today, you do not have the secularist image. You have become communal. Therefore, you must clear your intentions. B.J.P. is guilty but Bajrang Dal and V.H.P. had expressed all that what has happened, B.J.P. was riding on a lion, which apparently killed them, the leader of the opposition as well as the Chief Minister of the Government. The Central Government will have to make its intention clear. Therefore, the Janta Dal as well as the Rastriya Morcha consider both of you guilty for this. We are neither voting in

their favour nor supporting you, therefore the Janta Dal will remain absent and work in order to expose both of you before the people of the country. We will judge you later on through your deeds..... (Interruptions)....With these words I thank you

15.00 hrs.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: In 1989, 86 members were elected with your support... (Interruptions) 86 were elected in 89 with your support (Interruptions)

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: We did not let them demolish the Mosque.

MINISTER OF WELFARE (SITARAM KESRI): Mr. Speaker Sir.....

SHRINITHISH KUMAR: You did not listen to our speech therefore we will also not hear you... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: As time is very short, so do not disturb him. He is going to finish his speech within 10-15 minutes. He would take up all aspects.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: Mr. Speaker, Sir today my head hangs down in National shame. Today is a black day and a day of National shame and there is no question of allegations and counter allegations. First of all I will take up the issue raised by Shri Vajpayee who has asked the minorities to excuse and to show generosity. Atal Bihari ji is a scholar, an intellectual and a wise person. Till date, I have not heard like expecting generosity from the weak and poor. I am an uneducated person. Never went to a school or a college but I have always seen that it is the stronger one who shows generosity towards the weak not like the other way. But Atalji, said in his speech that day, which I was listening attentively that the Minorities should show generosity and give the Mosque to the majority people. While listening this I was feeling ashamed that an intelligent and scholar like him,

belonging to the majority community which has been a custodian of the society expects generosity from the minorities. It is for you to show generosity. You should say that you may construct a number of Mosques but you did not say like that.

Secondly, he said that he was sorry for this. While saying sorry, it also shows one's repentance, which means that he has accepted his fault and ready to pay any penalty for it. But in this case his sorry was a cover for his violent intentions. It happened in the past and the same is being repeated at present. If you have done something wrong then you should be prepared to pay penalty for the same but no he will not do this.

Thirdly, I would like to make a request with folded hands to Shri Ram Vilas ji, Shri Vishwanath ji that the country is reeling under the crisis and there is no question whether it is due to you or us you are also guilty as it has risen from the womb of the Non-Congressism. Had you and Mulayam Singh ji been united then the Mosque would not have been demolished. Therefore, do not consider yourself innocent. Paswan ji, I always asked you to be united but it does not mean that I am not guilty.

I would like to point out one thing more. They took away the national slogan "Vande Matram" from us. Similarly, Shri V.P. Singh, Shri Arjun Singh and others also say that they did not consider Mahatma Gandhi as "the Father of the Nation". Why should they consider him so? did they take part in the freedom-struggle? they did not. therefore, why should they bother to consider Mahatma Gandhi as "the father of the Nation"? They have nothing to do with the freedom struggle. They have no thing to do with the swaraj, secularism, nationalism or the unity of the country. Do they want to take revenge from the man who invaded India with 12000 soldiers and fought with Rana Sanga. He invaded at the age of 40 or 42 and when after getting defeated he was returning he wanted to know why smoke was emanating from all around there. He was told that there were many castes in the Hindu religion and they all had

separate kitchen. That is why today there are 10 crore Muslims here because many castes were expelled from Hindu religion. Such a religion having thousands of gods and goddesses is bound to be in such a crisis.

I would like to tell you one more point.
(Interruptions)

SHRISATYADEO SINGH (Balrampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. The hon. Minister is levelling allegations on the religion. He is calling religion * (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is point of order. I will hear him; I will allow him to speak. under what rule or provision are you raising it?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRISATYADEO SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister is calling religion * (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, continue Mr. Kesri.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That will not go on record.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: An article of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee appeared in the "Hindustan" in which it was said that Hinduism was no a religion but it was a culture. Therefore, hon. colleagues, please understand it there is not only one deity in the religion, there are thousands of deities here (Interruptions)

Please listen, I am pointing out one thing. I am saying it to them and to my party

[Sh. Sita Ram Kesri]

colleagues also. They say that they want to construct the Ram Mandir. I have never been in favour of constructing any Ram-Mandir, Masjid or Gurudwara. I have discussed it in my party also. I am taking their side because the Masjid has been demolished, and therefore it should be reconstructed otherwise, I was never in this favour. I am frank in this matter. It is not the duty of the Government to construct a temple, mosque, gurudwara or a church, rather, the duty of the Government is to protect them.

What did they do. By Sri Rama they mean the King Rama only and not the Rama who was banished to the forest. They started their Rath Yatra in the name of King Rama. The King Rama rode the chariot and similarly they rode the Rath (chariot) But unfortunately their Rath Yatra symbolised deceit and treachery and that is why it was intercepted by Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav in Bihar. I appreciate Shri Yadav. The Rath Yatra should have been stopped earlier. Had it been stopped in the beginning we would not have witnessed the ugly face of Rama and the mandir-masjid issue would not have been blown out of proportion. Therefore, I always say that there are ideological differences and not only political differences. It was in 1952, that Shri Prabhu Dutt Brahmachari came out in the open and fought with Jawahar Lal Nehru on the ideological plane. Now the Congress and you have to decide whether this is the country of Jawahar Lal Nehru or that of Prabhu Dutt Brahmachari. The second thing to be decided is whether the country will be run on the ideology of Gandhiji or those of Nathuram Godse who shot Gandhiji dead on January 30, 1948. Godse was not merely a person, he symbolised an idea. Therefore, this should be stopped. I tell you that your party is not strong enough to fight these things. The party is splitted. It should be united. But it should not try to disintegrate us. Our unity should not be disturbed. We will settle this problem with them. But they cannot. This is the product of non-Congressism and our weaknesses. I would like to point out one thing more. Their

Ram is illusive and their Ram is a trader, it is not written in any religion..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA (Padrauna): Mr. speaker, Sir, I am on a point or order....

MR. SPEAKER: I would not like to listen to such points of order frequently. First tell me under which rule? Which rule has been violated here? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: One who has betrayed has no right to take the name of Lord Rama.

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA: Sir, he is calling Lord Rama a trader. Rama is an ideal. He should mind his language.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: First you please sit down. You need not speak so much. We do not have so much time. there is no point of order here.

SHRI RAM NAGINA MISHRA: We too shall refer to other religions in our speech.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please understand what he means to say. It is no use arguing without reason.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: Ours is "Hey Ram" and yours is "Shri ram". Ours is Gandhis' Rama and not that of Godse's Rama (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Kesri, please conclude within five minutes. There are a number of persons to speak on this issue.

SHRI SITARAM KESRI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, why did they choose the date December, 6? I would like to tell you one thing. It was the death anniversary of late Shri Ambedkar. Shri Ambedkar disowned the Hindu religion and owned Buddhism because the Scheduled Caste and weaker sections of society were being neglected by Hindu religion. Therefore, he accepted Buddhism. He was a man of the stature who was the architect of our

Constitution and they have committed such a misdeed on his death anniversary day only to show that religion in the name of Lord Rama is supreme. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am, therefore, constrained to say that it is not only a matter of shame for the country, but we doubt whether this country can remain united. I also doubt whether this House can remain intact. I would like to submit to all hon. members that the B.J.P. has double standards. On the one hand, they beg apology and seek atonement for the sensitiveness of the country and on the other hand, they attack the place of worship. Just as five hundred years back.... (Interruptions) I would like to submit only this much that attempt is made to create a "sense of victory" among them. With these words, I would like to say that this No-confidence motion is not based on facts, it is meaningless**

[English]

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR (Mangalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by my Leader hon. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, who is also the Leader of the masses of this country.

Sir, he has moved this Resolution expressing loss of confidence in this Government. Today, it is proved beyond doubt that the people of this country, in one voice, have expressed the loss of confidence in this Government. During the discussion, many points have been raised. But, today, in my opinion and it could also be seen that if at all anybody is happy about the happenings in this country, it is M. Somnath Chatterjee. It is very clear that today, Mr. Narasimha Rao is not ruling this country, it is Mr. Jyoti Basu who is ruling this country. Indirectly Mr. Arjun Singh is ruling this country. The people of this country will not allow this. The people of this country have resolved to bring a representative Government. I would like to ask my Congress friends, if there is any doubt in your mind about this, let us go before the people and let the people really decide who should rule this country.

Sir, one point was raised that our

leadership could not control the Kar Sevaks and Kar Sevaks demolished the structure.

Sir, you will pardon me for saying something that in this House, we have five hundred members. We claim to be the representatives of people of this country and we claim to be the intellectuals of this country. Many occasions had arisen wherein, you by sitting in the Chair, were not able to control these five hundred and odd Members. Many times, you were made to retire to your Chamber. Therefore, I would like to ask one question and that is, how can you control lakhs and lakhs of people who have gathered there. It is a fact and everybody would agree to it. I would like to ask another question. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI DUTTA MEGHE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is passing a remark on you. That should not go on record..... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: This is a fact. We have also heard about Mahatma Gandhi saying that he was opposed to partition of this country. He had said that if the country is to be divided, it should be divided on his dead body. But, did he control the situation? The country was divided on communal lines viz. Pakistan and India. You also speak about controlling the masses. If the situation goes out of control what can you do? Today, we have to see first who is responsible for this aftermath. I would say, it is the Prime Minister of this country, who made such a speech on the 6th of December which was given a wide publicity on the television and after that, frenzied communal people, frenzied Muslims came out on the street, who is responsible.

SHRIMRUTYUNJAYANAIK (Phulbani): Nathuram Godse belonged to the RSS cadre.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: Police had to fire on them. Now, the people, from all the parties were saying that there were no

[Sh. Dhananjaya Kumar]

communal riots in this country after the happenings in Ayodhya. It was not a Hindu-Muslim riot. There was perfect communal harmony. Only because of the speeches, people came out on the streets and the police had to fire on them.

Sir, today, one Minister after the other are standing in the queue to support the Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now. Known facts need not be mentioned.

SHRIV. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: These are relevant facts. There was a long queue of Ministers and one after the other, they were standing and supporting the Prime Minister. They were speaking as if the BJP, VHP and Bajrang Dal have committed the most heinous crime. They were saying that they are in power. I would like to throw a challenge, if such is the case, let us go before the people and let the people decide who should rule this country (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMRUTYUNJAYANAİK: Then, you resign and face the by election.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: Sir, so many evidences have been placed before this country. From that very site, a number of evidences have been recovered to show that there was a temple and that temple was demolished and a so called mosque was constructed.

Sir, I would request my friends in the Treasury Benches, at least now, to open their eyes. Let them know the reality, otherwise, they have lost their right to rule this country and the people have already decided their fate. If at all they have anything more, let them go before the people and let the people decide who should rule this country. My friend Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan.....

MR. SPEAKER: No. I do not want this kind of debate going on. You don't have to reply to each and every point. Please take your seat.

SHRI V. DHANANJAYA KUMAR: One minute.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Now, Mr. Salman Khurshid.

[*Translation*]

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI SALMANKHURSHEED): Mr. speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to express my views when the country is standing at the cross road and its fate is at stake. Today, with a great amount of betrayal, the leaders of Bhartiya Janata party have moved this 'No Confidence Motion' I do not know whether these leaders understand the meaning of the word 'No-Confidence' or not. What type of doubts they have in the Government. Do they think whether they are incapable of facing the Congress. Today the fire says to the water that it has no faith on it (water). today a cruel man has expressed his doubt that the good hearted man would not allow him to commit cruelty.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, they have two faces - one with which they went to Ayodhya armed with weapons - to demolish the mosque and they did break the mosque; the other one with which they have come here, equipped with both sweet and bitter words to dishearten Shri Narasimharao. But my submission is that the security forces may have committed some mistake there but the Member of Congress party would not commit any mistake here in the House. They cannot succeed in dethroning either Shri Narasimharao or the Government. Your assistance.....

(*Interruptions*)

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee talked of India's identity. He said that there is Yamuna on one side and Ganga on the other. when the water of both the rivers join together it is called Ganga water. We do agree that it is Ganga water and that Ganga water then goes into Bay of Bengal and that water is called neither Yamuna water nor Ganga water. It is called Indian ocean.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these people talk of appeasement. BJP has formed its platform on this one single factor and emphasise for the suppression of minorities in the country. As far as the issue of 'Shahbano' and 'Satanic Verses' are concerned I would like to submit that if Indian women have to support them, they should have the courage to get a law enacted providing an equal share of matrimonial property between the husband and the wife as soon as they get married....

MANY HON. MEMBERS: Let it be enacted.....

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the minority Communities in India have never opposed the enactment of any law for the development of the country however they have always objected against any attempt of defaming them. It needs courage to enact laws for development. Ask the capitalists who gave money to assist the BJP workers to go to Ayodhya, whether they are willing to give half of their immovable property to their wives? When these people have no courage to do it how these people can talk of a uniform civil code, this matter can be discussed. But Mr. Speaker, Sir, India is a country with a comprehensive outlook but the Tax-laws for Hindus and Muslims are not the same. Who submits his tax return in united Hindu families? It is such a matter as pertains to sociology which has to see as to how should we move ahead and make development. India's problems cannot be solved by condemning Muslim Community. We must have to keep courage if we want to solve these problems, and if we have the capability we should look ahead and realize the speed with which the world is moving forward. We should not look back. They talk of sacrifices....

PROF. RITA VERMA (Dhanbad): if they want to take advantage of HUF, they should agree to adopt a common civil code. Why do they object it?

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Constitution was framed we never had any objection for having a common civil code. But the point is that the

common civil code cannot be a Hindu civil code. My submission is that the common civil code should be framed for the whole country. Why do they talk only of their own sacrifices? There are lakhs of Muslims residing in this country whose relatives fought and died for Pakistan against India, but no Indian Muslim shed tears on their death. When Jawaldar Abdul Hameed opened fire on the Pakistani forces he did not think even for a moment that his bullet might take the life of any of his relative fighting for Pakistan. This is the real sacrifice. We have made real sacrifices. These people do not know what is the real meaning of sacrifice.... (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Atal Bihari Vajpayee ji talked of sensitivity. How sensitive his ears were that he could hear the voice of the aged old stones but not the cries of the orphaned children in Bhopal, the cries of the ruined houses or those of the dying women all over the country. Today, the question is not whether we hear the voice of a stone or not, the question is whether we hear the voice of human beings or not. If BJP does not pay any heed to the voice of human beings, then it is very clear that they would not allow to live the people, but we would not let them die. We would die but not let the people of the country die.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to deliver a long speech. I know that a number of points have already been raised. I also know that clarification has also been given. However, I would like to ask a question to those who have stood either to support us or to remain neutral.

The situation is that now everybody has expressed regret for the incident in Ayodhya. All the leaders of the B.J.P. including Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee have expressed regret. They have said it in the Press Conference also that the happening in Ayodhya is a criminal act. I ask, if whatever happened in Ayodhya is a criminal act then what should be the punishment for that? Is there any provision in the Constitution of India or in law that if someone's houses is demolished and that if someone expresses regret for that then is it enough? Is it enough to express

[Sh. Salman Khursheed]

regret after demolishing a place of worship? It should not be taken as the mere demolition of a place of worship of Muslims. Ram Chabutra was also very much there as 'Rasoi of Sita Maa' 'Mandir of Sankat Mochan' were also situated there. We do have great respect for these places of worship. We know as to what is the importance of Lord Ram. We are also the citizens of India. We also know how to honour Lord Ram. we consider him as Maryada Purshottam Ram and we have also learnt as what is the importance of Lord Ram. When Gandhiji was ridden with bullets, what he uttered was the name of Lord Ram. he uttered "He Ram". the men of the B.J.P. pronounce "Shri Ram" and on the contrary, even while facing bullets we pronounce "He Ram". This is the difference between them and us. They know how to kill and we know how to be killed. This is what distinguishes us. today I would like to say that of course we could not be able to protect the mosque on the 6th December, but the struggle has not come to an end. As a matter of fact, it is now the beginning of the struggle. We know and we do also feel that what they did was not merely an act of demolishing a Babri Masjid, there by they did also create differences among the people. On one side stands the whole of India and on the other side stands a newly created minority class. Hindus-Muslims-Sikhs-Christians are on the one side whereas the men of the Bajrang Dal and the Vishwa Hindu Parishad are standing on the other side. I would like to say then they should bear it in their mind that the Government of Narasimha Rao is not going to appease them.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, only 15 days have passed, not the 40 days; we are still mourning it. Our minds are disturbed. So much so that I am not in a position to say anything.... (Interruptions)

SHRI JANARDAN MISRA (Sitapur): Mr. Speaker, sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: You should first tell me as to which rule is being violated, only then

raise a point of order. If things go like this frequently then the business of the House cannot be transacted.

