

12.05 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary-general of Rajya Sabha:-

- (i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 2nd December, 1992, agreed without any amendment to the Infant Milk Substitutes, Feeding Bottles and Infant Foods (Regulation of Production, Supply and Distribution) Bill, 1992 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 20th August, 1992."

- (ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1992, passed, in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution of India, without any amendment, the Constitution (Seventy-Fifth amendment) Bill, 1991, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1992."

- (iii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and

conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1992, agreed without any amendment to the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1992 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd December, 1992."

12.07 hrs.

INQUIRY COMMITTEE UNDER JUDGES (INQUIRY) ACT, 1968

Report and Evidence

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL: I beg to lay on the Table the following under sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968 read with Rules 9 and 10 of the Judges (Inquiry) Rules, 1969:-

- (1) Report, Volume I and II, (Hindi and English versions) of the Inquiry Committee appointed under the Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968, in respect of Mr. Justice v. Ramaswami, Judge, Supreme Court of India.
- (2) Evidence of witnesses tendered before the Inquiry Committee and original documents exhibited during the inquiry.

12.08 hrs

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received five notices of Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers under rule 198 from Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya, Shri

Madan Lal Khurana, Shri Rajveer Singh and Shri Jaswant Singh. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has secured the first place in the ballot.

The motion reads as follows:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

Shri Vajpayee may please seek the leave of the House.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) Mr. Speaker, Sir I seek leave of the House to move the motion "That this House expresses its want of confidence in the council of Ministers."

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: May I now request those Members who are in favour of leave being granted to this Motion to rise in their places?

Some Hon. Members rose.

MR. SPEAKER: As not less than 50 Members have risen in support of the Motion, leave of the House is granted. I think the sense of the House is that the discussion on the Motion may be taken up immediately. I allow Shri Vajpayee to initiate the debate.

May I request the hon. Members not to disturb any of the Members who is speaking (Interruptions) The Members who want to express their views will be given time; and they may please make their points when they stand up to speak and not otherwise. Shri Vajpayee, please.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the council of Ministers."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my No-confidence motion is a motion of one line. I have not given any reasons in it as I know that there is no need of giving reasons.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in a Parliamentary democracy the Opposition keeps on bringing No-Confidence Motions. When Shri Narasimha Rao was sworn in as Prime Minister then as per the orders of the President he had moved a Confidence Motion here and that time also Bhartiya Janta party had voted against that Confidence motion. The members of the Opposition, sitting today in the House had left the House at that time also. I have not brought this No-confidence motion to create problem for anybody. (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, everybody's position should be clear. No Confidence motion is not a religious ritual. There has been some incidents in the country on, before and after the 6th December. The nation is again in a dilemma. We are unhappy on whatever happened in Ayodhya on 6th December. (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, if they interrupt then we cannot discuss it properly because they have also to speak next.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD): I request the hon. Members not to disturb.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If they disturb us, they would also be treated in the same manner.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I was coming to the House, I saw something written on a dome which says "A meeting is not a meeting which has no elderman, an elderman is not an elderman until he practices religion, and a religion is not a religion which does not contain the truth and a truth is not a truth if it inspires you towards deception." Today in the House I shall speak only truth and nothing else. I would like that an open discussion

should take place today. If it concludes that we are at fault then we are ready to accept it. We had given an assurance to the Prime Minister. I realise his concern Arjun Singhji will not realise it. Every effort was made to fulfill the commitment given to the Prime Minister. But the commitment could not be fulfilled. The top rank leaders of B.J.P., R.S.S. and V.H.P. had been trying to prevent Kar Sevaks there. Video tapes are evidence of it. At that time many journalists were present there. *(Interruptions)* We have apologised to the journalists who were beaten there. The journalists were beaten and their cameras were broken because the Kar Sevaks did not want their action to be recorded. If it was recorded.....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the House be conducted in this way? Have the leaders of the Congress party no check on their members or they belong to C.P.M. Whosoever they are, but when Atalji is speaking and the hon. Speaker has been constantly trying to resume the proceedings in the House and the efforts are being made to maintain parliamentary tradition on the basis of consensus.*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura): We are preventing them. Everything should not be attributed to us. All of us have checked them.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Then it is right

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: What you people want who is not refusing it. *(Interruptions)* Oh, all of you are great personalities.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not talking to these people. I am speaking to you.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Oh, you are a great man. I have seen you speaking during the course of discussions violating all the rules.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr.

Speaker, Sir, it is not going to have any effect on me. I am performing my duties as a Member of Parliament. Others have different concept. Their conduct is different. I do not ask them to adopt my ways. I am merely requesting you if you want to run the House, we should be ready to listen to each and every thing howsoever unpalatable it may be. I am not one of those people who can run the country without Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: I fully agree with the views of Shri Chandra Shekhar. I, on behalf of all the Members, request you not to interrupt when any one of you is speaking here. As all of you are well aware that it is the only system by which our Parliament can function. By interrupting the speakers or adjourning the House again and again we cannot do anything. Again I appeal to all the members not to interrupt the speakers.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to my hon. friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar. He has tried to assist his 'guru'.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I would not be able to help him more.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It has always been a tradition that "Guru". The teacher should assist his disciple. But now such a time has come when the disciple has to come to the rescue of his 'guru' or teacher.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was making a submission that it would be far better if the discussions are held with a sense of sincerity rather with a sense of prejudiced feelings. The C.B.I. is conducting an enquiry into the Ayodhya incidents. The findings of the enquiry are still awaited. I would like that whatever the facts are with the Government, it should place them before the House. Whatever the facts are with us, I am placing these before the House. I am ready to go one step ahead and ask those Karsevaks who were a small in number to come forward and openly confess that they have demolished the structure and for that they are prepared to face the music. I would also like to state that there were karsevaks present in a large

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

number but they all were not involved in the demolishing.

Ram temple will not be constructed by foul or unfair means. If Ram temple is constructed it would be constructed on the basis of moral strength. There was no need to assemble large number of Karsevaks. Had there been an intention to demolish the structure, it would have been done easily without collecting karsevaks in large number. Fairs are held after every three-months in Ayodhya. If the structure was to be demolished secretly and according to a plan, it did not require Karseva. So whatever happened there, we regret the incident.

We as well as the Government of Uttar Pradesh had request the Central Government to get the matter expedited in the Court either way. How long the case would be kept pending. The representatives of the Central Government met us as well as the Government of Uttar Pradesh; but they refused to say in the Court that the verdict of the Court should be delivered soon. They started that it was too late. On that day, during the discussion Shri Chavan said that the matter was being postponed till 11th instant. Karseva was scheduled to be resumed on 6th instant. The assembled karsevaks were of the view that they would get some opportunity for construction work. But they could not get the same. However, efforts were made to control the situation. We had hoped that the Karsevaks would wait for the Court's verdict till 11th instant and our leadership made every effort in this regard. The 'Sarkaryawaha', R.S.S. had been requesting the people in Southern languages that no karsevak should go towards the structure. He should not take part in demilition activity. It was not a matter of creating any confusion.

The press reporters who went there told me that Shri Advani was very sad when the structure was demilished. He was in tears. That is why he sent in his resignation expressing his regret over the incident. Owing the responsibility Shri Kalyan Singh

also resigned. If you consider it as a drama, then it is a gross misconception because such type of misconception will neither encourage fair politics in the country nor it will encourage the right secularism.

I would like that all the facts should be brought forward. We would like to know the reality because it is a matter of great trouble and challenge for us. Our organisation was presumed a disciplined organisation. Our organisation was having an image of a disciplined one. It was its glory as to what they finalise they act accordingly. The same image is causing trouble for us.

We would like to know who was that group, from where it came and who organised it. I repeat it again that the Karsevaks who took part in demolishing the structure should come forward and reveal their participation in demolition. If punishment is given they should accept it. The temple of Lord Rama cannot be built without making sacrifice. At least it will not be built in this manner.

But there are other aspects also of this issue. It was not only a structure which was demilished. There was a temple as well. 'Namaz' was not offered in the mosque. Even the entry to the mosque was prohibited. But prayer was offered in the temple by the orders of the court. Now some hon. Member can object that the mosque already existed there and statues of deities were installed there later on. This right. Statues were installed there but I do not want to go into the history. I would like to ask the hon. Members whether statues were not kept with this belief that it was the birthplace of Lord Rama? There was no Janasangh, Vishwa Hindu Parishad or Bajarag Dal those days. But the people of that area had a strong feeling. Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I am constrained to say that the intensity of the sentiments of the majority community is not being understood.

I too did not understand it earlier. When Shri Advani went on the Rath Yatra, I had my reservations. If I expressed my feelings the press would have said that the Bharatiya Janata Party has worn two countenances.

Some times, it displays its countenance of moderates and sometimes that of hardliners. Mr. Speaker, Sir, excuse me, sometimes I deviate from the issue. I had said earlier that it will not serve any purpose. But the way people supported the cause, the mistakes that were committed by the ruling party particularly, the arbitrary decision by the then Chief Minister Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav to deal with the agitation, the way communalism was incited by the announcement that a particular community had the right to have arms, worsened the situation.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHOTEY SINGH YADAV (Kannauj): The name of a person who is not present in the House, is being referred and it is being said that he is responsible for communalism where as he is the only person who saved the country. But it is they who mislead the people.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Advani too is not present in the House....(*Interruptions*)

SHRICHOTEYSINGHYADAV: He had vowed to fight communalism and he was the only power who protected both the temple and the mosque. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If my hon. friend is hurt by referring to the name of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, I would say that the then Chief Minister was soft by name (Mulayam) but very cruel in his actions....(*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, why did the situation deteriorate? People gathered in a large number there. I understand the crisis of the Central Government and the crisis continued during the Kalyan Singh Government also. If people assemble in a large number and do something violently rash, how can it be controlled? (*Interruptions*) Shri Rajesh Pilot had rightly said that day, that if such a large number of people assemble there, it will go beyond control. But we did not feel like that..(*Interruptions*)

ANHON. MEMBER: Everyone said that

it was wrong.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Everyone did not say that and it matters little whether you say it or not.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we had trust in the people. Therefore, we said that if the trust of the Hon. Prime Minister has been betrayed, we too are shocked. Shri Kalyan Singh and Shri Advani resigned but nobody from the Central Government is ready to take the blame for it. Shri Arjun Singh said that he had already warned about it. Why did he not resign from the Cabinet. It was felt that the Hon. Prime Minister is on the right path. The N.I.C. had given a free hand to the Hon. Prime Minister. The Hon. Prime Minister did what he considered right. That day in the evening I met him and I am ready to say, even if all the members of my party do not agree that the Hon. Prime Minister tried his best to stave off any incidents and he tried to resume the 'Kar Seva' peacefully and maintain the security of the structure, though it is a fact that he cannot escape from his responsibility.