SHRI JANARDAN MISRA: What I want to ask is that.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You do not have the right to ask me anything....

(Interruptions)

[English]

It is not going on record. You please take your seat.

[Translation]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, our mental state is well explained by a line of the poem written by Faiz:

"Himmete Ilteza Nahi Baki
Zabt ka Hausla Nahi Baki"

We are now not even in a position to put forward our complaints.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Shahabuddin, there is a constraint of time, you should keep it in mind.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: You will have to allow me for 10 to 15 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: You will get that, but not more than that.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Before whom should we appeal?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Vajpayee Ji has given a call for telling the truth. He is right, now the truth should really come out still there is time. No facts should be suppressed because we have not been exposed to fascism as yet. It is, therefore, said that we should speak till we have the freedom of speech, we can express our views in the limited time as long as we are alive. We

should speak whatever little or more we have to speak because the truth is not dead.

I am happy that in the course of last three days' discussion, efforts have been made by our colleagues to tell the truth as much as have been comprehended by each of them. Various views have been expressed in many ways on whatever happened in Ayodhya. I would like to add that it was second assassination of Gandhi ji.

Many more things have been said about the Ayodhya incident I appreciate Vajpayee ji who entraps us in the jugglery of his words. I do not say that he does not mean what he says. But what has been said by his colleagues does not at all make me feel that they have even the slightest feeling of shame or grief for the blood shed of the people in the country or for the blot upon the dignity of the country. Vajpayee Ji is certainly a great orator, but I am reminded of a couplet by Iqbal:

"Iqbal Bara Updeshak Hai, Man Baton
Me Moh Leta Hai,
Guftar Ka Yeh Gazi to Bana, Kirdar Ka
Gazi Ban Na Saka."

I, at time, feel that keeping in view the events that took place there, we should not cherish the idea of reconstructing the Babri Masjid, rather we should make a monument there like the Samadhi of Gandhi Ji and on which the following lines may be inscribed:

[English]

"Here lies Secularism: Rest in peace
From 26th January 1950 to 6th December,
1992." That will be a true memorial to this
incident.

[Translation]

Shri Vajpayee Ji said that the temple cannot be constructed on the basis of fraud and deceit. Here he is absolutely right, but if he makes a close study of all the happenings, he will come to know that whatever happened in Ayodhya was only a game of fraud and betrayal. But when the word 'Betrayal' is

used Mr. Speaker, Sir, I fail to understand as to who is betraying whom. I fail to understand whether you are betraying them or they are betraying you or the both are betraying India together. Let me say Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the people of whole of India are betraying the helpless Muslims. 'O' God where should your helpless men take solace? Saints and the Sultans are both cunning. We are standing between the Saints on the one hand and the Sultans on the other. Before whom should we simple men pray and speak out our grief.

What Shri Vajpayee Ji said is really something very interesting. He said that the mosque was demolished because a uniform civil code is not followed and that because a Shahabuddin runs a magazine entitled Muslim India and that because this issues that is there for 500 years was internationalised. He also referred to Sharjah and his actual words were - "What is their attitude towards us"? Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know as to who are 'they' about whom he referred. Who are those, my brothers, sons and fathers for the guilt of whose we are being punished? If all the Muslims of the world are a community then it is an international issue and if you want to internationalise this internal issue then Vajpayee ji you are not doing justice with the country. You said as to what had happened in Warsaw in 1945. If one country had occupied the territory of the other, then, do you want to create that situation here? In your opinion 'chewing of Pan' represents Hindutva or Islam but in my mind it only represents Indianism and nothing else.

When we got freedom in 1947, was it for Hindus only or whether it was to settle the account of centuries. Would you draw the balance-sheet of History, whether anyone can draw balance-sheet of History with anyone and if you do it today then do you think that this would stop here only. Can you arrest the cycle of time? Will anybody ever ask you to settle the account?

You said that you were waiting for the decision of the court regarding acquisition. Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission I would like to say that it is a fraud with the

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

House. It is an attempt to mislead the House, because that case had no connection with Babri Mosque, its land and with its structure. Therefore, in this regard I want to cite extract of the post script written by the senior judge of the special bench in his judgement

[English]

"The Bench has been accused of inordinately delaying pronouncement of judgement and thereby contributing to the destruction of the structure. I do not propose to offer any justification for my "Lethargy" through the present post script. I only wish to place on record a fact and the procedure of pronouncing judgement in a case which has been heard by a Bench of three judges. First the fact which has bearing on the allegation that the delay has contributed to the destruction of the structure.

(a) The present writ petitions have nothing to do with the roofed structure, which has been demolished. In the writ petitions the dispute is confined to the open space around the said structure which was acquired by the State Government through impugned notification.

The demolition of the roofed structure was subject matter of litigation on the regular suits in which even recording of evidence has not commenced....

Further the aforesaid roofed structure was not lacking the protection of the Court order. In the regular suits in which the roofed structure was subject matter of litigation, an interim order had been passed on 14.8.1989 on State Government's own application requiring the parties to maintain a status quo. Court's interim orders have the same efficiency as its final order or judgement. The structure also had the protection of the solemn undertaking given by the State Government to the court and to the National Integration Council....

The Court has no police force or para military force to enforce compliance of its orders on the spot. Protection of private

property against vandalism is the function of the Executive especially a property which has the protection of a Court's order final or interim.

Protection of private property against vandalism is related to enforcement of law and order. In the above context, I wonder what improvement would have been brought about by the pronouncement of judgement prior to 6th December, 1992".

[Translation]

Therefore, I would like to urge you that this excuse can mislead the House. But this does not suffice and they reiterated that they talked of delinking. What can be the bigger fraud than this? Time and again we requested them to delink the issue, and asked them for a new map showing the land other than the Babri Mosque. Such map could be drawn, approved and the issue could be resolved accordingly. And if the temple was to be constructed, the work could have been started by the next day. I repeatedly said this, on behalf of the Muslim fraternity and on behalf of Babri Mosque Committee that this issue could be settled over night. Keeping in view the hope and aspiration of the country we exhorted the Vishwa Hindu Parishad to say that the mosque would remain there and the temple would be constructed. Draw a map for building a temple and abandon the idea of demolition of this mosque; then start a dialogue. This issue could be resolved by overnight and the construction work of temple could be started from the next day. Therefore, the pretext of delinking is not too much.

Then they made a wrong statement. They said that they had agreed to hand over the issue to the Supreme Court as a one point reference. History is the witness of the fact that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad had never accepted it but the Babri Mosque Committee had accepted. We had also agreed on Krishna Aiyar Formula. We had accepted the modified formula of Rajiv Gandhi under Article 143 (1) which was about Article 138(2) and was about the commission of inquiry. After that Shri Narasimha Rao talked about to hand over this issue to the Supreme

Court under Article 143 (1). We have accepted it but the other party should also assure in writing that it has accepted the decision. Perhaps you will remind what Owaissi Sahib has said in the House. therefore, third pretext can also not be accepted.

[Sh. Shahabuddin]

Fourth legal point is that a law was enacted in 1947, and Babri Mosque was not included in its preview. It did not mean that all parties had accepted your demand. It was not taken under its perview because we had to pacify the sentiments so that the sentiment of the people may remain in control with whom you were trying to play. It did not mean that we had made a commitment that the Government or the Parliament or the Muslims had accepted your views regarding the Babri Mosque. This question does not arise. Therefore, it is also not true. Reference of the decision on Shahbano case was also cited regarding Babri Mosque issue. I shall not expahsis on it. I would like to say that we are sitting here in the Parliament and the Parliament is supreme. Our feeling about Shahbano case was that Shariat Act also exists in India. This act was passed in 1947 and exists even today and according to that act this decision was wrong. Then the Parliament should correct it and should pass a clear law regarding it.

[English]

Parliament is Legislatively Supreme, Parliament is sovereign. Parliament has always corrected not one but many decisions of the Supreme Court.

[Translation]

Therefore, it was an issue of point of law. Nobody has ever made any objection regarding the decision of the court on point of fact. Therefore, this pretext is also not true.

After that they said that Muslims are much appeased and pampered in India. But the fact is that we are economically backward I have to say with great regret that no day in the history of India has passed without

shedding blood of Muslims and atrocities are not committed on us. This is our appeasement. The whole House know as to how much employment Muslims get. We are being appeased. The example of Babri Mosque is before you that how much our religious sentiments and rights are being regarded. There is systematic discrimination in public employment. They should also be exposed who introduced the Muslims historically adversary for inciting the sentiments of Hindus against them and to maintain the injustice prevailed in Hindu Society. But will this pretext be believed? they talked of Kashmir. I would like to say about Kashmir that every Indian is feeling very bad about whatever is going on in Punjab and Kashmir because India is moving towards the disintegration. But you have broken hearts of crores of people. India will not be united by doing so and we can suppress disturbance in Kashmir and Punjab but if by chance these is disturbance throughout India. We can't suppress it.

Somebody said about the M.G. Kamathi's minority psychology of Hindus.... (Interruptions)

I would like to say that our former Cabinet Secretary Shri H.N. Mukherjee said....

[English]

Hindus are a majority group with a minority psychology.

[Translation]

I am saying so because Shri Vajpayeeji has talked of mentality. I would like to say to those who claim themselves to be the representatives of the Hindus that Hindus are the backbone of India. They constitute majority and they should rest assures that nobody can snatch the rights of 85 per cent people. So the 85 per cent people must remain assured. They should not be illusioned. They should not consider themselves weak. They will get their due share for their being in the majority. But it appears that the majority had not coordination with the minority so far. They could not get.

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

out from persecution complex. It is not good on our part.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people are talking of history. I must say that prior to 1949 no Hindu leader, no religious leader or no Hindu organisation had ever claimed that the Babri Masjid was the birth place of Ramchandraj. The case of 1985 was referred to. One may go through the entire file of the case of 1985. Nothing has been mentioned therein that the real birth place of Ramchandraj is the place where the Babri Masjid is located. The name of Tulsidas ji referred to, he had never said this thing. I would like to ask my colleagues as to why did they not raise this question when they were in power in Uttar Pradesh during 1977-79. They were part of the Central Government during 1977-79. Why did they not raise this issue then? It was never raised before 1979. It is not the question of religion but it is merely a question of capturing power.

We have lost the battle but not the war. Today, it is clear that war is between chauvinism and secularism. One path leads to fascism and the other leads to democracy. We are standing at a cross road. Mere words cannot help reconstruct the demolished Masjid. The poison spread by words cannot be removed. The wounds in the heart cannot be healed up. The demolition of the Babri Masjid would force all of you to rise for the unity of the country and we should be ready to sacrifice our lives and property and everything to save the country from treading the path of fascism, because this war is a very serious.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, India will continue to enjoy the fruits of freedom. There will remain the Rule of law in India. The Constitution of India will survive. The traditions of the people of the country will survive. Nobody on earth can destroy them. But there does not arise any question to have a talk with these fascist forces. No legal short cut will be allowed to be adopted at the cost of rule of law. Government should expedite the proceedings of the court. I believe that this case can be settled within three months and all disputes can be solved.

Regarding final verdict, I would like to say that the whole country should announce that it would honour the verdict of the court, whatever it may be. Then in the light of the decision of the Court the Mandir or Masjid should be constructed.

I would like to draw the attention towards the statement made by Vajpayeeji to the effect that the Karsevaks should surrender themselves before the law. I wish that they should do it in reality. Perhaps it may prove a repentance for their guilt. If Government thinks it necessary to issue an ordinance for their convenience, it must be issued.

In the beginning, I had said that I did not know who deceived whom. I have a lot of material, but I would not like to utilise that now. I would like to say one or two things to the hon. Prime Minister. He is not present here. I would like to ask him as to why the State Government was not dismissed even after the demolition of the Babri Masjid. It took six hours in demolishing the Masjid. Why was that area not evacuated for thirty hours? It took you five days. Why have you taken five days in imposing ban against those organisations whose misdeeds were before our eyes and the world? I would like to ask as to why you have not declared the Babri Masjid as a historical monument much before this incident, if you had declared it as a historical monument then it would have come under protection of the Directive Principles or State policy and Central Government would have got the right of deploying its forces there. If you had entered into an agreement with Shri Kalyan Singh regarding deployment of Central Forces around the disputed structure this situation would not have arisen. Why did the Government not make it clear to Shri Kalyan Singh before hand that Central forces though would remain under his control yet these would be deployed only around the disputed structure. If his intention was not clear he would have definitely refused to do that then action could have been taken against him. Why did you not take over the administration of Ayodhya tehsil in your hands under Article 352, when law and order situation was deteriorating? why did you not file application

before the Supreme Court to appoint the Central Government as the receiver so that it could have got legal right to protect the Masjid? It was the question of the entire nation, it was the question of our community and its existence. I personally have no doubt on your intention. But today every Muslim and every person is saying that there was a conspiracy behind it. Government and B.J.P. were equally responsible therefor. I regret to say that Muslim community has lost its confidence and faith. It has lost its confidence not only in the Prime Minister, or Government or in a party but in the political system of India. It has become our national duty to restore the confidence and faith of 15 crore Muslims.

[English]

To restore that confidence and the faith of the Muslim community is the national task today. There cannot be a bigger task.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very strange that the thief cries to punish the 'Chaukidar'. I do not accept it. I will deal with the 'Chaukidar' later on. I will not let him go scot-free in this manner. I would get him arrested and punish him first. That is why I cannot support the no-confidence motion moved by such thieves.

I thank you very much for giving me time.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Somehow I am reminded of my younger days. In 1942, during the Quit India struggle, when I was still a young student, my father - who loved me immensely - bought me a Shervani and a Turkey cap. When I used to leave the school and go in Prabhat Pheri, the leaders of the Congress then, who were leading the freedom struggle (Interruptions)

[Translation]

I want that you should keep quiet.

[English]

There should be a limit. (Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Anything said without my permission will not go on record.

SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF: When we used to go in Prabhat Pheri the Congress leaders of those days, who used to lead us, used to bring me to the front row. We used to carry either the tri-colour flag with Charkha or Gandhiji's photo. I remember well. That was the spirit with which the Indian National Congress - which fought for the country's freedom - wanted to give the message to the foreign aggressors that every religion, every community, every Indian is fighting this battle together.

Today my friend Shri Shahabuddin just now spoke very emotionally. He might have lost all faith. But I have not lost faith in our people.

16.00 hrs.

I have faith in the Indian people, the secular people of India, who are stronger than many of the communal forces combined of who are trying to threaten the unity and integrity of this nation.

Sir, I have repeatedly said in this House - I am a member of the minority community; many of us are representing here, but we do not represent our own communities, we represent the Indian people irrespective of caste, community or creed. Sir, at this point of time one has to think whether really we are Indians or we are only Hindus or we are only Muslims; whether India is being forgotten, I do not know.

Sir, certain basic questions come before us. Before I come to those basic questions, I want to say something. This nation is one of

[Sh. C.K. Jaffer Sharief]

the most ancient and its civilization represents the most magnificent contribution to secular polity in the entire history of the world civilisation. It is this nation, India, where vedic religions visualising the concept of universal brotherhood (*Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*) was given to the world. It is this nation which threw up the grand spectacle of Lord Buddha whose message of peace, truth, non-violence and equality of men, revolutionised the religious ethos. It is this nation where Islam and Hinduism contributed to a glorious synthesis of two cultures. The nation of Ashoka and Akbar, the nation of Kabir and Tulsidas, the nation where art and cultural streams of different religions and ethnic groups graced the glorious Panorama, the grand concept which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's vision immortalised as unity in diversity. Indian history is replete with innumerable instances of the secular character of both Hindu and Muslim rulers of Medieval India. For instance, Chatrapathi Shivaji, who raised the banner of 'Swaraj', was the most secular of all leaders who not only granted lands and money to mosques, but in whose army the personal security guards were mostly devout Muslims in high positions. The name of Shivaji's father — Shahaji — had Muslim connotation. Shahaji's mother worshipped at the Dargah of Shaha Sharief in Ahmednagar and prayed for sons. She named her two sons as Shahaji and Shariefji after the great Muslim Peer Shaha Sharief.

Sir, I belong to Karnataka where there was the highly enlightened and great Patriot Tipu Sultan, whose contributions to the fight for freedom is by no means small. It was in his regime that secular ideals struck root in the State of Mysore where large number of Hindu temples were not only protected but also given magnificent donations of rich agricultural lands which flourished as never before. Let me quote from his declarations in 1787:-

"We hold this God-given law dear to our heart, based as it is on human dignity, reason and brotherhood of

man. With reverence we have also read the Vedas of the Hindus. They proclaim their faith in universal unity and express the belief that God is one although He bears many names. It distresses us therefore that some persons wearing the garb of religion have crossed into the frontiers of the Kingdom to preach the false and ungodly doctrine of hatred between various religions.

We hereby declare that from this day, it shall not be lawful in the Kingdom of Mysore and for any Mysore and beyond this realm, to discriminate against anyone on the basis of religion, caste or creed."

It was under his gallant leadership that the people of Karnataka fought against invading British armies in defence of their freedom. It was Tipu who had foreseen the danger to India's freedom because of the disunity of Indian rulers and fought with all his might to unite all Indian kingdoms to keep the British away from our land.

Sir, this is our history; this is our tradition. Where are we going now? I was listening very carefully to the debate and I was listening to very eminent speakers who are experts not only in parliamentary procedures, but who have very good knowledge of constitutional propriety. Today, I want to ask this House and outside this House, the secular people of India one question. I am not pointing out towards Kalyan Singh Government. It is not Kalyan Singh Government; it was the Government of a political party and that Government, after filing affidavit to the highest Court of the nation betrays the people. That government, by doing everything to incite people, brought the head of this great nation down. Government bent her head in shame before the world, which has been championing the cause of secularism outside the country also. Do we not have any responsibility? Do we not fix any responsibility?

Sir, my friend Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan is sitting here; our friends from the Janata Dal

and the Left parties, may be it is time that they should tell us something because we betrayed Mr. V.P. Singh's Government. May be, we have done a mistake; may be you are not doing it. When Mr. Paswan spoke repeatedly on that, he tried to equate both the things. he can do it. I am sure, he will not equate the people of India. I am quite confident that if this Government has taken certain measures, it is based on the face of the secular parties in this House and the secular people outside this House. it is not the question of one Government or one Prime Minister. The Prime Ministers come and go. the Governments come and go, but what are we leaving behind? Today, while the minority is being hurt, the symbol or religion having been broken, what is that they did and achieved? After all, anybody, even a child will react. What is that they did in reaction? Have they made any loss to the public property? Have they made any loss to the private property? Have they attacked any other religion? Have they attacked even the law and order machinery? I went to Jaipur. Perhaps more than 98 per cent of the population is Muslims and I find a temple there. The temple is in such intact position that nothing has happened, not even a scratch. I was wondering, if so many Muslims were there how a temple was there, who was coming there for worship. But I could see the bullets all across the house tops, windows, inside the windows in the houses.

One sister from that end got up to ask about the common civil code. I am sorry, my young friend, Shri Salmon entered into a lot of debate. But what is happening in Gujarat — women being raped. it is being filmed. Please think, if that happens with your sister or daughter, how do you react, how do you feel? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARISINH CHAVDA: Who is in power there? it is your party Government. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF: At least,

I expected the lady members of this House, not only lady Members but even other Members of this House would refer to that, would condemn that. Nobody is bothered. People forget that they have brothers, they have sisters, they have daughters. What is it going on in this country? Let me tell you, it is not the question of.....

[*Translation*]

SHRI DILEEP BHAI SANGHANI (Amreli): The Police Commissioner has said that nothing of sort of this incident has occurred,

SHRI C.K. JAFFAR SHASIEF: Don't tell me that. Tell somebody else. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

Sir, with all humility, I would like to submit that even today the ray of hope is the basic secular character of our Indian people. Sir, there was partition of this country. people who wanted to go and went. But none of us went. When we participated in the freedom struggle, we did not participate that we wanted to go elsewhere. We participated because the Mother India was sacred to us. Today the country which came into existence because of two-nation theory want to prove that it was right. And what is happening in our country. It is giving strength to the argument put forward by the people of that country.

If for one who believe that our history, our tradition, our culture, our heritage is great. Today somehow there is crisis of confidence. the credibility is at stake. Our security forces have lost total credibility. I do not think minorities will believe them unless the Government comes out with proper measures as to how they will rectify it, how they will orient the security forces. What kind of confidence they will give, I do not know. The day will not be far off, let me tell to every one of us, if Punjab, Kashmir and Assam is repeated in all parts of the country. Let us be very clear about it. You cannot push the new generation to the wall. if you push to the wall, it will rebound. How am I to tolerate it? What for we tolerate it? If you want to kill, yes,

[Sh. C.K. Jaffer Sharief]

people may be ready to be killed, but they will not be simply killed. Don't push our people, our new generation, to the wall.

The minorities of this country lived under the magnanimity of the majority of our country. They are the elder brothers. They have to carry with them every section of the society with love, affection and consent, but not by brow-beating. Brow-beating will not do. It will not do good to the country or to society, even to humanity.

What the other countries have done? I would like to warn Pakistan that they have not done anything good. I am sorry the Government of Pakistan should equate itself with the BJP here. If they have demolished the mosque, they should demolish the temple? I do not think a nation should do it. I hope they have realised it.

Whatever it is, I must on this occasion, appeal to all the secular parties "Let us not try to talk in two voices." I am glad it is time that we should recognise they are talking only in one voice. We have seen enough of drama, going to Lucknow, going to Faizabad, courting arrest, coming back home, sitting and holding a press conference.

I am glad Shri Indrajit Gupta, who is sitting here, has rightly said in the National Integration Council meeting "We talk in the forum, in parliament, in NIC. But we are not mobilising people in the field." This is what is required of the secular parties today. It is not a question of pulling one another's legs. Power will come to everybody. If you feel, you can save the House. If you save the House and the country, you can live in it. If you do not save the country, then God only knows what remains with us for posterity.

With these few words, I strongly oppose the No-Confidence motion. I thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: There are four names with me. I am inclined to give them the time. Please conclude your speeches in five

minutes time.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN (Chirayinkil): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand here to oppose this no-confidence motion.

When I stand here and when I heard all the BJP Members here, I remember a story which is very much talked about in our villages. One living being entered a house, eaten all the rice there, beaten the housewife and then tore into pieces the only bag that was there in the house. But still, going ahead with fury, it threateningly looked as if somebody else has done the crime? This is also like that. Our BJP friends are talking like that. Who has done any crime against you? All these happenings, all the sufferings of the people, are brought about by your one action. December 6th, the black Sunday will be remembered in our history as the blackest day of this century. There was a dispute. Actually, all wanted to settle that dispute only through negotiations or through the Constitutional means by approaching the court. Nothing was accepted by them. Finally, when the talks were on, they tried to have the *karseva* on the 6th of December. Our country has a federal structure. When we were considering that dispute, a Chief Minister was giving a word to the Prime Minister they should it would be honoured. What was stated? What did he say? He gave the promise to the Prime Minister, to the Court saying that the structure will be protected. It should be protected otherwise it will harm our federal structure be honoured. When Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was speaking, after the events, I expected something from him. Thousands of people died; thousands were injured, as the Railway Minister Just explained. What is worse, hundreds of women were widowed; hundreds of children were orphaned; women were raped and killed: How many crores worth of things were lost? As I said, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was not at all sorry for these things. He could have expressed his sorrows. I thought that with his stature, with his soberness, he would have told that when he moved that Motion. I thought he would apologise before this House and would say like: "We could not keep up the word; we have done a crime to this

[Smt. Suseela Gopalan]

country, to the entire secular fabric of this country." But he did not say a word like that. He only regretted about the action. Actually, he should have apologised. What happened? He said that it is an accidental thing. Was it an accidental thing? it is not an accidental thing.

Sir, when I went to Kerala, one thing happened. I was there on 6th December morning. Then, the people asked me what would happen on 6th December. I said what the Prime Minister had said. I said nothing will happen and at least it will go on up to 11th. But they said: "You are mistaken. The RSS-VHP-BJP are propagating here that by 12 O' Clock they will pull down the Masjid and Shri Kalyan Singh will resign. on the very day." So, this was pre-planned. There is enough material before you. Why was the building material kept three metres away from the Babri Masjid? Was it not true? I would like to know whether there was a trial conducted there by the 500 volunteers at the *Rama Katha Kunj* near the disputed complex on 5th December. Between 2.30 p.m. and 5.30 p.m. a trial was conducted, something was built by sand there. They had a trial on that day there. Nobody can dispute it. Why did you not allow the Press people to photograph that? You never allowed these things to be photographed. You attacked the press people. There is something to hide. You behaved like that till the end....(Interruptions) This is a pre-planned thing. Can any leader say that he does not know all these things? This trial was conducted there. Before that, all the materials were brought. The *karsevaks* had the weapons in their hands to demolish the structure. Was it like having match-box to put in the pocket? Everybody can see it. Only their leaders did not see it. They brought all the weapons. Around 500 people were there. But they say they could not see it. Actually, it is not that they did not see. But it was a pre-planned thing. So, they have done the biggest crime to this country (Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: What is the Parliamentary Affairs Minister doing?

MR. SPEAKER: He has to consult you and other persons.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: So the whole country is suffering now. The image of our country is tarnished before the world. Our brothers who are in the various parts of the country are suffering. Their life, their job and their property is in peril because of the actions of the BJP and their company. They are not sorry for it. They have gone there because they have no job in our country. But now what will happen to them? Temples are demolished. People are suffering. But they have no worry at all about it. We have tasted BJP rule. What is the message they are giving? They are trying to come to power in Delhi. There is a saying in our country that whenever a jack fruit is failed, a rabbit is dead. But don't think rabbit will be killed always when Jack fruit is fallen. The Indian people have realised this. By using Ram, you could always come to power. What will be the position if this BJP comes to power in Delhi? The majority of the Hindus are against this crime and they will be against you. And the whole secular sections in the country will unite together against this communal carnage.(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Now you have to conclude.

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: Actually, the Government has thoroughly failed by its monumental inaction to meet the situation. That is to be mentioned at least now after banning these communal organisations you have to act. When I went to Kerala, I came to know that five days after the ban, the order reached Kerala. How did they get 36 hours after the declaration of President rule to build the temple. Are they going to take over the place? All these are not possible things for the Government. The Congress party lacks courage to act in a serious situation like this. I want to remind you of 1984. Army was called after much killings. You wavered.

[Smt. Suseela Gopalan]

MR. SPEAKER: Now you have to conclude.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI SUSEELA GOPALAN: Proper action at the proper time and stern action is needed. Actually, all the secular forces and sensible people in the country will be with the Government. But only if you take proper action, this cooperation will come. We have got so many issues to criticise the Government. But this is not the proper time to criticise the Government. That is why, we are not doing it now. In short at the proper time, proper and stern action should be taken to save this country from this peril. (Interruptions) Which this, I oppose this Motion.

[Translation]

SHRI SUNIL DUTT (Bombay-North-West): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak. Today, no-confidence motion has been brought against the Government in the House. But in my opinion, here the issue should have been raised about those 1000 persons who have been killed in the aftermath of Ayodhya about those mothers who have lost their sons, about those children who have become orphan and about those women who have become widows. Today no reference is being made about them. Today, the discussion is being held as to how will the temple be constructed, how the mosque was demolished. But no reference is being made regarding those over one thousand people who have been killed in the riots. I have deep regret for them.

Today, I rise in this House in the capacity of an ordinary citizen and not in the capacity of a member of a political party. Therefore, I wish that this issue should be settled first. I would like to ask whether our people or our youth will continue to become victims of such petty incidents, whether our sister will continue to weep and whether our children will continue to become orphan. Will the

construction of the Mandir and the Masjid enable them to get back their lives? If we can return their precious lives, then do construct the Mandir and the Masjid. I want to submit to the House that today lakhs of children in our country are dying of starvation. Can they be given life, can they be provided food? You have always said....(Interruptions) I am talking of food. Among all the communities Hindus community is the most starved community. I am referring to them. Can you give education to you children? I have been observing for the last five years, we could have provided due place to the poor people in the society, we could have provided schools to the children, we could have undertaken welfare schemes for the widows with the amount of crores of rupees which we have spent on it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to refer to Shri Vajpayeeji. But he has left the House. I consider him the Bhishma Pitamah of this House. After thousands of years the war of Mahabharat is being enacted again today and Bhishma Pitamah is lying on the bed of arrows in the similar way. We the Pandvas will put the water into his mouth and not the Kauravs. When Bhishma Pitamah lying on his death-bed had asked for water, Arjun had provided him water. Even now Arjuna will give him water to drink and not Duryodhan because he wants to occupy the throne of the Indrapastha i.e. Delhi and become the ruler. This will not be possible. Therefore, through this House I would like to request every member of the House to think about India where the Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Christians all live together I can say it with confidence that until we think over it together, no Government can do anything in this regard. They should think about the children, mothers and sisters of this country. I am very proud of Shri Vajpayee and I have great regard for him and we call him Bhishma Pitamah. He is beacon of light for us and if we say that he is a true man it means that the fast which he observed yesterday was more to punish himself rather than to put pressure on the Government to accept his demands. I assure you that when he would speak in the House, he would speak the truth because he has a great love for the country. He loves the

[Smt. Sunil Dutt]

country more than his party. I too admit that the country is more dearer to me than my party. This Bhisma Pitamah too has to answer millions of the people. Thousand of years ago in such a meeting Bhisma Pitamah had sat silently watching Draupadi being disrobed. And before the eyes of today's Bhisma Pitamah the image of the country is being spoiled. Therefore, I request you all not to put the country to flames. Lord Rama had burnt Lanka. Today they are bent upon burning their own country. This should not happen. I do not want to say anything more. So, I express my thanks and conclude.

SHRISATYADEO SINGH (Balrampur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rose to support the no-confidence motion against the Government moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee in this House.

For last three days, the senior leaders, and hon. Members of all sides have been participating in the discussion on this serious issue. It seems to me that within these three days tone of speaking of certain members has changed as they were speaking in a way different to their usual one. Under whose pressure this change has come? Many resolutions have been moved and many discussions have been held in the past on the Babri-Masjid Ram Janambhoomi structure which has been demolished on 6th December and each time only words disputed structure have been used for it. But for the last three days I have been seeing that people are turning a blind eye again and again to this fact. Now they are using the words like Babri Masjid has been demolished or the structure of the Babri Masjid has been demolished. At present the country in bringing about changes in the economy of the country. Now they have turned to Raoism from Nehruism.....(Interruptions) Please have courage to hear what I say....(Interruptions)

Under whose pressure the Government is changing its tone or language. Is it the pressure from oil countries? Today Government has changed its economy. Be it is issue of labourers or unemployed persons

or the youth, the Government has covered its journey from Nehruism to Raoism.(Interruptions) The wheel has completed full circle. The Government has discarded Nehruism. Today a discussion was going on. Shri Sitaram Kasri was speaking whether the country will follow the path of Nehruism or the path of any other ism. Today the Government is standing on the cross road of many isms and it does not have the time to think about the country. Shri Sitaram Kesri turning towards, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan said that they too were feeling guilty conscious and were repenting. When Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh needed our support, he did not feel guilty conscious. But today he does. Today the Government is feeling guilty conscious. Today it should not feel guilty conscious and should not take any hysteric action. Government is banning one organisation after the other. Has it banned the Rashtriya Swayama Sewak Sangh for the first time? Did it not pass the buck of the allegation of the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi to other. It did not think over it. It levelled this allegation on a nationalist organisation. Today Bharatiya Janata Party has been put in the dock and it appears that the House has turned into a court, in which the investigation proceedings are going on against BJP. If there is at all any court in this country to decide our fate, it is the court of the people. If the Government does not suffer from any guilty-consciousness it should dare hold election and see the result....(Interruptions)

Sir, during last days, under the leadership of hon. Shri Vajpayee...(Interruptions) They had made promise, but when I returned from there, I saw the thousands of the C.R.P.F. and the B.J.P. personnel were standing. The journalists were agitating there. We demanded to bring our leader into the House. The Government is levelling allegation against him again and again. Please allow him to say something. The Government levelled false and wrong allegations against him and sent to prison. Today, it does not allow him to meet the journalists. Government would not like to come its misdeeds and wrong doings before the world. This hypocrisy will not last long. Shri Sita Ram Kesari was speaking in

[Sh. Satya Deo Singh]

the House in favour of Mandal Commission vociferously.