The people who went for 'Kar Seva' intended to resume the Kar Seva and construct the temple, but when they realized that the verdict of the High Court was yet to come, they were disappointed. They thought that indulging in this fruitless exercise of bringing sand from the Saryu and putting it in pits will not serve the purpose anymore. I think a group out of the mob emerged and they refused to follow the leaders and attacked and demolished the structure. It was very bad.

But the reaction to the happening in Ayodhya throughout the country and abroad is more or less over reaction. I think that primarily our outlook and the approach of Government to the problem is no less a factor to be blamed for it. We did not point out to the world that it was a disputed structure. It was repeatedly stated that there was a mosque. We never clarified that along with the structure of the mosque there is a temple also in which prayer and worship is being done and this dispute has been going on for the last 500 years. There are umpteen

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

examples like this throughout the world. When Russia occupied Warsaw a church was built there. When Poland became independent the first thing it did was demolition of the church. History bears testimony to this. When Toynbee visited India he taunted us that it is possible in India alone where a mosque has been erected after demolishing the temple. We have allowed wrong propaganda in the world. I attend the General Assembly of the United Nations as a delegate every year. It is discussed there also. They do not know the root of the dispute. They do not know whether there was a temple. They do not know that the remnants which have been excavated after demolition now confirm that there was a temple at the site hundreds of years ago. If this fact had been told to the people, then there would have been no uproar to this extent. Had they known this fact that an ancient temple was raised to the ground in order to build this Mosque, then they must have asked the Muslims to settle this issue amicably. If this is the fact, then should not the issue be settled with mutual understanding.

The Government had brought a Bill, which became law. Mr. Chavan is sitting here. He brought a Bill to this effect that there will be status quo in respect of all the shrines and places of worship as on 15 August 1947. What does it mean? Does it mean that time will stop running and cycle of change will stop. Does it mean secularism is in danger so everything should remain as is where is. These places of worship have been there for centuries. The rocks of stone and the monuments of stone also tell a tale. Many tales are linked with these monuments. They have close links with our feelings. The Government had also to accept this face so it had put Ayodhya in an exceptional category, it had to accept the truth. It could have included Ayodhya also and said that its position would remain intact as we have passed it because we are Parliament. But it did not do so. Because it knows that the situation of Ayodhya is somewhat different. The issue of Ram Temple is different but after saying this much what has it done?

Even other parties have also left this issue to the Government to settle it amicably. I am also of this opinion that Ayodhya issue is different. Thousands of Mosques, temples were constructed. My friend, Mr. Chauhan is sitting here, I had been to his place, Amroha for delivering a speech. I had said on that day that this incident is a misfortune. It is my submission that the rulers who come were not true representatives of Islam. That day I was listening to the radio speech of Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad. He said if temples were being demolished in Pakistan and Bangladesh, they were not being demolished in accordance with the tenets of Islam. Were the temples demolished in the country as per the tenets of Islam? Even this was also against Islam. That is why I do not consider Aurangzeb or the persons demolishing the temples the true representatives of Islam. Therefore, we were expecting our Muslim brethren to deplore such excesses but they did not do anything. They want to stick to this, this process has been going on. In the meantime, certain incidents have taken place in the country which have shaken the feelings of Hindus as also impinged their psyche be it in the form of the secessionists of Kashmir or be it the people of Punjab who are bent upon disintegrating the country through violence and raising arms or a crisis in Assam due to infiltration there, all such incidents are creating a feeling in the majority class as to what is happening after all?

The case of Shahbano has also underlined it. When this had not been there, it was alright. We, in Bhartiya Jansangh did not ask for a common civil code. We had wide discussions with our ex-Sarsangh Chalak Param Pujya Guruji in this regard. We used to say that Article 44 of the Constitution Under Directive Principles is about uniform Civil Code. Marriage law should be uniform as it will strengthen the unity of the country. He persuaded that every society has its own law regarding marriage and then he quoted Smritis and said until the society does not ask for it, itself or gets ready for it, the king should not intervene in such cases. I also apprised Shri Chandra Shekhar ji of it. We said that we would not make a demand

for it but the intention of the makers of the constitution was quite conspicuous. I have attentively gone through the Debates of the Constituent Assembly. The present and previous members of Muslim League have all along holding that they would not tolerate any intervention by Indian State or Indian Republic or Indian Parliament in the matters of marriage. Why would they not abide by law? Do they have a different type of citizenship? Will the family planning also not be implemented for the same reasons? Will the small family norm change on the basis of religion? Family Planning is the first and foremost problem, but the main obstacle to it is that Hindus, who do not wish to adopt it, say that others are being permitted for marrying with as many as four women, what does this Family Planning mean then? I know they are not marrying with as many as four women because married persons know that it is difficult to maintain even one wife. (Interruptions) I watch their plight. Mr Narsimha Rao is asking how I have come to know about it. Mr. Speaker, Sir in order to know that fire burns, one does not need to put his finger in fire, one can realise it from others' experiences

That time we did not press for the demand for a common civil code but in the meantime a case of an old women from Indore came up before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court gave its verdict and on its basis the Congress Party decided to have a common civil code. Mr. Arif Mohammad gave a beautiful speech on that day which was appreciated by the Congressmen, who said that it was a right decision and everybody should be governed by the same rules regarding marriage. Later on, the opinion of the Congress Party was changed. The opinion of Late Rajiv Gandhi was changed. Everybody knows that what happened to Mr. Arif. Then people felt that it was a policy of appeasement. Do the people of majority not get affected by what is happening in the house and outside the house. Do not they react to it? Now the world has come closer and by sitting at home we can watch the happenings around the World. We can watch even such happenings while sitting in our bed rooms.

I cite an example of Sharjah. People from Kerala went to Sharjah to earn their livelihood. They formed a club there. They staged a play there. This play has already received prizes from Kerala, Government. It is a play written by a good writer but somehow, a rumour spread in Sharjah that this play amounts an insult to Mohammad Saheb. The play has depicted certain things which are anti-Islam. The actors of this play were arrested. They were awarded 6 years' imprisonment and they are lodged in jail. Will this incident not have its repercussion? I do not know what happened on the official level regarding this case. There is another example, a person went to a foreign country for doing a job. I do not want to mention the name of the country. I mentioned Sharjah's name in connection with cricket. That person took a copy of 'Satyarth Prakash' with him. He reads it daily. As he is a religious person, he took it with him in order to draw some spiritual force. This nation can neither be an anti-religion nor a non-religions one. People could not understand the correct meaning of secularism. That is why, they developed a wrong feeling about secularism. I had said so on that day and want to repeat it today as well. Mr. Speaker Sir, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru wrote an Introduction to the book by Shri Raghunath Singh M.P. I do not know how many members have read that book. Panditji wrote in that Introduction that the present Hindi translation for the word secularism, which is Dharma Nirpeksha is creating, trouble and confusion. This is not a proper translation. He said further that secularism has only one meaning that there shall be no State religion and the State shall not discriminate against any religion. But even today the Hindi translation of the word secularism is Dharma Nirpeksha.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hindi version of our Constitution since 1982 shows the word Panth Nirpeksha instead of Dharma Nirpeksha.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Jha Saheb you are right, it has been modified now but it is not being used. You may see

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

how this word is being used by the All India Radio and Doordarshan. It should be changed. The word "secular" does not express our traditions and culture. It was used in some other context which I am not discussing here. Do the events taking place outside the country not effect us. As I was saying that a gentleman took a copy of "Satyarth-Prakash" with him. His baggage was checked at the airport. The copy was seized and he was put behind the bars. The Ministry of External Affairs knows well that he was got released after a lot of efforts. I do not want to mention the name of the country. We want to have relations with such countries. We do not want to act in the same manner. But we do get such reports. Does such act on their part not aggravate fanaticism? That structure collapsed. The sorrow for it assuaged ever since the reports are being received that in Pakistan, a Minister himself supervised the demolition of temples by using bulldozers. What was the provocation there for demolishing temples? Here, the Government is trying to control the situation through bullets. More than one thousand people have been killed. This is another matter but when one gets opportunity of counting dead bodies, then how many died in Madhya Pradesh. Now the question arises as to how many persons were killed in Maharashtra, Gujarat and West Bengal. But it should not be ignored that whosoever was killed, he was an Indian. I have sympathy for the bereaved families. The Government banned certain organisations and dissolved the B.J.P. Governments. Why? What is their fault? Punishment was awarded before any crime was committed, Capital punishment has been awarded before committing the murder. It has been the record of the B.J.P. Governments that they prevented communal riots that was a normal phenomena during the period of other parties' Governments. The figures will prove it. If the hon. Minister of Home Affairs speaks the truth today he will admit that the number of communal riots in Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan was very low and the police subdued them sternly wherever it erupted. No discrimination was made between a Hindu

or a Muslim. To provide security for everyone is the religion of our Governments. There can be no communalism in this regard. The ruler cannot make any discrimination on the basis of a community. If he does so, it is wrong and he does not properly discharge the duties of his Government. But today whatever is happening is being done only on the basis of gross discrimination. The B.J.P. Governments were dissolved. Why? Had the law and order failed there? In Himachal there was no such incident (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KRISHAN DUTT SULTANPURI (Shimla): Many people were killed there. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Nobody was killed there. But Shri Arjun Singh is interested in Bhopal. He and Shri Patwa either do not pull on well together or they pull on very nicely. I do not know. I express my ignorance in this regard. If he wants to throw light on it, he can do so.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUN SINGH): I too will speak the truth. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: This is very good. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV (Saharsa): It means other hon. Members who have spoken hitherto, have not spoken the truth.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it does not mean it. Sometimes the sun of truth is hidden by the clouds of politics. Now the truth needs to be spoken after clearing the clouds. I will see how far the Congress leaders speak the truth. I know that they will not admit their guilt. Why the B.J.P. Governments were dissolved? Were they dissolved only because some persons in these Governments were members of the R.S.S.? what makes a difference if they were members of the R.S.S.? Were not they abiding by their constitutional liabilities? Were they violating the instructions issued by the Centre?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Patwa Government closed and sealed the office of an unlawful organisation in Indore the members of the office approached the Court and the *Indore High Court* ordered that the office cannot be sealed. Please tell me whether this judgement goes in favour of or against the Patwa Government? But when the pressure was being put on the Government here and the hon. Prime Minister smelled a rat of the situation that the people are determined to dislodge either him or the B.J.P. Governments, he preferred to dissolve the B.J.P. Governments, 'sarvanas he samutpanne ardh n tyajati panditaa'. It means that whenever such a situation creates when one has to loose all, then one should try to save whatever one can and in this process it is immaterial whether one follows the norms of ethics or not. The same case is with you. You have violated the Constitution and run over the norms of ethics and sacrificed all the moral values.