If you want to know about Mandal Commission, you may go through the election manifesto of Bhartiya Janata Party issued in 1984 and 1990. Supreme Court has also given decision on the lines of those manifestos. That Election Manifesto refers to "the creamy section of the society".

Sir, today you call us people of non-congressism. It is not our non-congressism, rather it is our nationalism. We are no.....*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: That would not go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI SATYA DEO SINGH: We have born in this soil and will merge into it. BJP is not a offshoot of the Congress party, we are nationalist people. You may please look at yourself, those who are educated in foreign countries cannot sing patriotic songs, you will not be able to understand the essence of patriotism in 'Vande Matram' Your patriotism was ruined in Moscow and is about to be ruined in China. Therefore, listen to this voice.

Still there is time, we are passing through crisis. The incident that took place is a challenge for us, it given an opportunity to us. The Hon. prime Minister dismissed three BJP Governments one after the other. I would like to ask him on what grounds he dismissed the Governments of Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh?

Why did he ignore the incidents that took place in Gujarat and Maharashtra? Earlier too, we had a direct contest with the ruling party, we won the elections and formed Governments in these States. We do not need their support, nor do we want to take any certificate. Let a discussion be held on

communalism, secularism in this House. The country will judge the things and decide at its own, you people will also know what the history will be.

[English]

So, please do not go to the dustbin of history; try to come out of it. Thank you.

SHRI INDER JIT (Darjeeling): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for having given me time to share some of my thoughts with this House.

Sir, as I have said once before, in 1947 we set out to create a strong, integrated, secular and casteless India. Where are we today, Sir? I think we need to find the answer. I regret to say that we are more disintegrated today than in 1947. We are more communal today than in 1947. And we are also more caste-ridden today than in 1947.

Sir, these issues have been discussed times out of number, over the last three decades. Regretably however, we have never faced the issues squarely. We have gone by our genius for diagnosis, endless diagnosis. But, every time we have talked in terms of a possible remedy we have dithered and dithered rather sadly and tragically.

Sir, I would like to point out that we also have another genius-the genius of being wiser after the event. We have seen this displayed once again in this House from all sides. There can be no two opinions that what has happened deserves to be condemned in the strongest terms-the demolition of the Babri Mosque or the disputed structure as some friends would prefer to call it.

There can be no two opinions that reckless brickmanship has brought us to this very tragic stage. It is a pity that our friends across this House chose to play with fire around a dry haystack or still worse, with fire around a dry pool of petrol. Things have happened, Sir. But the question is what do we do now?

Unfortunately, we have Members swinging from one extreme to the other. Our Prime Minister has been blamed times out of number, even by good friends among the Left Front leaders and so on. We have been an extreme spectacle, a theatre of the absurd, where until upto 11.300 Clock of December the Prime Minister was praised by everybody as a great hero; And 45 minutes later, he is being denounced by everybody, particularly by our friends on the right, as a great villain.

Sir, what is the truth? the Prime Minister's - one fault - if he can be faulted on anything - one fault is that he was much too constitutional, much too correct in upholding the rule of law. Sir, the resolution of the National Integration Council has been quoted here. But few have cared to read that particular Resolution; and I would like to read that Resolution, just to show that what the Prime Minister did was the right thing. The Resolution stated:

"The NIC meeting, after considering all aspects of the Babri Masjid-Ram Janambhoomi dispute and the report of the Government, extends its whole-hearted support and cooperation in whatever steps the Prime Minister considers essential in upholding the Constitution and the rule of law and in implementing the court orders."

Sir, the Prime Minister, as I have said, can be faulted only on one thing — that he went all out to uphold the Constitution and to uphold the rule of law. Yes, the NIC gave him a *carte-blanche*. But then, he acted in accordance with his conscience; And I would like to complement him for his efforts until the end.

His efforts were there throughout. I know that as late as the evening of Dec 3 he drove specially to Parliament House to meet one of the friends, who was on his way to Ayodhya, and to be able to discuss with him. At that time, I happened to be there. He received a personal assurance from a ke individual that nothing wrong would happen and that the court orders would be upheld.

The Prime Minister has done his best. What has happened is, one can turn around and say, there was a case of miscalculation, misplaced faith. We misplaced faith in on BJP friends. Our BJP friends perhaps misplaced faith in the others. A commission of inquiry has been set up. I suppose before long, we will know the truth. One video-film has been seen. but I would not like - in accordance with our direction - to refer to that video-film because it is not before the House still.

I would now like to deal with one basic issue how do we tackle the basic problem of communalism? I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of this House to a very important resolution which was adopted by the provisional Parliament of India in 1948. It was my privilege as a young reporter to witness that particular scene from the press gallery above. What was this resolution? I would like to draw the attention of this House and more so particularly of the Prime Minister, and the leaders of the Opposition, in regard to what this resolution is. It clearly said that brave rhetoric will not do. What you really want is action.

This resolution in 1948, which was adopted unanimously, was moved by Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, who later became the second Speaker of the Lok Sabha. What did the resolution say. May I quote this:

"Whereas it is essential for the proper functioning of democracy and the growth of national unity and solidarity that communalism should be eliminated from Indian life, this Assembly is of the opinion that no communal organisation which by its constitution or by the exercise of discretionary power vested in any of its officers or organs, admits to or excludes from its membership persons on ground of religion, race and cast, or any of them, should be permitted to engage in any activities other than those essential for the *bona fide* religious, cultural, social and educational needs of a community, and that all steps, legislative and administrative necessary to prevent such

[Sh. Inderjit]

activities should be taken."

That is the end of the resolution. What has happened?

This particular resolution was supported by everyone. It was supported by Mr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, who was then in the House, Giani Gurmukh Singh Musaffir, Prof. N.G. Ranga and Mr. Tajmal Hasan. But sadly to this day, the resolution has not been implemented. So, I would urge the Prime Minister and beg of him and also the Opposition leaders to find time to look at this particular resolution and see what we can do about the resolution.

It should be implemented because unfortunately throughout Panditji's regime, it was not implemented. It was again not implemented during the time of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. In fact, I must say, at one stage I think, in 1983 or 1984 and Mr. Balram Jakhar, my good friend is here and he will recall - a decision was taken in principle to implement this resolution. But at the last minute, because of certain developments, it was decided not to pursue it.

Mr. Prime Minister, I would appeal to you to try and implement this resolution. I think what we need to do is to convene an early meeting of the National Integration Council and try and see what can be done to implement this resolution.

One other point I would like to make. This is a point which nobody else has made. I think, the National Integration Council should be asked to meet soon and perhaps have a small committee which could go into the various possible ways in which we can promote integration. Nothing of the kind has been done. And it is sadly here that we have a situation where the founding fathers of the Constitution wanted certain things to be done, but these have not yet been done. I would like to refer, at this point, to a matter which has become an unfortunate controversy. One of the things decided at that time was to go in for a common civil code. Sir, this question of a common civil

code is not adequately understood. Dr. Ambedkar had made it very clear that we need not make it a compulsory code. Let it be a voluntary one. And Sir, it was explained by Shri K. Munshi, Shri Aladi Krishnaswamy, Aiyar and also by Dr. Ambedkar that this did not go against any particular religion. In fact, the chief Justice of India, Shri M.H. Beg went on record to say that it does not go against any particular religion.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not the point. It requires lot of philosophy.

SHRI INDER JIT: I will briefly mention about this. I had much more to speak on the subject. Therefore the National Integration Council should try and specify steps which need to be taken so that we can really promote integration.

I will take a couple of minutes on one other matter. I have all along sought to strengthen the functioning of our parliamentary system as a journalist and now, as a Member of this House. In this context, I am rather unhappy on one point. And I would like friends on my side of the House to bear with me. I am particularly unhappy that we do not have Mr. Advani amidst us today. He is the Leader of the Opposition; he is not just an ordinary Member of this House....(Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : No, no. (Interruptions)

SHRI INDER JIT: May I be permitted to say that the Leader of the House has certain responsibilities? Regarding this, may I read from Kaul and Shakhder which is very important and which I would like my friends to know about.

"The responsibility of the Leader of the House is not only to the Government and its supporters in the House but to the Opposition and the House as a whole. He is the guardian of the legitimate rights of the Opposition as well as those of the Government. As such, he should be among the foremost champions of the rights of the House as a whole and see

that the House is not denied, despite pressure from any quarter its rightful opportunities." (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMRUTYUNJAYANAYAK: He has violated the Constitution. He is not the custodian of our Constitution. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDER JIT: Kaul and Shakhder made one point very clear. One of the biggest achievements of the present century is that the role of the Opposition has been formally recognised and is given a due place in the party system. The Leader of Opposition is thus an important person. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRAJEET YADAV: He has tried to destroy the unity of the country and you are pleading for him. What are you talking about (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE (Bombay North Central): It does not apply to him.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDER JIT: I do feel that the Leader of the Opposition has a statutory role. My friend, Mr. Chandra Jeet Yadav has made a point. I would like to say that in 1990, Mr. Atinder Pal Singh who was involved in the Shahadra Bomb Case and was arrested as a terrorist, was allowed to come to this House. I am only interested in upholding the finest parliamentary traditions.

MR. SPEAKER: You have made your point.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: If the Leader of the Opposition commits a crime, then he has no privilege. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK: He is not above law. He is not the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you getting up again and again? Please do not interrupt.

SHRI INDER JIT: I want to clarify one point. I am making this suggestion in the best interest of the healthiest conventions and is strengthening our parliamentary democracy. I do not want the world to have an impression that we are afraid of one individual. He cannot say anything more than what has been said before. It is unfortunate that he is not here and in fact, I would like to go one step further and say that we are playing Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: He himself is responsible.

SHRI INDER JIT: We should have the right to know what he has to say. We have the right to ask him questions, to corner him and if possible to expose him.

MR. SPEAKER: You have made the point.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI INDER JIT: Sir, there are occasions when we must rise above Party considerations and speak out what we consider to be in the best interests of parliamentary democracy... (*Interruptions*) He could have been allowed to come here only for this day. (*Interruptions*)

I am concluding and I have just two last sentences. Mr. Speaker Sir, our world today faces many crises because we have lots and lots of politicians but very few statesmen. And our position is still worse. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): This is called fascism - (*Interruptions*) Not to allow the one who is not agreeable to their thinking is called fascism (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI INDER JIT: I am just concluding. Our world faces many crises.... (*Interruptions*)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) Mr. Speaker, Sir, If members of Congress Party are not allowing member of their party to speak, how will they allow me to speak. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: This is fascism!

SHRI SHARAD DIGHE: He is making wrong submissions.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You should lead the House. He should get a chance to make his point. He is being prevented from doing so... (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI INDERJIT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am concluding. Our world today faces many crises because we have lots and lots of politicians, but very few statesmen. Our situation has become a little worse. We also have lots and lots of politicians, but even fewer statesmen. Sir, what is happening at present is that we are more and more concerned with the 'moment' and not even with the 'day'. I would therefore beg this much of the House. Let us not just think of the moment. Let us not just think of the day. Let us also think of tomorrow. Let us think of the future of our past. We can ignore it only at our own peril.

I am grateful to you for giving me this chance to speak.

[Translation]

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOR (Gopalganj): Mr. Speaker Sir, today when I rise to speak, I recall the day when after the partition of India Maulana Abdul Qulam Azad convened a conference in Lucknow at which the Muslim leaders of all political parties were present. At that time the situation in the country was

very fluid. We all were there. When he stood to make a speech, which I remember till date, he said that I have come here to make a speech but I am feeling difficulty to start with. The links of the chain of politics are entangled with one another in such a manner that the more we try to disentangle these links, the more they get entangled.

17.00 hrs.

Today, I attentively heard the speech of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee in this House. I also heard the feelings of our hon. colleague Chandra Shekharji. When Shri Indrajit Gupta became M.P. in Pandit Nehru's time, he was asked to make a speech on the very first day. At that time Pandit Nehru made a remark at him you want to ride a tiger but you do not even know how to ride a donkey.....

MR. SPEAKER: The time is very short. When your time will be over you will say that I have not been given enough time to make a speech.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOR: I do not mind, you may expunge, the portion you like. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of expunction of any portion. But time is short.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOR: Sir, I would conclude after citing one or two examples. I shall not repeat what other have already spoken. I narrate a tale of my own. I am recounting it because what has happened today is very much akin to what that had happened at that time and the House is discussing the same situation. Do not think that I am going to tell any story Alif-Laila but what I narrate is like this. While Babu Jhoolan Singh, M.P. represented my constituency in this House in 1942, I was in college and I recall how my colleagues pressed me to make a speech. I was awarded punishment for two and a half years. Babu Jhoolan Singh and I travelled in the same train for Motihari Extra Jail.

The station, at which the train halted, some old men and women appeared on the

scene with a bowl full of vermilion in their hands. They applied vermilion on the forehead of Jhoolan Babu. At this Jhoolan Babu informed them that I was also accompanying him to jail. When they heard so, they applied vermilion on my forehead also. After some time when train had already run for half an hour, my speech came to an end. Jhoolan Babu looked at me and asked as to why I was sad, I told him that though I was going with him to Jail, I saw people putting vermilion on his forehead, I felt happy because he was going to jail and people were expressing their joy at this but the Hindus of his community, among whom man like him was really Hindu but others were just like imposters....(Interruptions) I said so at that time. Today my position is the same as was at that time. Today my Hindu brethren apply vermilion on my forehead but when Muslims see me, they say that I am a purchased slave of the Congress, this was the condition of the Muslim League at that time.

Just look at the man like me. I was going to jail for the cause of freedom. Jhoolan Babu was also going and probably you might have also gone....(Interruptions) But my position was something different at that time. So, such situation arises in our country when one is in two minds. What to do and what not. All People, who are sitting here today, whether he is Vajpayeeji from this side, he is their true symbo, He said something in such a manner, as if these people have felt ashamed of their doing. What I am ashamed of, I would like to tell you that previously 25 Hindus, who applied vermilion on our forehead, are not only bent upon scratching it but are ready to kill us. Today the situation has come to such a pass. I have also spent 25 to 30 years' of my political life with Congress, went to jail and everything happened but Mr. Prime Minister, I would like to submit that the extent to which unrest is there in your community today was not there ever before. Previously unrest was of other nature but it is something different today. Once again, I am warning you from here, no matter who does abstain and who votes in your favour and who does not vote in your favour. I cite an example. when there was a polling in Singapore and Hitler's army

had reached Ortobrook. the leader like Stalin had said:

[English]

"All honest people of the world must support the armies of Great Britain, USA, USSR as the armies of liberator of mankind."