Mr. Speakers, Sir, the State Governments were dislodged because they were ruled by the B.J.P. but why the legislative assemblies were dissolved? Was not it possible to keep them suspended. Were the assemblies not kept suspended in the past? What was the need of dissolving these assemblies? If there was any complaint it was against those Governments and that complaint too has no proper ground. Those Governments should have been allowed to work for some time and then have judged their functioning. After that if you had any complaint against them, it would have been proper and justified to dislodge them. But the Central Government did give them any such opportunity? No at all and dissolved them. Today there are so many articles against the Government's decision appeared in newspapers. I would like to quote one of their parts:

[English]

"Dissolution is not the only option. When President's Rule was first imposed on Punjab in 1951, the Assembly was suspended as, indeed, it was in Rajasthan in 1967, Bihar in 1969, UP in 1970, Orissa in 1971, Andhra

Pradesh and UP in 1973, Gujarat and UP in 1976, Manipur in 1977 and 1981, Assam in 1979, Punjab in 1983 and Kashmir in 1986 - when it suited the Congress."

[Translation]

The author of the above lines is not a B.J.P. man.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the articles appeared in editorial column in newspapers, even in pro Congress newspapers criticise the Congress party like any thing. The daily 'Janasatta' which is not at all happy with the B.J.P., especially with Shri Advani, was compelled to publish:

"An action of the Prime Minister taken under pressure is not effective and credible. Shri Rao was playing politics for avoiding communal confrontation till now, but if the politics of Shri Arjun Singh can over rule his politics, Shri Rao should retire from politics."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have the editorial comments of an editor who has played a role in settling the Ayodhya issue. Its comments are very harsh against us, but after the dissolution of the Assemblies, you have compelled it to write such an editorial having the title "Political Nihilism". The paper is "Indian Express" you go through its above mentioned article

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chimur): But this paper is the mouth piece of your own party.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I wish you were correct. Had we been able to bring out such a large newspaper, we would have dispelled all the doubts which have been created in the minds of people. We do not have the capacity to run just more than two or three periodicals; but, truth is universal. Its editor Shri Prabhu Chawla is equally a supporter of the Prime Minister. Everybody knows the role played Ref Mr. Chawla in the N.I.C. But what is he writing these days? I do not know whether such news, comments reach the hon. Prime Minister or not. But this type of news and coments must reach the

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

P.M. too. There are other newspapers too. I would like to read out an extract from an article published in the "Indian Express".

[English]

"There was no breakdown of law and order in these States that could even remotely warrant any Central action against their Governments. While 800 people died in Congress-ruled States, there were only 200 deaths in those under BJP control. Yet President Shankar Dayal Sharma accepted the reports of the Governors that they had apprehensions about maintenance of law and order in these States. The Centre itself open to the charge of criminal inaction, provoking some politicians to demand its removal. The dance of violence that stupefied Surat and Bombay, generating fears that sense and sensibility had vanished from the corridors of power, was apt to sweep away the moronic ministries in Maharashtra and Gujarat. Mr. Narasimha Rao's protective umbrella that saved them was not available to Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan where sanity was never shaken."

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not our opinion, rather it is the opinion of an impartial newspaper. It should be taken into consideration. In the light of these comments, we should try to introspect ourselves a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now I come to the point of "ban". Mr. Speaker, Sir, some organisations have been banned. What was the ground of banning them? Before the 6th December, all those organisations were good, patriotic, discipline, but on account of a single incident that occurred on 6th December in Ayodhya, they have been banned. The picture of the

incident of the 6th December is not clear as yet. The Government is talking about appointing a Commission thereon and the C.B.I. is holding an enquiry in this regard. But in the meantime, the Government took a decision to ban certain organisations. Any way the reasons given for banning those organisations are very ridiculous.

I was going through this Bill. When the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Bill was presented in the House in 1967, I was a member of the House. That time Shri Yashwant Rao Chavan had moved the Bill and today it is Shri Shankar Rao Chavan. Both are Chavan; both hail from Maharashtra. I was going through Shri Yashwant Rao's speech which he delivered while moving the Bill. The Bill was discussed thoroughly. Some times I remember my house days in Parliament. Prof. Ranga, S/Shri Madhu Limye, Hiren Mukerjee, Kamath, Manoharan of the D.M.K., Nath Pai and Tridib Chaudhary were members of the House in those days. A grand debate was held that time. Shri Yashwant Rao Chavan went on assuring the Members that it would not be applied against them. He gave an assurance that the Government was seeking a right to take action against those who wanted to disintegrate the country.

I too delivered my speech. I started my apprehension that the Government would involve all the opposition parties in the name of so called cause of integrity and declare the opposition as unlawful. Those who would be declared unlawful would go underground. You want to stop the unlawful activities, but how you can stop these activities, you have the option to arrest them; but are you are that making arrests can win the battle of thoughts?

Sir, I want to raise an important question. Whatever is happening in this country is not the battle for a temple, it is rather a battle of ideologies. What is the nationalism of this country? Where lies the base of this country? Through what roots this country will have water and life. It is right that different kinds of people have come to this country for centuries. Many generations of people have settled here. Though there had been different

states, yet the country remained one. No passport was needed to move anywhere in this country. There was no need of having any permit for pilgrims for going from one place to another. This country was one. What was the uniting force behind it? The Ganga-Yamuna culture is often talked about. The place where Ganga and Yamuna flow together is called Sangam. But onwards Sangam, the Ganga flows alone taking all with it.

That day I quoted Shri Nehru. While addressing the students of the Aligarh Muslim University he said, "You are Muslims, I am a Hindu. But does not the cultural heritage of this country thrill all of us? The word used by Shri Nehru was "thrill". Now the situation of the country is that even the slogan of 'vande matram' is being opposed in this ill-fated country. Should it happen? There are minor issues associated with that cultural heritage which have no relation with any religion. If 'S am gachhadhvam Sam vaddhvam, Sam wo manansijantam' is recited in a State function, how can it be a body of the Hindu rituals? If we should move together, speak together and live together, does it not express the feeling of nationalism?

This country had never witnessed the religious discrimination at any stage. But now its probability is being seen. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am worried about it. I have already spoken to my party. I request you too whether you think that the recent incidents in the Jamia Millia do not affect other youths also. I do not want to mention any names, but it does affect them. If the Government compromises with one kind of fanaticism and promotes it, it cannot suppress the another one. I am sorry for the demolition of the structure. I usually come across with such people also who are of the opinion that it was a blot for 400 years and there was no alternative but to remove this blot. I am afraid of such type of sentiments. Such issues should be solved peacefully through dialogue. Issues should not be hung in balance otherwise they become a source of constant trouble. As long as the Ayodhya issue was raised it was all right but now the position is somewhat different. When Sardar Patel

reconstructed the temple of Somnath, our first hon. President Shri Rajendra Prasad attended the function but Shri Nehru was not happy on this. But Rajendra Babu went there, the temple was constructed and the problems were solved. Ayodhya issue has been kept pending in the court for Forty years.

The court could have decided the matter early. The Hon. Prime Minister was requested to refer this issue to the Supreme Court under article 143. But delay was made even in this regard. Then there was a proposal to not to touch the structure and start the construction over 2.77 acres of land. It will take 3-4 years during which some solution would be found. But this proposal was also not accepted. The Government did not bother to understand the changing mood of the people of the country. My friend Shri Shahabuddin is sitting here. I am calling him a friend. My party members would not like this word. However, it is a cultured way of behaviour. When I was the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Shahabuddin was working in our Ministry. He was well known as a progressive Muslim leader because he had perhaps been associated with Federation. We wanted him to send to a particular country. I would not mention the name of the country. The Government of that country asked us to send some one else because, that was an orthodox country and Shri Shahabuddin was known as a progressive Muslim leader. Then he left the foreign service and started practicing law. My party colleagues blame me for bringing him into Janata Party. I am blamed for bringing an other person also into the politics. I would not mention his name. But the change that has just taken place in Shri Shahabuddin is surprising. He is bringing out 'Muslim India'. If 'Muslim India' can be published why not "Hindu India? (Interruptions) The matter is not so simple. I know that Shri Shahabuddin is a very articulate person and would give an impressive reply to it. A lot of matter is published in that newspaper. But on the whole, it is doing nothing but spoiling the atmosphere.

Shri Shahabuddin must be remembering

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

that I had said in a public meeting held in Bombay in 1986 that Ayodhya issue could be solved. I had given two suggestions in this regard. First, Muslims should forsake their claim on the structure in favour of Hindus saying that they were doing so because the sentiments of Hindus were attached to this place. Hindus believe that it is the birth place of Lord Ram and there is an evidence to it. Faith is something very precious. We live in this country with you, we have to live together. If you believe that it is the birth place of Lord Rama, we give it to you. Second suggestion was that the Hindus, after getting the structure should say that their struggle for Ram Janambhoomi has now ended. This structure now would not be demolished. Pooja will continue to be performed there. Temple would be constructed at some other place. But Shri Sahabuddin did not accept it. He wrote me a letter to hold negotiations on the issue. I have that letter with me. This was no solution.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to conclude now. Ayodhya is a tragedy. The country is standing on a cross road. It is not the time to level allegations on each other. The more you level charges on us, the more we would be aggressive. The more you try to suppress us, the more we would retaliate. The Government is not understanding the mood of the people. Government is not realising as to what damage the Hon. Prime Minister has caused by giving the statement that mosque will be built again there. What was the hurry in giving such a statement? Was this statement given under some pressure from outside? Was it not necessary to find out first whether there existed temple or mosque earlier? Now the particulars state is under the control of Central Government, so Archaeological Survey of India should be asked to excavate carry out excavation at the site with a view to determine whether earlier there existed temple or not. This dispute should be settled once for all. Shri Chandra Shekhar wanted to solve it and he also got the cooperation of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Shri Chandra Shekhar arranged for the talks.

The talks were held in a cordial atmosphere and a number of documents were exchanged. Solution was about to be reached. But then his Government went out of power. The present Government also may not go out of power before finding any solution....(Interruptions) We are sure that there was a temple. if it is proved that there was a temple and the court also gives same verdict, then they will have to abide by it.

13.00 hrs.

But no effort to this effect has been made. The matter was kept pending. After all we had not performed the 'Shilanyas', it was performed during regime of Congress Government. At that time Congress was in power both at the Center and in the State. Is it wrong to complete a good work started during the days of Shri Rajiv Gandhi? We want to complete that good work. Will the Government put us behind the bars only because of this? What did Shri Advani do? He was arrested when the Lok Sabha was going on in the morning. Look at the allegations leveled against him. How ridiculous those allegations are? Advani ji was appealing to the Kar Sevaks that the structure should not be demolished. You may confirm it from TV reports or enquire it from the journalists. Whereas the Government have got the reports prepared to the effect that Advaniji was inciting the Kar Sevaks to pull down the mosque. Will it raise your credibility? Will it bring credibility to the Government? He is the leader of opposition and he was arrested when the Lok Sabha was in session. He was in Ayodhya. I also wanted to hear from him the sequence of events that took place there. I believe that he is a man of integrity and he is such a big man that he would admit if at all he had committed any mistake....(Interruptions) Please don't interrupt me, please be quiet if you do not understand the sentiments, I want to express my feelings. I have always been saying this and most of the members of our party are of the same view. Don't think that some are liberal and some are hardeners. Who is liberal in Congress Party....(Interruptions) Perhaps Margaret ji was saying that she was liberal.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, How can I make any complain to you when I myself have made a mistake. It has never happened in my 30 years' Parliamentary career that I would have gone continue speaking when you are on your legs.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: It is all right.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I would like to tell my colleagues that I had gone to the hon. Speaker and expressed my desire to resign.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, there is nothing of this sort, it is alright.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If we cannot speak in the House and you are not ready to hear me, then what is the use of continuing as an M.P. Sometimes there is a noise from our side too, but that is not a good thing. This should not happen. After all, we are also the citizens of this country. We are bound by the ties of democracy. The bonds of our culture are inseparable. This is just a passing phase. It would pass. I am confident that India would emerge stronger and more prosperous out of this crisis. We are passing through crisis and it would rather help us if we discuss the matter sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we did not create any difficulty on the first day. It was alleged that B.J.P. Members sat with their heads down. We were sitting quiet and calm. We did not want to indulge into any hullagulla even then we were criticized. Our silence was misinterpreted. We asked for an opportunity to express our views..... but that too was not given. We continued to plead not to suspend the Question Hour. Today, I faced a great difficulty to persuade my party members. Advani ji has not been released. I would like to know the difficulty in releasing him? The Government says that he can be released on bail, why is he not being released? Sky is not going to fall, if he makes a speech here. Why the Government is adopting an

inflexible attitude in this regard? It is clear that they do not want the discussion to take place in normal situation you do not want Advani ji to express his views and that the facts in regard to Ayodhya to come to light. We are ready to admit our mistake, if we have committed at all in Ayodhya. But at the same time the other political parties sitting here should also admit their fault. Central Government should also admit its mistake. I do not want to go into all those details as to how the Hon. Prime Minister complicated the matter and why he did not take any initiative for two months and to how he stated contradictory things before the sadhua, and how he tried to create rift among them. It is true that the Hon. Prime Minister was very particular even upto the last day that the structure should remain intact. Central Reserve Police was also despatched there. What were they doing there? Why did the Central Government not interfere and impose President's Rule? Why did the Central Government not intervene in Ayodhya affair? The hon. Minister of Home Affairs may please tell us-what was the report of intelligence agencies? What was the role of the officers present there? Facts to this effect should be brought into light. It won't do just by accusing us. The Government may take the immediate political advantage, by accusing BJP for it, but it would not solve the problem. There is a need to start a new chapter. Ayodhya incident is a challenge and it should be availed of as an opportunity for solving the tangle. It depends on our intention whether we take advantage of this opportunity or not. I do not think that the present Government would be able to do it. Because I am unable to understand whether the Hon. Prime Minister is unable to take decision or his subordinates do not allow him to take decision. If Dhritrashtra is surrounded by Duryodhan and Dusshasan, he cannot move on the path of justice even if he intends to move. With these words I conclude.

✓ THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ARJUNSINGH): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the speech delivered by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee in his well known style is always very impressive. It depends upon the listeners or audience to

[Sh. Arjun Singh]

understand as to how much factual and sentimental contact is there in it. I have listened his many speeches as also today's speech, about which he himself has said that it was all truth and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, truth is always welcome but in this context, the psyche of that person who speaks the truth and the psyche of the entire country and the other parties also have some importance in a democracy. Shri Vajpayee has tried to present this issue in a wider perspective. No one has any doubt about his erudition, but I would like to request Shri Vajpayee that if argument given in support of a case do not have any link and are not authentic then one can only say that a very good advocate has given a very good arguments in support of a very bad case.

Hon. Vajpayee ji, the present psyche of people of our country did not develop or form only in 1947, 1950 or 1960 but it developed from the date when this country had waged its first struggle for freedom and that psyche ultimately pressurised the biggest imperialistic country of the world to leave this country. Please link this psyche with that period and do not confuse us by talking about any other psyche developed in between we have no interest in borrowing our ideology from outside and no Indian should have such an interest.

You yourself have said that this case was sub-judice for the last fifty years. The idols were kept at that place. The Court issued some orders. This case has been going on for the last fifty years and it might have been going on even before than that. This country would like to ask you and your party at which moment and for what reasons, this sub-judice issue was brought to the political arena of this country. You should have allowed to continue it where it was going on previous. If it was not decided in fifty years, it would have taken another twenty years or more. You did not speak out your so called truth as to when your party decided to raise this issue or bring this issue in political arena. You should tell about that date and

day, when the Bhartiya Janta Party decided that this issue would not be solved in the Court of law but it will become an election issue and will be decided by the people of the country. Through this, you thought to create an atmosphere of disharmony in the country, because only such an atmosphere could have helped you in getting the power. This all started from there only and you are taking it to four hundred to five hundred years back. If you cannot speak out the truth, the country will be grateful if some one else from your party says something about it.

When you saw that despite all determined efforts, you have not been able to come to the power, you decided to politicise this issue. It is your right to achieve power, but you should have followed all those principles which are valid to be adopted by the individuals and political parties to come to power or to dislodge others from the power in a democracy. If you would have come to the power by following this principle, no person having belief in democracy, would have any complaint or any regret for that. But by ignoring the Constitution, the laws and the feelings of the people of this country, you have made this issue a way to achieve power. The propaganda made thereafter was not within the limits of the democratic values, because you had decided to change the psyche of the crores of people of this country by raking up the feeling of Hindutva. You wanted to change the psyche of the people by giving them a call that if they were Hindu, they should adopt this path. You have declared yourself as the sole representative of the Hindu community of this country. I do not accept this.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to urge that they should not have this misunderstanding in their minds. Maybe we are proud of being Hindu and we may be having faith in different religions but if we indulge in such a propaganda as an Indian then we may be playing with the sentiments of Indian citizens and not with the sentiments of a Hindu, a Sikh or a Muslim. The founders of the Constitution had taken this decision with great prudence and wisdom. You have challenged that wisdom. I would like to ask you whether you

do not know or you do not have the courage to say that the ideology which you are supporting today had once inspired to hatch a conspiracy to remove a great man from Indian Scene or stage. The assassination of Gandhiji was an indirect effort.....(Interruptions)..... It was an indirect effort to achieve the goal to which they were eager to attain because it was felt at that time that if the voice of this man, who spoke the language of amity and brotherhood, continued to echo, they would never be successful in their plan. So when they failed in undermining his influence, they had only one way out and that was to do away with him physically. The elections started in this country from 1952 and the voters elect the Government of their choice. If a person thinks that he can do anything as he had not got the opportunity to come in power, whether such a right can be given to him or any party, while keeping the democracy of this country alive? Mr. Speaker, Sir, please allow me to say this that the day any person will get such a right, the democratic set up of this country will start crumbling down. I regret to say that Shri Atal ji has never thought about this.

This temple dispute was not there in 1952, 1965 or in 1972. What was the reason that it suddenly came up in 1980, the BJP got this inspiration. I don't know from where did they get it? Perhaps it would have appeared to them that they had no other way to come in power except to raise this boggy of temple. This is a mistake. Shri Vajpayee may or may not seek apology for that, I know he is a broad minded person and he may come any time, and seek apology. But he should keep one thing in mind that the people of this country are not so naive that they would not understand as to from where this issue started and to where it is being taken to. There came different stages at different times and stands were changed accordingly but that could not affect the Constitution of our country and I am confident that it would not affect in future also.