[Translation]

These words are a testimony to it. Today, I once again say that I have never been a communal in my entire life. I am not afraid of anybody because if you have gone to jail, I also have gone to jail. You do not have a speciality as such and we are also not dirty because of our birth in a particular community. I always say what I feel. Therefore, Vajpayeeji will agree with us. If you do not agree with us he will. Today the time has come, as I have said just now about the period of Hitler because at the time all the honest people of the world had come together. The same situation persists today. Where would you go? I am saying it not out of flattery because of their statements. Today we have been facing an undesirable situation which has been forced on us. I tell you honestly that Shri Vajpayee has become isolated today. There was no need for Shri Advani to start a 'Rath-Yatra' again. It is was obvious that people will come. Even if he had not gone there, some persons might have gone. By resuming his 'Rath Yatra' he has committed a blunder. All of us were of the opinion and having firm belief that there would be no trouble as Shri Advaniji. was there; but nothing could be done and nobody listened to Advaniji. As a result of it, this incident took place. a new political sanyasin has emerged whose photographs have appeared. I would not like to make any reference to her. But the association of such persons resulted in bringing a bad name to Shri Advaniji too. He could not control the situation Sometimes it happens so. The people generally cannot control. Even Mahatama Gandhi could not control such type of incidents. Once he started a movement and some untoward incidents took place near Chauri Chaura. As a result of this untoward incident he decided to withdraw the movement.

[Sh. Abdul Gafoor]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to speak on various things today. But I am going to leave all of them and going to sit down. I would like to point out that the speeches of the speakers who spoke here, were different, some of them spoke out of anger, some out of compulsion, some spoke from a political point of view, but I would like to request you very humbly to leave aside all these things. You are like my elder brother. I submit to you with folded hands that I am not in anger because neither you have no doubt, about me, nor they have. Nobody has any doubts about me. Neither the C.P.I., the C.P.M. nor the Forward Block has any doubt about me. This is very common in the family also that brothers quarrel with each other. I was the youngest of all my abrothers. We used to quarrel but being the youngest I used to win because of elder brothers liberal attitude. Today, I as a younger brother, am requesting you to adopt a kind attitude towards us. We are your younger brothers. If you do not want to adopt a liberal attitude towards the country, you should adopt this attitude at least towards us. If we are treated with generosity the country too will get the benefit of it ultimately. Every Muslim, whosoever goes to offer his prayer in this world, does certainly utter a sentence 'Al Hamdu Lilahee Rabbil Aal Meen'. Without this sentence the *namez* is not complete. It means that God is the sole master of the world and everything is the grace of that Almighty (Allah). It means that Allah is one for all, whether it is America or Japan or Iran or U.K. or Turkey or Pakistan or Saudi Arabia. But we are all afraid of I.M.F. and World Bank, because they are playing the role of God and a number of countries are compelled to accept them as God. "Al Hamdu Leelahee Rabbil Muslimeen" are not the exact words written in the Kuran. Instead the words are 'Rabbul Almeen'. It means God is praiseworthy and he is the sole protector of the world. In Kuran the word 'Muslimeen' has not been written but the word is 'rabbul almeen' which means God is not only for the Muslims but he is for every human being. Thus, if God is one, why there should be any quarrel between us. We used to speak out of fun that Shri Khurana was the future Chief Minister of Delhi. (Interruptions)

We can demolish this very building. If Shri Vajpayee wishes, he can set it ablaze. If you wish, you too can set it on fire, and if they want to rebuild it, they can do it easily. But Shri Vajpayeeji strangles me to death, is it possible for him to bring me back to life? Not at all. Therefore, you should not commit any act that you cannot in do. You can do all other things whatever you want. You may cause a train accident, but you should not kill anyone. Once again I would like to say that you should not indulge in such things as may divide the nation and the society. You yourself mentioned the other day that 10 or 11 persons had set out to kill Shri Advani and others. Do you think that somebody has formed some society to kill Advaniji and others; certainly not, nobody can form any such society. The society is formed of its own. Today, I know that some hon. Ministers have black cats, or black-dogs, or Alsatian dogs. But I have not kept even a rat in my life for my own security because I have no fear of anybody. (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I consider Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as the present leader of B.J.P. and I understand his difficulties but my other colleagues do not accept it. I request him to desert those persons who have prejudiced feelings and fanatic ideas. He may fight with Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, Shri Arjun Singh, Shri Sharad Pawar and take on them properly. I would like to request him kindly to spare us because we are very weak but none is going to accept our request. In those circumstances when everybody is adamant on his stand, then where should we go? Today, I once again request you humbly to spare us.

[English]

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Speaker Sir, I am indeed grateful to the large number of hon. Members who have participated in this discussion and made valuable contributions. The debate has rightly been exhaustive and many Members were able to express themselves with anguish, with anger, with reason and with so much of patriotism that this debate, perhaps, will go down as one of the debates of a highest order in history of Parliament.

I once again express my gratitude to them. The occasion itself is one of introspection, seriousness, gravity and perhaps, an occasion where each one of us has to set our sights on the vision of the future.

This country has been a great country, it has risen to great heights, it has seen aberrations but from every aberration it has come out stronger and not weaker. I do hope that this great tragedy, this act of betrayal and vandalism which occurred on the 6th of December will be obliterated as quickly as possible from the public mind. I wish to God that this happens. Even the slightest remnant of the memory of this would be harmful to the country and I would appeal to all sections of the people, all sections of the House to help in this process, the process of living down this shameful event of the 6th December and prove to the world once again that this is just an aberration, otherwise the country is one full of harmony, full of brotherhood and this has been so for thousands of years; it will be so for thousands of years to come.

It is rather strange, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that this discussion should come in the form of a No-Confidence Motion. The Bharatiya Janata Party has no confidence in the Government of India. Why? Because the Government of India reposed confidence in the State Government of the Bharatiya Janata Party. May be, this is good justice meted out to the Government of India. I have to own that. I have to admit that. But how do we run the country, How do Centre-State relations run? On the basis of suspicion? On the basis of mistrust? How do we run the Governments of the States which are so inextricably linked with the Centre, that they have to be running a three-legged race all the time? One of them cannot run in advance, leaving the other behind.

In the National Development Council, in the National Integration Council, in the Chief Ministers' Conference, we have seen that every problem is so intractable if seen in isolation but becomes easy when seen comprehensively with the States and the Centre both Governments sitting together

and trying to sort it out. During the last one and a half years the National Development Council has been functioning this way. Several sub-committees of the Council headed by Chief Ministers of whichever party, have been constituted and they have been doing excellent work. There has been no dissension of any kind and the National Development Council on the whole has acquitted itself admirable as a result of this functioning. This is how a federal State has to function.

But is it possible, is it conceivable for the Central Government of any federation to even imagine that one of the units, a State Government, would keep giving affidavit after affidavit after affidavit, giving solemn assurances, and finally violate those assurances in a manner that until the last moment it cannot be detected? That is why my first reaction was that for all appearances it was pre-planned. There is going to be an enquiry. I would not like to anticipate there results or the findings of the enquiry. But it was so planned, it cannot be an accident, it just cannot be an accident.

Sir, I have been arraigned, I have been criticised for believing. That is the only sin I seem to have committed. I agree. I plead guilty for believing a State Government. I have no explanation on that. But the point is that I believed it not only as Central Government; I found that there was nothing else but to believe the assurance of the State Government. Was there any other way when the Supreme Court believes it? The Supreme Court hearing after hearing places more reliance on the State Government; asked the State Government to come back with more affidavits; asked me at some point of time to keep out because they would like to try the State Government. They have full faith in the State Government. I am not party. The Central Government is not a party before the Supreme Court nor in the High Court for that matter. But I was called for a particular purpose. We said: "We are prepared to help the Supreme Court in whatever manner the Supreme Court wants us." That was all the role we played. And ultimately on the 6th itself, the Supreme Court had been shocked,

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

what they said is revealing. I do not remember any State Government in a federal set up having behaved this way. So, those who told me and tell me now, did we not tell you? Yes, they have been proved right. But I was proved right in July. So, it is not a question of who is proved right. The question is what has happened to the Constitution of India in this process. It lies shattered. What happens to Article 356? It lies shattered. I would like constitutional experts to go into it. Where is it that the President of the Union finds that a situation has arisen whereby the governance of the State cannot be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution. What is that precise Point? We have dismissed State Governments times without number. Most of the State Governments dismissed or removed have been Congress Governments belonging to the same party at the Central Government. It was easy to tender the chief minister's resignation. We send advisers from here and the State Government gets President's Rule. In those few cases, where other Governments were also dismissed; similar procedure not quite beginning with the resignation, but some other procedure was followed. But in no case was the practical implication of Article 356 tested. You send the advisers. They take over at leisure any time, maybe one day late, maybe one day early. But here in the Ayodhya Matter, I cannot do a thing without dismissing the State Government. I send my troops, paramilitary forces. I sent them because I wanted them to be available to the State Government. At no point of time do the State Government tell me that they will not use them. Yet they do not use them. I have yet to come across a scrap of paper from Shri Kalyan Sinighji to say that he refuses to use the Paramilitary forces sent by the Centre. The Home Minister will bear me out. But, he has not used them. Ultimately, on the last day, when we say please use them, please use them, please use them, the Home Secretary who is sitting with the Chief Minister says - it is so unfortunate - Unthinkable and unfortunate.

*At 2.20 P.M. DG, ITBP informed M.H.A. that three battalions which had moved

from DRC had met resistance and obstructions en route, there were a lot of road blocks and people stopped vehicles. After talking to the people en route, the convoy reached with great difficulty at Saket Degree college where the forces were again stopped and the road was blocked. Minor pelting of stones also took place. The Magistrate asked them in writing to return. DG, ITEP further informed that three battalions had returned accordingly. the Commissioner had been contacted, who informed, the Chief Minister, Uttar Pradesh had ordered that there will be no firing under any circumstances."

(Interruptions). Earlier, the Home Secretary spoke to Principal Secretary, Home, Government of Uttar Pradesh at Chief Minister's residence asking him to persuade the Chief Minister to accept the assistance of the Central forces. The Principal Secretary, Home, Government of Uttar Pradesh said that he would requisition central forces after consulting the Chief Minister. At no point of time was it refused? This is what I am trying to impress. When does that moment arise when we come to the conclusion that the governance of the State cannot be carried on according to the provisions of the Constitution? So, these are some of the difficulties. If only one word had been there, in Article 356 which says, "a situation has arisen if after that it could have been added - is likely to arise." Then the Governor gets, the President gets a greater leeway. But, then, one has to go into greater detail. This is the first time in the history of the Constitution, in the history of Article 356 when it has been put to a time based test. It was never put to before and it has not been able to stand the test. Never mind who used it, never mind who did not use it, howsoever you look at it you will find that there is a lacuna and that would have to be made good.

On one side these are the reasons why I have to trust the State Government (Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack) Did you receive any IB Report or not?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: There is no variance between the IB report and what I have read. The, three days before the date, the Governor of Uttar Pradesh writes in categorical terms, that the Central Government should not, I repeat, should not, think of imposing President's rule in the State. He also adds that if any such thing is contemplated, the safety of the Babri mosque can become questionable. I have got the letter. All these factors are on one side which stop me from invoking article 356. On the other side is, of course, the private advice tendered by more supposedly knowledgeable persons.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): He is quoting Article 356. Is it not under Article 356 that if the Government of India is convinced without the report of the Governor and without the report of the State Government that the Constitution is not being implemented there, they can take action? And action has been taken even without the Governor's report, on the information that the Government of India collected.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: I agree Chandra Shakhariji. I am only trying to list out the circumstances under which the Government of the State could not be conducted. That is all I have said. On the other hand, as I said, was the advice that these people might let us down, and some statements here and there, not from the Government but from some leaders, saying that they would not do *kar seva* only by sweeping. These were the other things. I say in all sincerity that the Government had to weigh the evidence on both sides and we came to the conclusion that it was not possible to impose President's rule, in the face of all this, at the time at which it would have been of some use. And I would also like to add - I do not know whether I should say this - that the situation in Ayodhya was such that one had to be very careful, extremely careful. The Babri Masjid - that structure - was a *hostage*. On one side was the possibility of its being saved by negotiation, by further commitment of the State Government, on the other side, you had absolutely no lead time to save it by the central forces in spite of

the State Govt. It is not only with *kudals* and these things, as were used on that day. It could have been blown up in a matter of minutes, seconds, by one bomb the size of a tennis ball, detonated from two hundred years, if the State Government connived at it. There were the real possibilities. This is like the mother stabbing the child, the mother poisoning the child. You do not expect it to happen but when it does happen, no one can save it. This is my case....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): What about previous experiences?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is what I say. In July I succeeded. You all heard me, heard my statement here in this House. We discussed it. It worked. I was taking the same line....(*Interruptions*). Please. I was taking the same line which I had elaborated in my statement. We had the Cell. We got the discussions going. Two meetings were held in a very good atmosphere. The third meeting was to clinch the issue of reference to the Supreme Court. It was at that point that a spanner was thrown in the works and the whole thing came back to square one. This is the situation. History will judge, people will judge. I am not really being dogmatic about it. Some of my own party people had different views. I told the party that it is possible for Congressmen to have different views. Who is proved right, who is proved wrong, is not the question. You take a decision, you stick to it, you defend it. If you win, you win, if you do not win, you do not win.....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI VISHWANTAH PRATAP SINGH (Fatehpur): With your permission. Sir, the hon. Prime Minister's full case is that he totally trusted the BJP Government, the U.P. Government, and he had no reason to mistrust it. And because he trusted fully, therefore, this tragedy took place. May I remind the hon. Prime Minister that we had put a question that if Kalyan Singh suddenly resigns, how will he manage the situation. He did say: We have alternative programmes and within minutes we can get into action and manage the situation. That means that it was = and prudently so - as any administrator

[Sh. Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

should do to have alternative plans and also not mere trust. We were given to understand that there are alternative plans; if Shri Kalyan Singh resigns, the alternative plans are there and within minutes the things can be managed. The whole scenario, as it developed, was described here. May I know where has that alternative plan gone? What happened to that alternative plan that, if Shri Kalyan Singh at the last moment resigns, you will put into action?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHARAO: Sir, when Shri Kalyan Singh resigned, it was too late to do anything. He timed it like that. In fact our information had been that the BJP very much wanted to save its States Govts. Resignation route was not expected. But when it happened contrary to our information, nothing could be done then except to dismiss the Government which was done.

What I am really trying to impress on the House is let us not go into who is right and who is wrong information wise. I have borne all the criticism from friends and from other parties. I am only trying to place some known facts. In spite of these facts there had been a betrayal. A betrayal is something which is never detected. A conspiracy is something which comes to light much later, when only hindsight functions. Indiraji would not have been assassinated Rajivji would not have been assassinated if the knowledge about the conspiracy had been available earlier. This is one of those mishaps the way it has happened. Nobody can say that he is impeccably right. No plan can be absolutely, hundred per cent foolproof. You get everything but you do not get magistrates. Is it possible? I would like to ask where do you take magistrates from? If the State Government does not give you 20 magistrates who are needed, do you take magistrates from Delhi? Is it possible legally? Can any legal luminary tell me?

Therefore, if you go into the details, here are many factors. There is a Commission of Inquiry which will go into

there, I am only placing before you some rudimentary facts which need to be taken into account.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, one small question to the hon. Prime Minister. Is it not a fact that the news that the demolition work on the mosque structure having begun reached you, reached the Government of India by Twelve noon? If so, why the Cabinet meeting was not called till Six O' clock in the evening to decide what to do?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The first impulse of anyone who gets a report like this is to see that we save the mosque first. We ask them to make use of the forces; we go on pleading with them; we go on asking them to do it. This is all that could be done at that stage. *(Interruptions)* *

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the logic of what happened on the sixth of December...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, How long did the Government of India continue to have faith in the Uttar Pradesh Government? Was it till Eight O' Clock in the evening or till Nine O' clock in the evening, when by this time the demolition work had gone on? Therefore, what we have been most anxious to find out from the hon. Prime Minister is that realising that the betrayal had started, that he has been betrayed, how long did he continue to have trust in him. This is what is worrying us.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: By 9.10 p.m. the President had signed the papers. By 7.30 p.m. or so, Shri S.B. Chavan took the papers to him. Those are the timings if I remember right. *(Interruptions)*

The inexorable logic of 6th December has started... in right earnest, started within whatever time is necessary to take action. Action after action after action has been taken. Yes, this is a change in direction

because it was warranted by the worst tragedy we could imagine and the now direction has been accepted, the challenge has been accepted, the battle has been joined. There is no need for us to go into history now. The need for us is to make new history and that is that for the first time after many many years the secular forces of the country have come together, the secular parties with all their internal differences have come together. I feel that at this is time(Interruptions)

And we will forge ahead, we will see that the secular credentials of this country are re-established fully and what our great leaders through the constitution and through their own example told us to do, we will do it to the hilt.