You have tried to shut our mouths by saying that you were speaking only truth. I do not say that you did not speak the truth hither before. I take it for granted that whenever

you speak, you speak the truth. But it is not the question whether you are speaking the truth here or not. The incidents have their own truth. Can we ignore the facts.

You have referred to the language of mute inscriptions. You are definitely that much sensitive so that you could understand the language of the rocks. But Vajpayeeji, the time does not stop even if we listen to the language of rocks or other things. The time passes on. The language we are capable of hearing and the duties we perform as a political activist and party after listening to that language is written in a different language. Attainment of independence and then voyage of Indian democracy also speak its own story. Why do the people get this opportunity to say like this. You spoke a lot about the Governments of B.J.P. It is a political issue. Just in reply to your question I am saying all this, but it is not a matter of sentiments. Atrocities have been committed on weaker sections of the society everywhere whether it is in M.P., Rajasthan or U.P. No such atrocities are ever committed on people in any other State. May I ask you.....(Interruption)

At least you listen to your leader. Do not listen to me. I have been listening his views. Therefore, you are linking today's incidents with the incidents that occurred during the past three years. As I have already said that as one of the best advocates you have argued well a very weak case. Whatever the steps were taken, they were taken in a very non-partisan way.

You must have felt that the Prime Minister was hurt. It was quite but natural. I don't want to mention anybody's name. People whoever met the Prime Minister from your side gave assurances but did nothing practically. The Prime Minister who is a sensitive person is making endeavors in his own way and wants to repose faith in others to bring the society and the country to one platform and try to find out a peaceful solution to the problem. If he is hurt by your conduct, it is your fault and not that of the Prime Minister.

Now, the question arises why did you

[Sh. Arjun Singh]

people do that? May be it is my misfortune, but I am fully aware of the nature and objectives of the game you are playing. But I was confident that.....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Do not you belong to old R.S.S.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Is it the conduct of R.S.S.?

For your information I would like to tell you that at the time of partition of India in 1947 you people thought to provoke Hindu feelings because lakhs of people were moving from here to there. You did the same and it culminated in the murder of Gandhiji. At that time the Congress party constituted a National Volunteer Corps to check these events. My old friends of the Congress Party must be aware of it. I was a petty worker in it and had started fighting against you since 1947. That is why, I know you. But I had full confidence that you would respect the sentiments of and efforts made by the Prime Minister to solve the problem in the country by peaceful means. Perhaps, there is no such example in the history of India or in any political party which disturbed the political unity, national integration and humiliated the national sentiments. God forbid, such an instance should occur in future.

I am not arising any personal issue here. What I want to say that whatever the Prime Minister did was in the larger interest of the nation and we fully endorse his action.

You said that the Prime Minister has been hurt and were apprehensive whether Arjun Singh is there or not. If he is there, he should resign. Vajpayeeji, you are cleverer than me. If you are feeling so sad why do not you resigned? I want to tell you that I am not going to resign. Today it is my foremost duty to bail the country out of the prevalent situation and firmly support the endeavours of the Prime Minister and fight against the anti-national activities.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Is it true?

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Those who never speak the truth are apprehensive on each and every issue. The people and the party which could not honour the affidavit it gave to the Supreme Court is trying to evade the facts and demanding others to be truthful.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to say that the people of the country should understand it well that it is not the question of success or failure of only the B.J.P. The challenge before the country does not relate to the success and failure of a particular man. The psyche these people are trying to strengthen should be checked collectively by people who have faith in democracy and in the country. If they do not try to check this psyche unitedly the day will not be far when one more partition of the country will definitely take place. Does any one of us desire so? Does any one of us wish to witness another disturbance in India. If we do not, it is the time for us to show our unity and strength and teach a lesson to those people who do not care for maintaining the unity of the country. Their concern is only how to capture power by hook or by crook. Atalji, I would like to tell you and you know it also and if you do not know, then listen to me. The democracy of this country has met many challenges. The spirit of unity, secularism and amity in the country is not our or your achievement. It has been a part of liberal humanitarian Hindu feelings for thousands of years. If secularism has been strengthened in the country, it is not only due to the efforts of one person. It is a natural phenomenon of crores of people for thousands of years. Your tactics will not have any effect on it. It is my conviction. Yes, the challenge has been thrown by you. To meet challenge we have to come forward. Today, you will realise that all the democratic forces which understand the ensuing danger will not be misled by these peoples. I am fully confident that it will be strongly opposed and finally. Indian democracy will emerge more stronger.

Referring to a historical incidence, you have tried to make a taunting remark that when Dushasan and Duryodhan were sitting on either side of Dhritrashtra(Interruptions). I would like to ask you

whether you know only this much part of Mahabharat? Don't you know about the last moments of Bhishma Pitamah when he had given his last preaching to everybody? It was also one of those preaching, I am not attaching myself with any of the mythological tales, this is what you are doing. As far as I know, sometimes to save their kingdom or to get power, people even go to the extent of dividing the nation. When there is a danger of division of the country, the countrymen should come forward to face any kind of battle whether it may be Mahabharat or the like and if such type of Mahabharat repeats itself, the people should undoubtedly participate in it on each occasion. Country should be saved, nationalism should be saved to which you have posed a threat today. (Interruptions) Now, you should inculcate it in your new movement. (Interruptions) You have started the Mahabharat, probably a lot of people do not know about it. It is said that the inaugural ceremony (Muhurt) of 6th December was fixed by you, taking into account the Mahabharat only. I do not know about right and wrong. Perhaps Vajpayeeji might be knowing about it. You want to start a Mahabharat but your weak shoulders cannot carry the burden of it, because these shoulders are accustomed to hit below the belt. You cannot stand face to face to fight, whether it is democratic fight or otherwise.

Atalji, today a straight line has been drawn. Now it is not in tune with the time to cross it either way. Today, it is the call of the time that the nation faces the challenge thrown by you. Let us see whether the people of this country face it or not. Today, it may be possible that the people have different views on any political or other issue but it is definite that they all are one on a single issue and they should remain one on this issue. You are requested to stay on the other side of the line and not to put your legs on both the sides, and let this war take place. No doubt, it would be a democratic and peaceful war. This would be a war for the hearts and minds of crores of people of this country. I can assure you that the democratic and the secular forces would positively win this war and these forces wish that the

country should remain united and work together for the betterment of the country. These forces do not differentiate between Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians and consider everybody as an Indian national. This is the situation which would be acceptable to all of us. You cannot ruin this picture with your vicious thinking.

You talk of the Hindus. I am proud to be a Hindu. I am proud to be born in a Hindu family. I am well acquainted with the Hindu customs. I am attached with these. But if situation arises, I am attached with these. But if situation arises, I am ready to lead my life as a Sanyasi on the stair-case of a temple. But if there is a question of using Constitutional right, then neither I am a Hindu, a Muslim, a Sikh nor a Christian but an Indian and as an Indian I have only one religion and that is National religion. If at any time our national religion faces any crisis then as an Indian it would be my sacred duty to defend the same. Today, the Prime Minister has expressed the same conviction and has decided it. I know that the whole of India stands behind him. None of your attempts can break this conviction prevailing in India. You may weep, express sorrow or make apologies, you are doing all this after the incident; but what did you do to stop this incident. You did not make any effort to bring out the facts in this regard in the house. Because speaking the truth is dangerous for you but I may tell you that hiding the truth is much more dangerous. You are requested to cooperate in this regard. Let bygones be bygones. Now let us create a peaceful atmosphere. A peaceful effort should be made towards the integration of the nation. All and sundry should work together in order to pacify the anguish of the people. All problems should be solved with mutual cooperation, wisdom and intelligence. If you wish to make efforts in attaining this goal then we are with you. You have expressed your views but what your party members wish to do in this regard. The nation requires an assurance from you in this connection.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I think, we can meet

[Sh. Arjun Singh]

again at 2.30 p.m. after lunch to resume the discussion

13.33 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till thirty minutes past Fourteen of the clock

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at thirty-two minutes past Fourteen of the clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV (Madhepura): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you for providing me an opportunity to speak. The direction which hon. Shri Atal Bihariji and hon. Shri Arjun Singhji have given to this debate, has created a peaceful atmosphere in the House which has been witnessing an uproarious scenic for the last few days. I heard both the speakers very attentively and I felt that both the speakers are very much concerned about the welfare of our nation.

The hon. Leaders are not here. Had they been here, it would have been much better.....—(Interruptions) I was not saying about them only. They have a great responsibility I had hopes that they would be present in the house. Everybody looks towards facts with his own angle. I accept that both of them visualized India in a true manner and they have very rightly expressed their feelings according to their convictions. A point was given much importance during the course of their debate. People read the ancient history of this nation with their own angles. The stories of Mahabharat were read by Shri Atalji and Shri Arjun Singhji with their own respective angles. Atalji has rightly said that the present Prime Minister is surrounded by Duryodhans and Dushasans and Arjun Singhji has referred to the teachings of Bhishma Pitamah. I am also starting my

debate with the teachings of Mahabharat, which I have read with my own angle. Bhishma Pitamah was lying wounded on a bed of arrows bed. My these two colleagues have narrated this episode of Mahabharat with their own angles but I have my own point of view that when the war of Mahabharat came to an end then Kaurvas and Pandavas went together to Bhishma Pitamah who was lying on bed of arrows. Even at that time Bhishma Pitamah gave them preachings. The ancient literature of this country sometimes speaks in favour of the poor of the society. Bhishma Pitamah was preaching and everybody was listening attentively. There was a character in Mahabharat, who bore insult, pain and distress she was Draupadi. When Bhishma Pitamah was preaching, Draupadi daughter surcastically. It very much hurt Arjun who was closely related to him, he asked her of the reason for her laughter. At this Lord Krishna who was also standing nearby, said that she was not an ordinary woman. She always speaks correctly. When she was asked about it she said that this man who is preaching us the great sermons at the time of his death, never acted upon those principles.

I would like to make a request that Draupadi represents the exploited, oppressed and downtrodden of India. Atalji, I request you kindly to give this a serious thought. The caste system in India does not include woman, who is a mother too. She does not fall into the category of Shudras. She is beyond 'Varna' system. In Indian culture woman is considered to be.....(Interruptions) Even then I would like to state that some people misunderstand it. I am speaking in the august House of the nation, so I can speak at length about good things but I shall not do it, I would like to point out that despite so many traditions prevailing in Indian society, what are our achievements. What are the results of having so many religions and cultures and one should keep these results in his mind while analyzing truth of any of these religions and principles otherwise it would turn out to be another Ayodhya.

I would like to appeal to all the hon. Members that we will have to eradicate the

social evils spread in the country if we want to solve the Ayodhya problem. Today, I would like to draw the attention of the members to the evil practices which gave rise to these problems. Today, we are facing the Ayodhya problem, I would like to submit that we faced a lot of problems during the last 45 years since independence and will face many more in future. If we do not find solution to those problems we will have to face the bitter experiences as we did in the past. What did our culture and religion teach us. Please pay attention to what I have said. What was Draupadi's view point in regard to this country? What a great man Bhishma Pitamah was considered at that time? But how hypocrite he was in his conduct? Our culture and religion have been greatly influenced by hypocrisy I would like to ask what place of our country has acquired in the world after achieving the independence in 1947. I would like to ask all the Members of the house that we are passing through a period of crisis, and we cannot raise our head high. India tops the world in the matter of poverty. 52 percent of the total poor population of the World Times in India. Again, India tops the list in illiteracy. 47 percent of the total illiterate population lives in India. 57 percent of the total handicapped population of the world is in India. Begging has become our wholesale trade. No religion or culture in the world has any place for such an evil practice. But some people do take pride in it. It is something meaningful, if we help those who serve the society or our culture. If begging is restricted, objections are raised. people engaged in it say that they have no occupation other than this., and that they have been begging for the last so many years. How can the malaria insects be killed when drains are not kept clean? The situation in this country is very strange. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would also like to ask as to where does our country stand in the field of science and technology, inventions and creativity. Thousands of years ago, when our forefathers had made invention of numerals our country at that time must have been in a better condition. Invention of number 1 to 0 was made by India. India had a rich culture, but what happened afterwards? What has been our contribution in the development of science and technology? I would say that

the electricity being used in this house is the result of inventions made by others. Multiple-mike being used here, the pen with which we write, the wrist watch on our wrists - everything is the result of the invention made by others. What type of society and culture have we created to promote science and technology and to create atmosphere to make new invention? A scientist., Shri Khurana, who belonged to India made an invention in America. But the number of such Indian Scientists who made inventions is very limited. No doubt you can mention the name of Khurana but he too studied in America. (Interruptions) I am saying the same thing. I have already said that the number is give crore or two and a half crore or three crore out of the total population of eighty seven crore in India where as they are in thousands. (Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: There is one Khurana also. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: That is why I am submitting to Khurana ji.....(Interruptions)..... he is rather ahead of him. I am also addressing you. Your language may differ, but your deeds and acts are the same. I will just prove it. A four play is being played here.....(Interruptions)..... No decision can be taken in view of the one thing alone. It is very difficult to discuss the happenings all the time. Your number in this House is quite large. We were also with you at one time. This is the peculiarity of this country, and I shall call it as rubbish and it is very difficult to evolve a system out of this rubbish. There are about one lakh castes, a number of gods and religions in India. The total number of Hindus in this country is sixty crore whereas their gods and deities are thirty five crore in number. There is virtually one god after every two Hindus. It is very difficult to evolve a system out of such a social malady. My submission to you is that the condition of the country at present is very deplorable we are standing where we stood in 1947 when we got independence. This House is supreme. I have gone through the Content of No-Confidence Motion moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee very carefully. It has everything

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

except the reference to the sufferings of 87 crore people of India. I would like to submit to Atal Ji that we are all passing through a period of difficulties and tensions. But we should remember that we got our independence after struggling for thousands of years and we must be careful that we may not commit a mistake for which we may have to face hardships afterwards. We are the spoilt people and the proof to this effect can be found at every step. Our acts should not be such that they may endanger our independence. You have said that the demolition of Babir Masjid is a matter of great distress. However, I would like to submit with complete confidence.....(Interruptions).....

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT (Ajmer):
Disputed structure.....(Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: I do agree, you would also agree that whatever has happened is very painful. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has also said the same thing.....(Interruptions)..... Khurana ji immediately pointed out that it was wrong on our part to condemn the Motion. This is the only irrelevancy. I do not say that our party is united and your party is divided. I do agree that your party is more united than ours. But you are moving along the flow of the stream while we are moving across the stream. Even our brothers do not support us. Sometimes our close relatives also Estate in supporting us. I feel that there is difficulty involved in it. However, I would like to clarify its reasons. People say that Babar changed the course of history which was as old as four hundred years old. I feel that nowhere else in the world is as much cruelty as is in India. If at all there is anything most specific, in our culture, it is the caste system. Therefore there is a long history of such type of cruelty. I do agree that Babar was an outsider, but Sher Shah Suri was our ancestor. I do not rise here to speak in favour of Babar. The English were also outsiders. I am also anguished that Britishers destroyed our country and kept us in the bondages of slavery but the more distressing thing is that we let ourselves become slaves. It is very difficult to point out all things. The faulty

system is the root cause of all the prevailing evils in the country. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Shri Arjun Singh made reference to it during the course of discussion and it appeared that they wanted to talk of facts.

If I go on discussing in details what they have said it will take a long time. I know, I have to be brief in my submission. The tale of tyranny, as has been said, is linked with emotions. I do agree with Atal ji who has said that our civilization and culture have tolerance to a great extent. In this context can we expect any tolerance from the hypocrites? Is it tolerance to surrender before any plunderer? We seldom resist. Aggressors have to face little resistance in entering the country. I ask why does it happen? Is it the outcome of what we call our great culture? I repeat, this is the outcome of our so called great culture. The present problem of Ayodhya has its roots in this very culture of ours. We talk of Babar, but what is more important to be thought about is the fact as to how Babar succeeded in coming to our country. He travelled thousands of kilometers to come to India to rule it and to be the part and parcel of our tales and our history. I, however, do not personally believe in these stories, but I would like to say that those who believe in it should ponder over it as to why our bravery was ineffective in giving tough fight to Babar who ruled us after coming here from thousands of miles. Why to talk of Babar alone, there were many more who let loose a reign of terror in India. Aggressors have in fact no religion. Their only religion is to let loose destruction. Their activities are not restricted to more demolition of a mandir or a masjid, they do also go to the extent of molestating our mothers, sisters and daughters. It is a fact that we had been unable to prevent them from doing so. We are foolishly showing our resentment against those aggressors now.

Sir, only a few persons from among those who participated in the freedom struggle are sitting here. I agree that our forefathers who fought for freedom were great. They were the men who liberated the country from the slavery of more than thousand years. We have got this freedom on account for courage

and boldness shown by our ancestors and if at all we want to preserve our hard-won freedom, we will have to show the same courage and boldness. It is said that Babar was responsible for it and it is further agreed that since the issue is concerned with the sentiments of the majority of people, a temple may be constructed by demolishing the structure.

I would like to tell my colleagues belonging to the Bhartiya Janata Party that there are sections of people in India who have not been allowed for thousands of years to enter any temple and they have been punished for making any such efforts. There has been a long history of the tragedy of helplessness and insult being meted out against several crore people who constitute 90 per cent of total population, who work in the fields and farms and who have been categorized on the basis of their different castes. What is more pitiable is that they are not even aware of that fact. It is a fact that according to Manu there are innumerable number of people who had to face tragedy. The majority of the Members present here are the persons who belong to the majority class. The rights of the people of backward classes and of Scheduled Castes of India are clearly mentioned and they are there for the last 45 years but we all know as to what happened in the country whenever a demand for these rights was made. Even after the verdict of the Supreme Court the Government passes orders to kill the terrorists of the Punjab and Kashmir in the pretext of violation of the Constitution. On the one hand, they are killed while on the other hand, there are people who are not at all ready to accept the verdict of the Court and they are the people who call themselves nationalists. This is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to remind you that throughout the country I have been attacked and humiliated on several occasions but I never complained against them. At some places people threw shoes on me. At times when I went among the intellectuals, the young men from among them put shoes on my head. I tolerated all this because I know that India is now independent. But the fact

remains that I am much pained and angry. The issue of Ayodhya is now being referred to and it is also said that people will take revenge upon. If we are also allowed to put forth our views, we would say that the slant of the ancient history of our country cannot be wiped out by resorting to revenge. I believe in the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi that the World can be changed by changing the hearts of the people and not by force and bullets. I agree with Atalji that change should be brought about in a proper manner that is to say in judicious manner. But there is nobody in his own party to pay attention to what is bad according to him. What he is saying.....(Interruptions) We do listen, but you people are not listening to what I say. He has just said that he had some difference of opinion about 'Rath Yatra' at the time when it was just started. He has said it just now. He had some reservations about it which one can read in the newspapers to be published tomorrow. So what I mean to say is that it is not only your party that has several voices within it, there are several voices in our party as well (Interruptions)

No, he is inciting me to speak, I would like that he should listen to my views, I am already speaking to the hon. Speaker, I know that it is my duty to address the hon. Speaker (Interruptions)

He is provoking me, but I do not have any objection to it. I am least disturbed by his provocation's. But I am certainly ready to welcome the rectification if he wants any. What I mean to say is that we all know that there are differing voices and we all know in which direction the country is heading. I should tell that I did not have even an iota of imagination that the structure of the Babri Masjid would be demolished.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I remember I once came to you to raise a question. Atal Ji and Somnath ji were also present there. I did not raise the point that the graves were being damaged and about which the reports were pouring in. We did not raise this issue because we hoped that the Government may find out a peaceful solution. We were supporting the Government in its pursuit of