Sir, Mr. Indra Jit has raised a very relevant point. In fact, I was going to read the same Resolution which he read from the Constituent Assembly, I had occasion to raise this in one of our Party meetings. In a secular democracy, what is the place of non-secular parties or what should be the composition and the programme of parties participating in that democracy, is a question which needs a national debate. I want this debate, I want thinkers, I want leaders to come together because the time has come when we can easily see that there is an irreconcilability in these forces. We tried to carry on for many many years. Now we find that there is a Party which takes a religious issues as its main plank. I have nothing against a religious issue, I have nothing against religion, but a religious issue being brought into politics election after election after election cannot be accepted. This will have to be looked into and this will have to be effectively checked. If there is a party which takes to arms, for instance, if the candidate of one party has an AK-47 and moves with it and the other candidate has nothing, it is an unequal fight. If a party takes Ram as the spokesman of the party and affects the minds and hearts of people day in and day out, whereas the other party does not even utter this because it is a secular party, does not want to make use of that as an issue, then it is again an unequal fight and the Constitution does not, in my view, allow such unequal

fight. The field has to be even for both teams, those who are participating in the elections would have to participate on the basis of certain guidelines, certain principles which are common to all and which are defined very clearly in the Constitution. This will have to be looked into. This is fair to both of us. Let Ram remain where he remains, let us fight on the basis of other issues which are much more important from the point of view of the people and that is the only way of making the constitution work in its right spirit. I appeal to the other parties who are thinking perhaps that religious issues are going to be a permanent asset to them, they will not be a permanent asset to them. The people of India can see through game very easily and very quickly; may be in one election or in the other election, the next election, they will see through it and perhaps you will be wasting five years for doing nothing except raising unnecessary slogans. So, I would like this to be gone into. I thank Mr. Inderjit, for having brought out that resolution. We will have to act on it; we will have to think about it. I will come, if possible to the House or to the leaders of the Opposition first, all leaders and perhaps for a general debate, a wider debate in the country, of how this aberration which has become rather menacing during the decade has to be set right. It started with small beginnings, but then it has permeated, more or less, every party. Today, when I say that something which has happened will have to be undone, there are eye-brows going up in all parties. I do not want this at all to happen in any party. If we are secular, the vandal cannot be allowed to take advantage of the act of vandalism committed by him. It is quite clear to me. Everything is there for discussion. We will discuss all these things, find ways, as we were about to find the way, we will find a way once again. I assure that to all of you. I would like to once again appeal that today, the day of balancing pluses and minuses is over, we will have to go ahead with a programme.

So far as rehabilitation and reconstruction measures are concerned, I thought I should apprise the House of what has been decided. The Government of India have advised the State Governments to take

[Sh. P.V. Narasimha Rao]

strong action against officers who have been derelict in their duties in maintenance of law and order during the recent communal riots. At Present, the scale of *ex gratia* assistance to victims of communal riots differs from State to State. The Government of India will see to it that assistance to riot victims is given on a uniform scale by all the State Governments so that next of kin of persons killed in riots could be paid Rs. One lakh and those who are permanently incapacitated are paid Rs. 50,000/- each. For this particular incident, I would like to add that as a one time exception, we would like to raise this amount to Rs. Two lakhs in case of death.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): The Uttar Pradesh Government is paying only Rs. 50,000/-.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will talk to the Uttar Pradesh Government; between them and us we will see that it is paid.

[Translation]

SHRIMOHAN RAWLE (Bombay-South Central): Does the Government propose to pay any compensation to the next of the kins of the police personnel, who were killed during these incidents?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: A fund will be set up for repair and reconstruction of all places of worship which were damaged in the disturbances. In addition to the *ex gratia* relief in the case of death, grievously hurt or damage to the property, the Government of India will recommend to the State Governments that the victims of recent communal riots may also be given the following assistance; employment to widows or wards of the families affected by the communal riots where in earning member of the family had been killed or permanently incapacitated, allotment of tenements and house sites to families rendered houseless, allotment of shops/space for kiosks to families to restart their business and bank loans for

capital investment as also working capital for recommencement of industries and businesses affected in the riots. Similar measures will also be taken in the Union Territories. These are the steps that have been decided upon.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: What about the payment of wages to the workers during the period of curfew? This also should be taken into account.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, some of these suggestions have come from the hon. Members. If more suggestions come and we find them feasible, we will go into them. I have done. (Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: After the imposition of President's rule, the compensation has not increased. He has not replied that (Interruptions) *

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): The Prime Minister told day before yesterday and assured the House to give a White Paper on Ayodhya issue. That has not been submitted. about the reconstruction of that structure, you have not said anything today. What is your response about, Reconstruction?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: The Supreme Court have asked the Government of India to submit its views on this particular subject within a time-frame which they have fixed. We would like to examine all aspects of this and go to the Supreme Court and make our submissions. I would like to tell the hon. Members that this is being looked into. (Interruptions)

SHRI INDER JIT: (Darjeeling): The cause of mediamen who have suffered has not been referred to.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, there is a specific term of reference in the terms of reference of the Commission of Inquiry in regard to what happened to media persons.

We have meanwhile decided to give those whose equipments etc., were damaged, certain concessions which were asked by them. So, the Commission of Inquiry will go in great detail into what happened to the media persons.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Are you including the lapse of the Central Government in the terms of reference? That should be there. *(Interruptions).*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Shri Vajpayee.

*(Interruptions).**

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record.

*(Interruptions).**

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I could not hear the speeches of all the hon. members and could not remain present here, but I have tried to go through the speeches delivered by them.

I regret that the discussion has not taken place in tune with the feelings expressed by me while initiating the debate. Allegations and counter allegations were levelled against one another in the House and it will continue also. It is easy to accuse but difficult to make introspection. Had the interpretation of the incidents of 6th December been so easy, as some of my friends sitting here have tried to do, it would have altogether been a different thing. I am looking for Shri Rajesh Pilot. One after the other, hon. Ministers seemed to be eager to show their loyalty and commitment to the hon. Prime Minister. *(Interruptions)* They were Members of the Council of Ministers and were a party to the decisions taken. *(Interruptions)* I have no objection to it, but am I not entitled to make comments?

Now I would like to raise a minor issue where after I would come to serious ones.

That day Shri Rajesh Pilot got up and said that the structure had been demolished in Ayodhya and the people who demolished it had been imparted military training. A camp had been set up in Sarkhey near Ahmedabad to impart training. He also mentioned the name of a Brigadier. Of course, you have not allowed the name to go on record....*(Interruptions)* It appeared in the newspapers the next day that there must have been a conspiracy behind the demolition. It would have been a conspiracy by those people who had received training and the training was imparted by a Military Officer. Shri Pilot should have found out the truth. There is an institute in Sarkhey which imparts training in internal security and the Brigadier is associated with the Congress Party. He had been appointed by the Congress Chief Minister to a post. He has issued a statement. He has been appointed as the Chairman of Water Pollution Board. I am not making any criticism. He was imparting training there. Training on rifle shooting and Judo are being provided in the camp. There is nothing objectionable in it. I am making any allegation against neither the Brigadier nor the Congress Chief Minister. He should have found out the facts. After all he is the Minister of Communications. Cannot he not communicate properly....*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI RAJESH PILOT): Atal ji, even today, you are not prepared to accept that it was pre-planned *(Interruptions)* Please say from your inner conscience whether it was pre-planned or not. Even today I am ready to accept....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Pilot had made this allegation in the House. At that time hon. Members from this side had voiced their protest that Shri Pilot should resign if this allegation is proved wrong. He is a friend of mine. So I am not demanding his resignation. But I would like to register my complaint against creating such a turmoil in the House.

The Government has set up an Enquiry Commission in regard to Ayodhya happenings. We have welcomed the Commission. We would also like to know the facts. But the Commission is being biased by the Government before it unearths the facts and submits its report. The second point is that the Government is creating a poisonous atmosphere against us in the country. We don't know what would be its repercussions. We are sorry for whatever has happened in Ayodhya. (Interruptions) The hon. Prime Minister says that he had been assured. I accept it. I had also said this earlier. Had the discussion taken place making the atmosphere the basis which I said on that day, we would have reached a conclusion long back.

18.00 hrs.

I would like to make it clear that the discussion of 2-3 days will not help us to reach the correct destination. The hon. Prime Minister had believed that whatever they were promising, they would stand by that. We also had the same hope which was shared by the hon. Prime Minister and the Government that the work of providing protection to the disputed structure as also the work of initiating *kar seva* on the 2.77 acres of land would be separated from each other. We also hoped that Lucknow Bench of High Court would deliver the judgement by then and the *kar-sevaks* assembled there would get an opportunity to perform the *kar-sevak*. We were sure about it. I am afraid, you may say that your expectation was genuine where as our expectations were not so, it was rather a conspiracy. I would then like to ask as to how can there be two different criteria to measure the same thing. If the verdict of the Court that came on 11th had come before 6th December (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur): How could it happen?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I do not want to explain it for Chatterjee Sahab would again say as how could the Court give its verdict earlier. You know, he is a big lawyer and he knows how to indulge into legal manoccurring in everything. I am, on the contrary, a simple man. We are simply aware of the fact that our simple demand of representing before the Lucknow Bench of High Court to request for an expeditious decision was not accepted by the Government. Even this petty demand was not accepted.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, these questions call for an early reply and I expect that a reply would be given during the course of discussions. The Government should make an announcement to the effect that it would not make tall claims and would also not place anyone in the dock unless the inquiry report on Ayodhya happenings is submitted.

[English]

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I would like to make one thing clear at this stage. For the information of Atal-ji, I want to tell him that the Central Government is not a party to the proceedings in the Lucknow Bench. We have been made parties because the Land Acquisition Act happens to be a Central Act. Only to that extent. We are not substantive parties. This may be noted, please. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister is again going into the legality of the issue. We are talking about the 'faith'. I do not want to put some ministerial colleagues of the hon. Prime Minister into trouble by quoting their names. They assured us that the verdict of the court would come soon. Had the Central Government and the State Government made a united approach to the Court for speedy disposal of the case, then the court might have considered it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Swamiji has dealt with the issue of Ayodhya at length. There is virtually no reply to the many questions raised by him. I dare say that let the Government conduct an inquiry and let the findings come. We also want to know as to what actually happened in Ayodhya? At least, I would come to know about it. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: He should stand up and speak. We have heard them, so they should now hear us.....(Interruptions) What is all this about?

[English]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Shri Somnath Chatterjee, I am not yielding....(Interruptions) I refuse to yield.(Interruptions)

[Translation]

I do not want to enter into arguments with the political parties which have no principles, particularly with those parties which at one time support repeal of Article-356 and on the other day support retention of it in the statute book.

Shri Kalyan Singh resigned following his failure to keep his promise given to the Supreme Court through the affidavit. The Central Government dismissed the Kalyan Singh Government instead of accepting the resignation tendered by him. This was a big achievement for the Government....(Interruptions) The Government of Kalyan Singh was an elected one. If the role played by Shri Kalyan Singh contempt of Court, then the case in this regard is there in the Court and the Court will decide about punishment. But so far as the question of his being responsible to the public is concerned, he resigned accepting his moral responsibility. But the Central Government did not have with another elected Government in the manner as is expected of an elected Government(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, two reasons have

been given for the dismissal of the Kalyan Singh Government....(Interruptions) I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister as to what were the reasons for the dismissal of the Governments of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh? One of these Governments was dismissed under the pretext that the Ministers of that Government had sent *kar sevaks* to Ayodhya. At the time when the *kar sevaks* were sent the *kar seva* was not banned by the order of the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact the Supreme Court had allowed *kar seva* to be performed...

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura): The Supreme Court did not allow demolition of the mosque.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: He should not interfere Mr. speaker, Sir, the discussion can not go on like this e(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): We have already heard the abuses from Shri Indrajit Gupta (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: May I please request you to maintain atmosphere in the House in which the battle of wits can go and not the battle of vices.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am disturbing you Vajpayeeji for one more minute. Please your side, this side and this side, may I plead with you..

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Not this side, Sir, we are disturbing the least, we are giving patient hearing. There is no question of disturbing Atal ji when we have already heard the hon. Prime Minister who is actually more guilty.

MR. SPEAKER: You disturb very intelligently.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is being asked as to why am I moved this No-Confidence Motion. You know our leaders have been put behind the bars, three State Governments ruled by our party have been dismissed and assemblies have been dissolved...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH (Mirzapur): Let it be decided first as to how this House will run.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Now talks are in the offing to ban the Bhartiya Janata Party. Today I came to know that there is one Ram Lalji who is the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs. I wonder, Ram has such a son or Lal. He has said that the Bhartiya Janata Party should not be allowed to function as a political party. What does it mean? Yet the members are asking as to why are we moving the No-confidence Motion? Should we express confidence in the Government and should we congratulate the Government for all that? we should be concerned about whatever happened in Ayodhya on the 6th of December and about its fall out in the country. My friends who are in the Government should know- I am not going to disclose any secret- that at the time when large scale killings in Bihar were being committed the leaders of the Congress party approached me with the proposal that if the Bhartiya Janata Party was prepared to support the dismissal of the Laloo Government then the Government would do

SHRI INDRA JIT GUPTA: What was your reply? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I told them that I did not believe in such actions.. The hon. Prime Minister says.

[English]

"Article 356 lies in shambles"

[Translation]

...*(Interruptions)* .. What happened in

Lucknow and Himachal? Why the Government of Rajasthan was dismissed? Is it an offense to give send off to the *Kar sevaks*? It was prior to 6th of December. The *Kar sevaks* were free to come from all parts of the country. Will the Constitution be interpreted like this? Please see the language of the Article 356. Shri Soli Sorabji, who is a lawyer of different ideology, has said:

[English]

"The basic condition precedent for imposing President's rule under Article 356 of our Constitution is that 'a situation has arisen in which the Government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution..'. The fact that the Chief Minister who helps the Government in a B.J.P., ruled State belongs to a banned organisation cannot, by itself, lead to the inference of failure of the constitutional machinery."

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): The ban was not being implemented.*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to my colleague Comrade Indrajit who had also come forward to speak.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Moral responsibility and the Constitutional responsibility are two different things.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am at the moment referring to the Constitutional responsibility.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You also believe in the moral responsibility.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Indrajit Gupta has advised to move slowly but who will allow the hon. Prime Minister to move slowly at present. Someone has fixed his eyes on Madhya Pradesh and other are dreaming of strolling again in the Raj Bhawan

of Himachal Pradesh nested in the Himalayas atop high peaks. Has the Centre issued any directive, which have not been implemented by all the three Governments? Is it not a fact that these Governments were functioning according to the Constitution? Is it not a fact that these Governments had assured to abide by the directives? Then why these Governments were dismissed? Sir, is it not a mockery of the Constitution? Is it not the misuse of the Article of the Constitution? The hon. Prime Minister is repeating the word federation time and again. In our Constitution there is the word union instead of federation but the foundation of the Union is getting weak. Not because of the incidents of Ayodhya and not because of what have you done. But those who are sitting in glass houses should not throw stones on others.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, which circumstances had come up in these States. There was only apprehension that such situation would emerge. The Constitution does not work on the basis of apprehensions, it requires facts. In this case, such drastic steps were taken on the basis of apprehension only. I can very well understand Shri Arjun Singh ji. He was expecting the office of the Prime Minister. I am not pointing towards the speech of Sharad Pawar ji had made. I am distressed at his speech. Perhaps it was his first speech and he wanted to impress all but he forgot that he was speaking in the Lok Sabha of the country and not in the Shivaji Park of Bombay. He had made a complaint that the Government of Madhya Pradesh was asked to seek the help of the military, but it did not, can an elected Government be dismissed on this basis only? If a State Government controls the situation without seeking help of the military...

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): If it can...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Yes, the State Government had controlled the situation. But, will it be made the basis of dismissing a Government? Sharad Pawar ji himself says repeatedly that the military should not be summoned for controlling internal disputes, there should be its minimum

use. The Government of Madhya Pradesh was dismissed but the riots took place even in Bombay and they continued even after calling the military. The people were killed, I have tales about the way people were killed, which I don't want to relate since it tarnishes the image of the country. You have said that...(Interruptions) the people of Bajrang Dal, dressed in Home Guards Uniform had gone to create riots.(Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Such complaint has been received.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Do you have any proof? It is just like repeating a hearsay (Interruptions) The fingers are already being raised at Sursawalas. It is a matter of serious concern for all. Sir, now they will say that whatever communal virus has spread is all due to us. All right, if we have done so, then we are the worshippers of Lord Shiva and we will drink this poison and do the welfare of the country. But it is not so easy and who will drink the poison?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the ban had been imposed on the parties. On what basis it was done (Interruptions) What was their fault before 6th December? Shri Jaffer Sharief Sahib was speaking a short while ago. One of his old speeches made on the 19th December, 1989 in the Lok Sabha is with me. I am quoting from it, and if there is any mistake, it may be corrected. He had said: "I would certainly like to inform my Bhartiya Janata Party friends, present here, that I have also attended the *shakha* of the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh."

[English]

SHRI C.K. JAFFER SHARIEF: I am grateful to Shri Vajpayee who raised this point now because I wanted to speak about it in the afternoon, but I was not able to make a mention about it. I am very clear when I said on the floor of this House before as referred to by Shri Vajpayee I had been to the *shakha* only for three days. It was my classmate who took me there when they found out that I was a Muslim they left me and thereafter I did not go. Whereas Shri Malkhani - there is a report

[Sh. C.K. Jaffer Sharief]

(Interruptions)*

in *The Hindustan Times* dated 20.11.92 I did not know he used it, nobody knew that I went to the *shakha* - He appears to have written in his book that I attended it for six months. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I accept the clarification given by Shri Jaffer Sharief Sahib. I am not saying so to blame him. I had made a special reference to it since there are so many persons on the other side who were associated with the *Shakha* of the Sangh and there is nothing objectionable in it. The Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh is a patriotic organisation. (Interruptions) Sir, the hon. Defence Minister, Shri Sharad Pawar is very well acquainted with R.S.S. He had been with us in the Government. During his tennure, a demand was made in the Legislative Assembly (Interruptions).

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: I have given clarification.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Yes, Sir, you have given it today. You have already taken a stand. But what you had said at that time was full of wisdom and you had said that after a deep thought. So, be firm on that. (Interruptions) Actually the ideological differences can not be overcome imposing bans. A ban was also imposed on the R.S.S. in the past. I was shocked when a reference to Gandhiji's assassination was made. I have with me the report of the Justice Kapoor Commission but I would not like to read it out. Sir, Gandhiji should not be brought into power politics. I would like to know from this House, this commission says that there was no hand of R.S.S. in it, you may read it and the whole of the world knows it, suppose, those who are associated with his murder confess in the House outside this House or anywhere else in the country that they had assassinated him and that they had made a mistake and now they want to repent then would you not give them a chance.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not going on record.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nathu Ram Godse had no connection with R.S.S. He used to criticise the R.S.S. it is a documentary evidence that he used to write against the R.S.S. in his articles in his journal.

I mean to say that if you want to level political charges on each other, then there are so many other issues but do not make a reference to Gandhiji. What Gandhiji had given to the country and what we have to take from him in future like *Swaraj*, *Swadeshi*, this self reliance, mother tongue and the proper utilisation of the means for noble cause. (Interruptions)

Now you will ask whether we have faith in Gandhiji and if I ask whether you have faith in him then this discussion will lead us to a blind alley Gandhi is a personality, do not bring him into controversy in this way.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Vajpayee, you do not have to reply to that.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted to congratulate the Telgu Desham as it had condemned the dismissal of three State Governments. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, at that time the speech

made by Shri Sharad Pawar in the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly reflected a good amount of far-sightedness.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): At that time you were the Speaker of Maharashtra Legislative Assembly. (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You were holding the office of Speaker at that time.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: Shri Shankar Rao Chavan was also the Member of the Assembly at that time (Interruptions).

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: But ideological war cannot be fought like this.

The Prime Minister might recall that I had said that day and the Home Minister was also present there that the Government has to fight the B.J.P. one day. But it should not fight Ram. (Interruptions)

Imposing ban on the B.J.P., derecognising it, debarring it from contesting election are not the ways to take on the B.J.P. This is an ideological war and you should counter the ideology with ideology. I am giving warning to the Government in this regard. Shri Chandra Shekhar is sitting here. (Interruptions)

Shri Chandra Shekharji is realising the matter. He has condemned the arrest of Shri Advaniji. He has criticised the way the State Government were dismissed. The Members belonging to the D.M.K. and A.I.D.M.K. were of the same opinion. Many Members of the Congress Party met me and told me that the Prime Minister did not want to dismiss the State Governments but the forces, which have engulfed him forced him to do so.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the ban has been imposed, but the imposing of ban is being seriously condemned.

[English]

'Kerala High Court suspends ban on 'Jamal'.

[Translation]

The Jamat has been banned. But the High Court revoked the ban orders. Were the imposition of ban on these three organisations not enough? It is not at all necessary to ban one Muslim Organisation alongwith three Hindu Organisations just to show the secular image. No supporter of yours raises any objection to your secularism. It is only we who have objected and will object in future too, because your secularism is not the right secularism. It is not a balanced secularism. Your secularism is limited only upto the vote bank. You compromised secularism in the case of Shah Bano. Your secularism has no hesitation in seeking vote in the name of installing a Christian Government in Mizoram. It will not be allowed to go on.

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chimur): Are you not worried about your vote bank?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Now we have started to worry. It is a dangerous game. That is why Shri Advaniji said something but a lot of objection was raised over it. Shri Advaniji has said that whatever was happening in the country, it would benefit his party, but it can damage the country. The people asked him as to why was he indulging in such activities as might harm the country. He said that his party did not want to do so. But this game cannot go on one sided. You are not allowing Shri Advaniji to come here and speak. Advaniji has resigned, but you people are not ready to attach any importance to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The ban has been imposed but it is being criticised like anything. The Government has not given any reason for imposing the ban. A tribunal is to be constituted. You cannot wait for 30 days. The tribunal could have considered the matter. The Government is a great supporter of judiciary. The Government does not want to function arbitrarily. You had been waiting in Ayodhya for hours together. I do not blame the Prime Minister for it. You will say that mock-wrestling is going on. I won elections from Lucknow, but I fail to understand the meaning of mock-wrestling even today. What

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

type of wrestling is it?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the same type of state of confusion was being faced by the Government of Kalyan Singh as well as by the Central Government. Shri Kalyan Singh had already said it earlier that he would not open fire on Sadhus and Saints. It was known to everybody; there was no secret in it.

SHRISOMNATHCHATTERJEE: Were the persons, who climbed over the domes Sadhus or Saints?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You are unable to identify, as to who is Sadhu and who is Saint?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Kalyan Singh had already made his stand clear. But it should be investigated as to why tear-gas was not used. Why were the rubber bullets not fired? How did the entire administration become ineffective. These were not the orders of Kalyan Singh...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You will not get up again and again. It is not conveying anything. It is not being recorded. please take your seat.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the news came that the structure was being demolished, the Central Government could have taken over the administration without caring for the Government of Uttar Pradesh. The Government could have asked Shri Pawar Sahab to hand over the situation to the army. Why was it not done? Because the Government did not think it proper. Use of force could have caused a heavy bloodshed. Perhaps, Shri Chandra Shekhar may differ...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Balla): 1200 people died there. At least these 1200

people could have been saved.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapur): In the entire country, the toll has gone upto 2000.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Whatever has happened there, it was wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bring them back.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody brings anybody back. Comrade, who can bring whom back. Who will bring those students back who had been brutally killed by Chinese army by crushing them under the Chinese tanks at Tiananmen Square? Will China bring those back who had sacrificed their lives in the struggle for restoring democracy in the erstwhile Communist countries.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what type of ban was imposed? Was it inevitable? The Government could not wait for 30 days? What do they want to do now? We experienced in yesterday. Whatever happened with archaeologists yesterday is also a clear indication of the Government's attitude. Will the press conference of archaeologists not be allowed to be held in Himachal Bhavan, Delhi?

Much, more evidence have been found in Ayodhya which prove that there was a temple which was demolished later on. Why are you afraid of it?*(Interruptions)*

If such evidence is found, the Government should challenge them. The Government should go to the court*(Interruptions)* It may rise a demand that this should be examined by the court. The Government can constitute a court. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this proposal was placed earlier. The Prime Minister knows it. The other Members of the Cabinet also know it. The discussion was going on to refer this matter to the Supreme Court under Article

143 or 138. It was to be decided by the Supreme Court whether there was a temple earlier and by demolishing that temple that mosque was built in its place. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: You did not agree. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We said that there should be a package deal including resumption of *Kar Seva* on 2.77 acre of land, reference to the Supreme Court and complete protection of the structure, for which you did not agree....(Interruptions)

The Government did not agree to it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know whether the Government is prepared to accept our package deal even now? What happened in Ayodhya.....(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying that....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI ANIL BASU: You have lost all credibility.(Interruptions)

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): What was that package which you are talking about? Please explain. Let the House be informed. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already said that we had held ample discussions with the saints. Shri Sharad Pawar did also participate in some of these discussions.....(Interruptions)

You want to hear a package discussion and yet you say that a wrong thing has been done. According to the proposal passed in those meetings the issue had to be referred to the Supreme Court for its opinion. Secondly, the saints had been pressing for the right of *Kar Seva* in 2.77 acres of land and besides, they all held the view that the disputed structure must be fully protected.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: We have always accepted your contention about referring the issue to the supreme Court and providing protection to the disputed structure but the proposal of *Kar Seva* in 2.77 of land was never accepted. (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am telling the very same thing that the Government did not accept the package as a whole. I would not misguide this House. Now I leave the old topic because now we are in a changed situation. The structure is demolished. Those who demolished the structure considering it to be a Masjid, actually did also demolish the Mandir as well. This pains me. In a state of frenzy they forgot the fact that a Mandir also existed there and 'arti' was performed. The names was not offered. The violence would not have broken out had the people been told the fact by the Government that the disputed structure was more a Mandir than a Masjid. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: The Vishwa Hindu Parishad had stated that it was a disgraceful structure.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am not aware as to what statement was made by them. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussions were held between Sharad Ji and the leaders of V.H.P. The Bhartiya Janata Party did not participate in those discussions, so I am not aware of any such statements made by the leaders of the V.H.P.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: This is the problem with you, you are not aware of all the things.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Well, at least you have given me a bit relief. But, what does the Government propose to do now? Why so much confusion is being created? The Government states that the structure will be rebuilt. The Government states again that there was a dome and there was an arch which was a part of the masjid. There were two more domes where the idol of Ram Lala was installed. There were stone

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

pillars on which the images of statues, 'Kalash' and lotus were carved. Will all they be reconstructed in the same way. Shri Sharad Pawar and the hon. Prime Minister are making differing statements in this regard. I ask, what will be reconstructed there?
(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that we have still time to solve this problem once for all. If we had thought to gain political mileage out of this issue then in that case we would have asked the saints to wait for Kar-Seva because election was still far off. As a matter of fact the saints are not to wait now, their loyalty is with the Mandir not with the votes.....

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Are you justifying the demolition in Ayodhya?

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We simply want to know what does the Government propose to do now. Whatever it does, it should take this House and the people of the country into confidence. There is one more option left and that is the Government should take up further excavation so that it may be confirmed whether a Mandir existed there or not. We have already got some proofs. The things of archaeological importance that have been found there prove that there was a Mandir. The Muslim leaders have already promised...

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): We do not promise anything now. (Interruptions) You have betrayed, there will be no short-cut now. Now only law will take its course and none else will take any decision now.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is good that our colleague Shri Shahabuddin has said it in this House amidst all. I have a

letter written by him on the 4th July 1987. This letter was written to Prince Anjum Kadas who is a leader of 'Shias'. The 'Mucealli' of the Masjid was a 'Shias'. It is claimed that the said Masjid belonged to 'Shias'. Shri Buta Singh may also be remembering the efforts which brought the 'Shias' to agree that the dispute should be resolved. Shias were ready to shift the Masjid if the majority Hindus thought that Ram was born there and the a Mandir was demolished to construct a Masjid. But Shri Shahabuddin did not allow the proposal. He wrote the letter and today his intention is clear to all.

[English]

"Even if shift is permissible under some school of thought, there is no reason at all to opt for shift. In one flash, shift would open Pandora's Box. Please do not pursue this line..... I remain absolutely and totally opposed to the mischievous idea of shift proposed by the RSS, which you appear inclined to accept. Please reconsider.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): This has been in accordance with the Shariat and in accordance with the opinions of all the Ulemas in the country.
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we also were telling the same thing that we did not want to demolish the mosque, we simply wanted the mosque to be shifted honorable to a different place, different from the birth place of lord Ram. ... (Interruptions) the mosque could be constructed at a little distance from there and we were ready to perform Kar-Seva for the Construction of that Mosque.... (Interruptions) it was, however, not done.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: A mosque cannot be shifted, the location of it cannot be changed.... (Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Mayiladuturai)** (Interruptions)

** Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not going on record. It will be expunged.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Members will measure that words before they utter. It is not good to use such kinds of words.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay - North): Sir, he should not only withdraw but also apologise.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not going on record. Please don't disturb. Now, Mr. Vajpayee.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been listening to all those things since yesterday. The glory of the Constitution is sung. It is always impressed upon that judiciary should be honoured. Nevertheless, it is also almost simultaneously said that the Marriage Acts cannot be uniform because it goes against the Shariyat and Shariyat is a divine law. I do not intend to offend the beliefs of anyone, but I must ask if ever had it been thought that if some other community sticks to certain beliefs of their society what would we do in that case. In this very

context I ask as to what is the special importance of the mosque in Ayodhya for Muslims? It is as simple a mosque as any other mosque.

SYED SHAHABUDDIN: That has always been a mosque.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Ayodhya is a place of pilgrimage for the Hindus. They believe that it is the holy place of Birth of Ram. This is not a subject matter of evidence, this is a matter of belief in the same way as Muslims believe that their marriage system has been set by their "Khuda". This is their belief.....(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to appeal to this House and here I would reassert what

I said at the very outset. I said that the country is on the junction of three roads. The Government should not encourage a particular type of communalism of fundamentalism only to fight against the counter productive fundamentalism. The Government is done the same.

I said in the beginning that we could make use of this opportunity for a new beginning. We agree that the Central Government resorted to the dismissal of the State Governments ruled by our party. When the Government imposes ban, we have then got to go before the public and in this context, I would like the Government to remember that we would come here in greater number than what we are at present. The Government does not have a proper understanding of the mood of the Indian people. If it thinks that our party would be swept away, then I dare say that the hon. Prime Minister should dissolve the Lok Sabha following the No Confidence Motion moved by me and he should then go to the people to seek a fresh mandate. He will then come to know the verdict of the people of the country.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put this Motion to the vote of the House I think after the verdict of the division is announced, you may not be in a mood to hear what the Chair says. I would like to thank all the hon. Members for their splendid cooperation.

I would also like to make an announcement. Immediately after the result of the division, we have a Bill which seeks to amend the Constitution of India. It was decided in the Business Advisory Committee that, as very good Members of this House, we would like to see that the Bill which is pending before this House for the last three to four years, is passed. Now, you are here. It will facilitate passing of that Bill. So, I request you to continue sitting here because it requires a special majority.

We will just put it to the vote of the House. I think nobody would like to discuss it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We are ready to take it up.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

I shall now put the motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to the vote of the House.

Let the Lobbies be cleared

Now, the Lobbies have been cleared.

18.51 hrs.

Division No. 5

AYES

Abedya Nath, Mahant

Agnihotri, Shri Rajendra

Bandaru, Shri Dattatraya

Berwa, Shri Ram Narain

Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal

Chaudhary, Shri Rudrasen

Chauhan, Shri Chetan P.S.