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

finding a peaceful solution and which would also have been in the interest of this country. Now the autonomy of the country is at stake due to policies of Government. Similarly the issue of scam is also there. Today the farmers of the country are facing troubles in getting fertilisers and seeds. We wanted that the Government should pay attention to the problems of the living people. That is why, we wanted to raise those issues chiefly. We did also want that there should be a peaceful solution to that. It is the question of mental appetite of the people. I do not believe that the mental appetite and the appetite for food are one and the same thing. We had been trying for peaceful solution and we did also support the Government in this regard and in this house we warned the Government many times that it should be careful in this regard. We never thought that the structure of the Babri Masjid would be demolished, but this unnatural event ultimately occurred. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have hurt the sentiments of 15 crores Muslims of the country and now we do not have the guts to talk to them face to face. Do we have only a thing like religion? I would like to say that our country where gods were born is now reduced to a hell and the people of the other countries where gods were not born are leading a more comfortable life. I would like to say to the men of gods that they have maltreated the people, from Jerusalem to the Bay of Bengal. There is no difference in the poor people. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Saiffudin, we could also have ruled the country but it is hardly making any difference. It is so because of the glorious culture of our country about which I have told you. Shri Arjun Singh has also come. In the way, he was boasting, a matter of glory in the world that the Masjid has been demolished?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the sentiments of Muslim have been hurt. A Muslim fellow of mine who has been my associate for a long time told when I contacted him on telephone that he now thought of quitting the world by putting India and himself to fire. We have cornered them to such an extent that they are compelled to think like this. It is said that

Muslims are responsible for the tragedy of the Babri Masjid, suppose, what would happen if we begin to raise controversy over the tragedy committed by our own people?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we all are sitting here by virtue of the Constitution framed by Babasaheb Ambedkar and the Constitution deals with nothing else than the betterment of the living people. This House may certainly talk of mental appetite, Nothing is objectionable, but the Constitution does not deal with hypothetical heaven with rivers and mountains, rather it deals with the living people.

I have been with the Members of Bhartiya Janta Party, for a long time. I was with you even in jail. I have gone through your writings. They contain references to natural scenes such as rivers, mountains etc., but no reference to human life. India in your opinion is in minus.....(*Interruptions*) Please go through it I have been with you for many nights.

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): They sing in praise of human beings.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Whatever he has said is based on assumption. If there was no water in the river, fields would not be irrigated and thus failing to yield enough produce and when production is not adequate, farmers would starve. If there are no mountains, there would be no snowfall.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: I did not say that there is no importance of river. I said that it hardly matters how many lives are lost. My opinion is that mountains, rivers are related with human life. If at all there is reference to human life in your writings I would take my words back. But please do go through your slogans again in the evening today. They speak of bravery and doing courageous deeds. There is reference to everything except to human life. They refer to Ganga, Himalayan and Narmada, and they speak of the valour of our forefathers but not of the living beings. If I am wrong - they may prove it tomorrow - I would take back my statement.

I do not have any difference of opinion with them. The present state of the country can be improved. I have said that they sing patriotic songs.....(*interruptions*) I have not said that. My submission is that much water has flowed down the river since Independence but the fruits of freedom have not reached the deserving people. Our system has led only to poverty, hunger and disease.

Shri Manmohan Singh is present here. He may be abused and criticised as much as possible. He has been given the charge of tackling the economic affairs of the country. He has to go with a begging bowl for the country. The International organisations threaten him and he has to cover the truth here. He simply bows to the conditions laid by them and signs the pact. Remember that he may be criticized but at the same time the country should be strengthened so that the Finance Minister may walk with his head high. The country is full of the traitors and cheats. When I stand they watch.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIRENDRA SINGH (Mirzapur): Ours is an ancient history replete with acts of bravery. Shri Sharad Yadav is talking of his India which is full of traitors and cheats. My India is a country with an ancient culture, it is a great nation.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my statement is based on facts. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are five fingers in a hand. Can this fact be denied? Fingers are very much there.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not saying anything. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: My statement is based on facts. I have dwelt in your plight and the conditions prevailing in the country - please do think about it and peep into yourself. Would they like to face the situation and diagnose it or continue to gossip. If they want to gossip I would give you a book *Alha-udal*. I have not gone through any such book. Ten persons die to kill a man, we have always been defeated. Ours is an ancient country

where a lot of rotten material has gathered. I am suggesting several improvements. Many good things are also there. You would be pleased to listen to them.

I would like to submit that it was not only the structure of mosque that was demolished there was a 'Sankat Mochan Mandir', its structure was also demolished. Pakistan and Bangladesh - the two communal countries are our neighbours. We gave them an opportunity and pretext to demolish temples in their country. I do not condemn those countries. It was only their communal thinking that led to the partition of this country. We were good neighbours that we did not disintegrate these countries and merge them with India. Dr. Lohia was in favour of forming 'Hindu-Pak Mahasangh'. If we propagate humanism we can certainly prove them wrong.

This party worships the country and claims to keep it integrated. But they misuse the name of religion and this is absolutely wrong. They want to establish the reputation of the country in the name of the religion. Britishers ruled our country and took everything. They destroyed the culture and traditions of this country and made it dependent. They committed atrocities and chopped off the fingers of artisans. Had the people been brave they would have prevented the Britishers from doing that. (*Interruptions*) I have read their statements. I had told all the Members and leaders of their party that it was not possible for them to tackle the situation. I had warned that the leaders would not be able to control the situation when people trained for the purpose gather there, and that is what exactly happened. The statement they issued was that they were going to participate in Kar Seva or going back to resume Kar Seva. In both the cases they were to win accolades. The result was that, unnatural things took place in most unnatural circumstances. What has happened is not their fault alone. Chanakaya had said twelve hundred years ago. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: How long would you like to speak.

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Please allow me some more time out of the time allotted to another member of our party because I do not frequently speak. If you admit that you want to.....*..... run it then I would sit down. I am giving you a right direction. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: That will not go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Chanakaya was a brilliant ancestor. He wanted the king who played foul to him to be removed immediately. When Shri Arjun Singh was speaking the members of Congress party said that their party represents a culture and does not allow any corruption. I would add that Congress is a culture which gives freedom to enjoy and indulge in corrupt practices without being defected. It teaches not to admit any indulgence if at all scandals are unearthed. Huge amount of money is deposited in Swiss Bank. But it couldn't be found out whom these accounts belonged I mean to say that the Congress culture is least bothered about the welfare of the country. These are poles apart. Which culture do you follow brother.....*(Interruptions)* In the meeting of NIC, the hon. Prime Minister was the only person whom all others, except BJP supported and gave a free hand to take decisions at his discretion. *(Interruptions)* All the leaders were present there. *(Interruptions)* Bhadana ji, you donated money and came here and sought our help. *(Interruptions)* It seems much has been lost.....*(Interruptions)* You do not know the conventions of the House, so please sit down. All the Members including Shri Chandra Shekhar read the statement in the meeting of NIC. They also met the hon. Prime Minister on 30th of the month and tried their utmost to convince him in that respect. We tried to wake them up. Shri Somnath Chatterjee is sitting here. I found that he was most disturbed. He was sure that some untoward incident would take place and thus he also tried to make him realized that they cannot

do anything in the interest of the country. Communal tension can be well assessed by watching the present situation all over the country. Atal ji requested not to make distinction between the deaths of Hindus and Muslims. Muslims have died in larger number. We want to save the country.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Who killed them?

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Most of them have been killed by the police who were engaged in restoring law and order. They say that they were compelled to take action. The leaders who could not foresee the risk involved to so many lives are not worthy to rule the country. They did not evaluate the situation even after this mishap. There is no use counting the persons who were killed instead they will have to make efforts to remove the rift that has been created between the two communities. This House can do this job and show the right path to the country. If we succeed in this I would be convinced that it is the second time since Independence that we served our country. There can be no greater service to the nation than this.

Everybody knows to what extent efforts were made to warn the Government in this regard. There is no reference to the temple in the election manifestq issued by BJP in 1989. He has announced from the ramparts of the Red Fort so many times that the Masjid will not be allowed to be demolished, come what may. It would have paved the way had the Prime Minister resigned on the day the Masjid was demolished. We don't know how long Rao Saheb would continue, all of us have to go.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): If you support us, he will go.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: The tragedy is that we would have definitely supported you had you made a reference to mankind in this motion you have brought here. The intention with which you have brought this motion is the result of the problem that has arisen after the demolition of Babri Masjid which are not good signs.

You have thrown all the norms of democracy, judiciary and the executive to the wind. Today you want the country to run systematically. I do not think the derailed train would be put back on rails soon. There will be difficulty in doing so. It will take time. Atalji has rightly asked Shri Arjun Singhji if he really wanted to fight for the nation and save it, for which he had taken a vow, then he should have resigned since he was merely a Minister and none else. Shri Rajesh Pilat is present here, he will make long speeches but some people will not resign their offices of Ministers and at the same time will lament. We were also in power. We never agreed with you. You asked us to get the 'Shilanyas' performed with five and a quarter bricks. We did not agree. We stepped down. They are making a mockery of our party saying that we can't rule. We could not even secure support from those for whom we stepped down. But I would like to tell my colleagues belonging to the Congress party, that it was the time when we ordered arrest of Shri Advaniji. Then a no-confidence motion came up here. We asked them not to vote on the 7th itself, we asked them to topple down our Government the next day but not on that issue. We had asked you but you did not pay any heed to our requests. You were given full authority. Today, there is the question of demolition of Babri Masjid. The B.J.P. members themselves say that nobody visits that places. You have given such a publicity to this structure that everyone thinks to die with honour. I am not a religious man but when temples are demolished in Bangladesh and Pakistan, it hurts my feelings. Therefore, it seemed to me that my colleagues are spoiling that work. Naturally, they will spoil the country in order to strengthen their now religion. That is why, they have spoiled the country in the name of religion. Remember, the world does not run in the name of religion. The day you decide to crush Muslim brethren in the world, then your dream will remain just a dream and the Brahmanstan and Thakurstan in the country will be replaced by Jatavastan.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that once a Jain named Ramnarayan went to Mahatma Gandhi, who told all people not to pay a visit after his death but asked the

former to stay back and later said to him that so long as Muslims were there, he was safe. If a Hindu claims to be liberal, nobody is more guilty than he. This example is enough. Several castes have been pressurizing the Government for the last 40-45 years. Nobody is bothered about them. The Congress Party has been fighting the evil of casteism for the last 47 years. But when equation with casteism emerges, it is not able to tackle it properly. One should not have such misunderstanding. Here I am not referring to Mandal because Mandal is not something not been able to protect a man from a man. There is communalism in India. They claim to be liberal. But they are not liberal. Rather, they are weak. If you unit the idle Hindus into one, no problem relating to Muslims would ever arise. By raising the issue of Ayodhya and Mandir and Masjid time and again, you want to keep the poor, distressed Hindus as they are. Once Atalji asked what was the comparison between the Mandal and the Mandir? Atalji, the comparison lies in it that you ask Hindus to unit once again. In this very call for unity lies Ayodhya.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one event of history will have to be remembered. One youth by the name of Goswami was burnt at the time of anti-Mandal agitation, and Khuranaji as well as Advaniji went to see those boys, they were humiliated. They realised that they could be criticized for their actions. So, Advaniji went on Rath Yathra. Even today crores of people have not forgotten it. Today in the country 90 percent people are in distress. They know all your affairs. When they rise, some or the other way out for the country will emerge. You may see Bihar. Today the peace is there in the State. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is why I would like to submit to you that 15 crore Muslims of the country have realized that there is a question of life and death left for them now. This act has hurt their feelings. This party had already declared its attitude but the Congress Party had come to power on the vote for secularism. It had come here on the basis of harmony and secularism. Ram is faith, so there is no question of any decision. They had come here after announcing that who was responsible for checking what they are doing?