Chauhan, Shri Shivraj Singh

Chavda, Shri Harisinh

Chhotey Lal, Shri

Chikhliya, Shrimati Bhavana (Junagarh)

Choudhary, Shri Ram Tahal

Choudhary, Shri Pankaj

Das, Shri Dwaraka Nath

Deshmukh, Shri Chandubhai

Dhumal, Prof. Prem

Dikshit, Shri Shreesh Chandra

Drona, Shri Jagat Vir Singh

Fundkar, Shri Pandurang Pundlik

Gangwar, Dr. P.R.

Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar

Gautam, Shrimati Sheela

Gohil, Dr. Mahavirsinh Harisinhji

Gowda, Prof. K. Venkatagiri

Jaswant Singh, Shri

Jatiya, Shri Satynarayan

Jeswani, Dr. K.D.

Joshi, Shri Anna

Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal

Kalka Das, Shri

Kanaujia, Dr. G.L.

Kanodia, Shri Mahesh

Kapse, Shri Ram

Kashwan, Shri Ram Singh

Katheria, Shri Prabhu Dayal (Firozabad)

Khandelwal, Shri Tara Chand

Khanduri, Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Bhuwan Chandra

Khurana, Shri Madan Lal

Kori, Shri Gaya Prasad

Krishnendra Kaur (Deepa), Shrimati

Kumar, Shri V. Dhananjaya

Kunjee Lal, Shri

Kusmaria, Shri Ramkrishna

Lodha, Shri Guman Mal

Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra	Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh
Mahendra Kumari, Shrimati	Sakshiji, Dr.
Mallikarjunaiah, Shri S.	Sanghani, Shri Dileep Bhai
Maurya, Shri Anand Ratna	Saraswati, Shri Yoganand
Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina	Sarode, Dr. Gunvant Rambhau
Misra, Shri Janardan	Scindia, Shrimati Vijayaraje
Misra, Shri Shyam Bihari	Shah, Shri Manabendra
Naik, Shri Ram	Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh
Oraon, Shri Lalit	Sharma, Shri Jeewan
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan	Sharma, Shri Rajendra Kumar
Passi, Shri Balraj	Sharma, Shri V.N.
Patel, Dr. Amrit Lal Kalidas	Shastri, Shri Vishwanath
Patel, Shri Chandresh	Shukla, Shri Astbhuja Prasad
Patel, Shri Haribhai (Porbandar)	Singh, Shri Brijbhushan sharan
Patel, Shri Somabhai	Singh, Dr. Chattrapal
Pathak, Shri Harin	Singh, Shri Devi Bux
Pathak, Shri Surendra Pal	Singh, Shri Rajveer
Patidar, Shri Rameshwar	Singh, Shri Rampal
Prem, Shri B.L. Sharma	Singh, Shri Satya Deo
Premi, Shri Mangal Ram	Swami, Shri Chinmayanand
Raj Narain, Shri	Swami, Shri Sureshanand
Raje, Shrimati Vasundhara	Tandel, Shri D.J.
Ram Singh, Shri	Thakore, Shri Gabhaji Mangaji
Ramdew Ram, Shri	Tomar, Dr. Ramesh Chand
Rana, Shri Kashiram	Topiwala, Shrimati Dipika H.
Rawal, Dr. Lal Bahadur	Tripathi, Shri Lakshmi Narain Mani
Rawat, Shri Bhagwan Shankar	Trivedi, Shri Arvind

Vaghela, Shri Shankersinh

Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihari

Varma, Shri Ratilal

Veerappa, Shri Ramchandra

Vekaria, Shri Shivilal Nagjibhai

Verma, Shri Phool Chand

Verma, Prof. Rita

Verma, Shri Sushil Chandra

NOES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb

Adaikalaraj, Shri L.

Ahamed, Shri E.

Ahirwar, Shri Anand

Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin

Aiyar, Shri Mani Shankar

Ajit Singh, Shri

Akber Pasha, Shri B.

Anbarasu Era, Shri

Anjalose, Shri Thayil John

Anthony, Shri Frank

Antulay, Shri A.R.

Arunachalam, Shri M.

Asokaraj, Shri A.

Athithan, Shri R. Dhanushkodi

Ayub Khan, Shri

Bala, Dr. Asim

Baliyan, Shri N.K.

Banerjee, Kumari Mamata

Bansal, Shri Pawan Kumar

Barman, Shri Palas

Barman, Shri Uddhab

Basu, Shri Anil.

Basu, Shri Chitta

Bhadana, Shri Avtar Singh

Bhagat, Shri Vishweshwar

Bhagey Gobardhan, Shri

Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan

Bhandari, Shrimati Dil Kumari

Bhardwaj, Shri Paras Ram

Bhatia, Shri Raghunhandan Lal

Bhattacharaya, Shrimati Malini

Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu

Bhonsle, Shri Prataprao B.

Bhonsle, Shri Tejsingh Rao

Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh

Birbal, Shri

Brar, Shri Jagmeet Singh

Buta Singh, Shri

Chacko, Shri P.C.

Chakraborty, Prof. Susanta

Chaliha, Shri Kirip

Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati Maragatham

Charles, Shri A.

Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal Kant

Deshmukh, Shri Ashok Anandrao

Chatterjee, Shri Somnath

Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan

Chaudhary, Shri Kamal

Devarajan, Shri B.

Chaudhary, Shri Ram Prakash

Devi, Shrimati Bibhu Kumari

Chaudhri, Shri Narain Singh

Dighe, Shri Sharad

Chaure, Shri Bepu Hari

Digvijaya Singh, Shri

Chavan, Shri Prithviraj D.

Diwan, Shri Pawan

Chavda, Shri Ishwarbhai Khodabhai

Dome, Dr. Ram Chandra

Chennithala, Shri Ramesh

Dutt, Shri Sunil

Chidambaram, Shri P.

Faleiro, Shri Eduardo

Chinta Mohan, Dr.

Farook, Shro M.O.H.

Choudhury, Shri Lokanath

Fernandes, Shri Oscar

Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin,

Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao

Chowdary, Dr. K.V.R.

Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath

Chowdhary, Shrimati santosh

Galib, Shri Gurcharan Singh

Dadahoor, Shri Gurcharan Singh

Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai

Dalbir Singh, Shri

Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya

Damor, Shri Somjibhai

Gehlot, Shri Ashok

Das, Shri Anadi Charan

Ghangare, Shri Ramchandra Marotrao

Das, Shri Jitendra Nath

Ghatowar, Shri Paban Singh

Das, Shri Ram Sunder

Giri, Shri Sudhir

Datta, Shri Amal

Giriappa, Shri C.P. Mudala

Deka, Shri Probin

Gogoi, Shri Tarun

Delkar, Shri Mohan S.

Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Dennis, Shri N.

Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela

Deora, Shri Murli

Gudadinni, Shri B.K.

Deshmukh, Shri Anantrao

Gupta, Shri Indrajit

Handique, Shri Bijoy Krishna	Kanithi, Dr. Viswanatham
Harchand Singh, Shri	Karreddula, Shrimati Kamala Kumari
Hodda, Shri Bhupinder Singh	Kasu, Shri Venkata Krishna Reddy
Hossain, Shri Syed Masudal	Kau, Shrimati Sheila
Imchalemba, Shri	Kewal Singh, Shri
Inder Jit, Shri	Khan, Shri Aslam sher
Islam, Shri Nurul	Khan, Shri Sukhendu
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.	Khanna, Shri Rajesh
Jakahar, Shri Balram	Khursheed, Shri Salman
Janarthanan, Shri M.R. Kadambur	Konathala, Shri Rama Krishna
Jangde, Shri Khelan Ram	Krishan Kumar, Shri S.
Jatav, Shri Barc Lal	Krishnaswamy, Shri M.
Jawali, Dr. B.G.	Kshirsagar, Shrimati Kesharbai Sonaji
Jayamohan, Shri A.	Kudumula, Kumari Padamasree
Jeevarathinam, Shri R.	Kuli, Shri Balin
Jha, Shri Bhogendra	Kumaramangalam, Shri Rangarajan
Jhikram, Shri Mohanlal	Kuppuswamy, Shri C.K.
Kahandole, Shri Z.M.	Kurien, Prof. P.J. (Mavelikara)
Kairon, Shri Surinder Singh	Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri
Kale, Shri Shankarrao D.	Made Gowda, Shri G.
Kaliaperumal, Shri P.P.	Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
Kamal Nath, Shri	Mahato, Shri Bir Singh
Kamat, Shri Gurudas	Malik, Shri Dharampal Singh
Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram	Malik, Shri Purna Chandra
Kamson, Prof. M.	Mallikarjun, Shri

Pressed 'NOES' Button but due to the technical fault of the AVR machine, he was shown as 'PRESENT' in the photograph subsequently the confirmed through correction ship that his vote be counted for NOES.

Mallu, Dr. R.	Naikar, Shri D.K.
Mandal, Shri Brahmanand	Nandi, Shri Yellaiah
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar	Narayanan, Shri P.G.
Manphool Singh, Shri	Nawale, Shri Vidura Vithoba
Marbaniang, Shri Peter G.	Nayak, Shri Mrutyunjaya
Masood, Shri Rasheed	Nayank, Shri Subash Chandra
Mathew, Shri Pala K.M.	Netam, Shri Arvind
Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan	Nikam, Shri Govindrao
Meena, Shri Bheru Lal	Nyamagouda, Shri S.B.
Meghe, Shri Datta	Odeyar, Shri Channaiah
Mehta, Shri Bhubaneshwar Prasad	Padma, Dr. (Shrimati)
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Pal, Dr. Debi Prosad
Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas	Pal, Shri Rupchand
Misra, Shri Satyagopal	Palacholla, Shri V.R. Naidu
Mollah, Shri Hannan	Pandian, Shri D.
Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta	Panigrahi, Shri Sriballav
Mukherjee, Shri Subrata	Panja, Shri Ajit
Mukhopadyay, Shri Ajoy	Panwar, Shri Harpal
Muniyappa, Shri K.H.	Patel, Shri Harilal Nanji
Muralee Dharan, Shri K.	Patel, Shri Praful
Murmu, Shri Rup Chand	Patel, Shri Shravan Kumar
Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandrashckara	Patel, Shri Uttambhai Harjibhai
*Murgesan, Dr. N.	Patil, Shri Anwari Basavaraj
Muttemwar, Shri Vials	Patil, Shri Prakash V.
Naik, Shri A. Venkatesh	Patil, Shrimati Pratibha Devisingh

Pressed 'NOES' Button but due to the technical fault of the AVR machine, he was shown as 'PRESENT' in the photograph subsequently the confirmed through correction ship that his vote be counted for NOES.

Patil, Shrimati Surya Kanta

Ram, Shri Prem Chand

Patil, Shri Uttamrao Dcorao

Ram Awadh, Shri

Patil, Shri Vijay Naval

Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S.

Patil, Shri Yashwantrao

Ram Badan, Shri

Patnaik, Shri Sivaji

Ramamurthy, Shri K.

Patra, Dr. Kartikeswar

Ramasamy, Shri R. Naidu

Pattanayak, Shri Sarat Chandra

Ramchandran, Shri Mullappally

Pawar, Shri Sharad

Ramsagar, Shri

Pawar, Dr. Vasant Niwrucci

Rao, Shri J. Chokka

Peruman, Dr. P. Vallal

Rao, Shri P.V. Narasimha

Pilot, Shri Rajesh

Rao, Ram Singh, col

Poosapati, Shri Anandgajapati Raju

Rao, Shri V. Krishna

Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram

Rath, Shri Rama Chandra

Prabhu, Shri R.

Rathva. Shri N.J.

Prabhu Zantye, Shri Harish Narayan

Rawat, Shri Parbhu Lal

Pradhani, Shri K.

Ray, Dr. Sudhir

Pramanik, Shri Radhika Ranjan

Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan

Prasad, Shri V. Sreenivasa

Reddaiah Yadav, Shri K.P.

Rahi, Shri Ram Lal

Reddy, Shri A. Indrakaran

Rai, Shri Kalp Nath

Reddy, Shri A. Venkata

Rai, Shri M. Ramanna

Reddy, Shri B.N.

Rai, Shri Ram Nihor

Reddy, Shri G. Ganga

Rajaravivarma, Shri B.

Reddy, Shri M. Baga

Rajendra Kumar, Shri S.S.R.

Reddy, Shri M.G.

Rajeshwara, Dr. V

Reddy, Shri Magunta Subbarama

Raju, Shri Bh. Vjayakumar

Reddy, Shri R. Surender

Rajulu, Dr. R.K.G.

Roshan Lal, Shri

Roy, Shri Harad'han	Sidnal, Shir S.B.
Sadul, Shri Dharmanna Mondayya	Silvera, Dr. C
Sahi, Shrimati Krishna	Singh, Shri Abhay Pratap
Sai, Shri A. Prathap	Singh, Shri Arjun
Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman	Singh, Shri Khelsai
Sajjan Kumar, Shri	Singh, Shri Motilal
Sangma, Shri Purno A.	Singh, Kumari Pushpa Devi
Sanipalli, Shri Gangadhara	*Singh Shri S.B.
Satrucharla, Shri Vijayarama Raju	Singh, Shri Surya Narayan
Sawant, Shri Sudhir	Singh, Shri Uday Pratap
Sayeed, Shri P.M.	Singh Deo, Shri K.P.
Scindia, Shri Madhavrao	Singla, Shri Sant Ram
Selja, Kumari	Sodi, Shri Manku Ram
Shankaranand, Shri B.	Solanki, Shri Surajbhanu
Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal	Soundaram, Dr. (Shrimati) K.S.
Sharma, Capt, Satish Kumar	Sreenivasan Shri C.
Shastri, Acharya Vishwanath Das	Sridharan, Dr. Rajagopalan
Shastri, Shri Rajnath Sonkar	*Subba, Shri Thota
Shingda, Shri D.B.	Sukh Ram, Shri
Shivappa, Shir K.G.	Sukhbuns Kaur, Shrimati
Shukla, Shri Vidyacharan	Sultanpuri, Shri N.
Siddhartha, Shrimati D.K. Tharadevi	Sur, Shri Monoranjan

Pressed 'NOES' Button but due to the technical fault of the AVR machine, he was shown as 'PRESENT' in the photograph subsequently the confirmed through correction ship that their vote be counted for NOES.

Suresh, Shri Kodikkunil

Vandayar, Shri K. Thulasiah

Swamy, Shri G. Venkat

Verma, Shri Bhawani Lal

Tara Singh, Shri

Verma, Shri Shiv Sharan

Tej Narayan Singh, Shri

Verma, Shri Upendra Nath

Thakur, Shri Mahendra Kumar Singh

Verma, Kumari Vimla

Thangabalu, Shri K.V.

Vijayaraghavan, Shri V.S.

Thomas, Prof. K.V.

Vyas, Dr. Girija

Thorat, Shri Sandipan Bhagwan

Wasnik, Shri Mukul Balkrishna

Thunon, Shri P.K.

Williams, Shri R.G.

Tindivanam, Shri K. Ramamurthee

Yadav, Shri Arjun Singh

Tirkey, Shri Pius

Yadav, Shri Ram Lakhan Singh

Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran

Yadav, Shri Ram Saran

Tope, Shri Ankushrao Raosahe

Yadav, Shri Surya Narayan

*Topno, Kumari Frida

Yadav, Shri Vijoy Kumar

Tytler, Shri Jagdish

Yumnam, Shri Yaima Singh

Umbrey, Shri Lacta

Zainal Abedin, Shri

Unnikrishnan, Shri K.P.

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

Upadhyay, Shri Swarup

Ayes: 106

Urs, Shrimati Chandra Prabha

Noes: 334

Pressed 'NOES' Button but due to the technical fault of the AVR machine, he was shown as 'PRESENT' in the photograph subsequently the confirmed through correction ship that their vote be counted for NOES.

The following Members also reinded then order

AYES: Shri Mohan Rawale, Shri Virendra Singh, Shri Kariya Munda, Shri Sartaj Singh Chhartwal and Major D.D. Khurana

NOES: Shri Rajaram Shankarrao Mena and Shri Dharmabhiksham