[Sh. Sharad Yadav]

No doubt, it was the responsibility of the Congress Government. I say that it was not the responsibility of Shri Narsimharaoji alone but the entire Cabinet and those, who prefer to be Ministers and who visit several parts of the country and give a call for unity, are equally responsible. I would like to tell them, who pose to be gentlemen, that we always protect them for their lapses, though they may by happy be uniting us, but I would like to ask them how many times they called Cabinet meeting? You may claim that you had warned them. No Minister in the Cabinet had condemned the assembly of lakhs of people there. These lakhs of people will not remain there peacefully. What Advaniji said, what Atalji said, you believed them. The result of that belief is before the entire world today and which is that you are clamoring for help. Those who are in service earn more for the Government as compared to those who are engaged in export. There is no Hindu nation in the entire world. Nowhere in countries, whether it is Japan or America, people are professing Hindu faith, all have professed other faiths. Why did the Government put Hindus living in those countries to trouble? It has happened due to its lapse. Shri Narsimharao may step down, we have said so, but I will never forgive the Congress Party.... (Interruptions) ... Had even a single Congress member have the courage, the tragedy could have been averted. Had even a signal Minister raised his voice and warned the Government that he did not think that the Government could tackle the situation when three lakh people have assembled there and tendered his resignation, the party would have been held in high esteem today. The people would have realised that you have some courage. Some of Congressmen boast of old Congress. They must not do so. That Congress has lost relevance. Sometimes I used to think that it exists but now I realize on this question that it does not exist any more. 99 percent people of the Congress Party accepted that something wrong was going on there. But you kept sitting in lobbies and Ministries. And now that you are taking action, you are feeling pangs. You are taking action half-heatedly. You

have hurt the sentiments of the people of India and are taking action. now you are indulge in bickering. The action you are taking is not having any impact. People allege that you are doing so under pressure. It is a strange thing.

You have committed a blunder unmindful of the fact that you owe a responsibility to history too. Your lapse means you have no right to remain in power.

I am not in favour of this no-confidence motion because it has been brought forward by such people who have disturbed the natural process going on in the country by demolishing Babri Masjid. They will go down as culprits in history. And so far as your contention is concerned, our fight against it is continuing and will continue. You had done this 'Sarkar Seva' by topling us down that you came to power at our cost. Allright, you had done 'Sarkar Seva' whereas we hadn't. Perhaps you don't know who are we. Remember, undergone a jail term for a period of four and a half years for achieving this 'Raj' while you might have suffered jail for 11 months or two years, I would like to submit to you that in my opinion these people pretend to be liberal. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the relationship between the two is that of a mother-in-law and daughter-in-law. Everyone knows what is such relationship. They fight while they are out but when back home, they unite. Who got the shilanyas done there. Who placed the idols there? Who opened the lock of the Babri Mosque? Who had got that platform constructed? Then, who had got the Shilanyas done? The Shilanyas is got done by the mother-in-law, the lock is also unlocked by her, platform is also got constructed by her and the daughter-in-law sits in her chariot with a long veil and the Babri Mosque is demolished. Therefore, all this game is of daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Are you 'Nanad' and 'Jethani'.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: We are like the 'Devar' of the village and therefore we understand everything very well. The two of

them and daughter-in-law and mother-in-law, the one gets the shilanyas done and the other puts the brass idols of Ram Lala and later on the later gets into her chariot to enjoy the ride. She goes to Banaras in a Chariot and after reaching there she demolishes the mosque.

Atal ji was saying that he felt miserable. I admit that he might have been very sad, since when some one commits a crime, he certainly becomes sad, but every crime can never be the same. Every crime is followed by agony but sometimes a crime is committed from the inner soul, which you have committed. You have committed this crime. All the sacrifices made to achieve freedom for this country have been nullified. Mahatma was a great person of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Sharad ji, you have spoken for an hour.

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the end I would like to say that both of them are equally responsible. Both of them realise that they have brought the country to such a point but it would be better if they try to put it in the reverse gear. Friends, remember that it is a question related to our country, whether you belong to this side or that side.

Atalji has given a suggestion here to go for the excavation, but I think that our Muslim brethren have never said that they will not honour the Judgement of the court. Therefore, once again I request you to please find out a solution to this problem peacefully.....(Interruptions) Remember that I have never been in favour of Shahbano. Anyone, who demolishes the temple or the mosque is a convict, whether he belongs to this side or that side. We are not among those, our stand is quite clear.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you, I would like to appeal from my inner instincts to all those, who are marching towards danger, to turn back. I would like to say that no one is going to get anything but the country will be ruined. You will not be able to go before the people of Punjab and Kashmir. The country is already being run on the alms from the

other countries of the world. The economic policy of this country is also dependent on those countries. Try to resurrect the image of the country, this is my appeal to you.....(Interruptions) At last I would like to say.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA (South Delhi): Do you support the action of sacking three State Governments?

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: I have already submitted that you acted against the need of the hour and due to that everything has deteriorated; now there is no use, whether you shout or they shout. Due to the actions of mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law, the brother-in-law is also suffering.

Therefore, Sir, through you, I would like to appeal to this House that every party will contribute to the nation building but I would like to say that friends, who want to disintegrate the country, and those who want to change its history, we would oppose such things and such of their efforts, howsoever long we may have to fight for it, no one can imagine it. If they choose a wrong path then definitely there is no other way left for us except opposing it. I am fully aware that their is merely not a question of request but a question of mutual trust, after that there is only the battle of thoughts. Therefore, I would like to submit that we are totally against this proposal and we desire that we should not at all stand by the Government. I would like to submit that this proposal should be taken back. (Interruptions) It is all right, it is upto you to say whatever you like. We oppose both of these. If Devar feels hurt when the Bhabhi taunts him, therefore, we oppose both of these. With these words, I thanks you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI BALRAM JAKHAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion in the House has been very impressive. I am very much impressed by the fluency of Vajpayeeji. I have great regard for Vajpayeeji. He has a sweet tongue, fluency, logic and satire in his speech but he lacks coherence. His speech has

[Sh. Balram Jakhar]

touched my heart. I made out, from what he said, that he was very sad. I am also sad and I feel that the whole of the country is sad. Every one who can peep into his soul is sad. All such people are sad since the loss has touched every heart and perhaps they are repenting on it and are worried as why all this has taken place. It could have been averted, but there is a lack of will power. I would like to know from them in brief as to whether it was not possible to avert that. Vajpayee ji, come out from your inner instincts and express your views on it. I take you as the Bheeshma Pitamah of your party but your voice was stopped. Did not you consider yourself as helpless as Bheeshma Pitamaha? Did not you feel that the unnecessary things going on there should be stopped? Perhaps you wanted to stop that but what was the compulsion or difficulty which compelled you not to stop that. You have said every thing that the hon. Prime Minister was disgraced and he was cheated too. I would like to know as to who has not been cheated, whether the Parliament has not been deceived. I would like to know, as to who hasn't been betrayed? Hasn't Parliament been betrayed, hasn't the judiciary been deceived? Haven't the people of this great nation been betrayed? Haven't they violated the sanctity of the oath, they took in the name of God, in the name of Lord Ram? We all have taken an oath here to safeguard the Constitution and the Rule of the Law. Thus, who hasn't been betrayed? The only fault of the Prime Minister is that he believed on such assurances.

*'Hum karte hai wafa ki ummeed use
jo jaante nahin wafa kya hai.'*

(we expect faithfulness from those, who do not know even the meaning of it)

This means that it is wrong to believe, to trust, but people have been believing all along and continue to believe, or else, the term 'betrayed' would not have found place in dictionaries. An event has taken place which has changed the whole scenario for the worse. Everything has been betrayed. I am yet to forget the happenings of 1947.

Many of the people present here might have witnessed them. Atalji, I come from a place which is hardly four kilometers away from the Pakistan border. The scenes of the partition days still loom large before my eyes. I have seen people weaning away children from the breasts of their dead mothers. I have seen sisters lamenting over their dead brothers. Today, that very chapter of history is being repeated. Why? Haven't we learnt any lesson from history?

It is said that man is a superior animal with brains to think and act rationally. If it is the case, why do we forget that history repeats itself? Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is an English quotation which says that History repeats itself. If this is the case, why don't we give it a serious thought? Why the repercussions of actions are not taken into account, in the light of precedents? Why another partition can't take place? Whatever happened was tragic and unfortunate. Religion can never be the basis for a nation and countries formed on religious lines exist no more. Why Bangladesh seceded from Pakistan? Why Iran and Iraq have fought and violence don't take place in many parts of the world, in the name of religion? Had religion been the criteria for nationhood, there would have been only four countries in the world. Hindustan for Hindus, an Islamic country for the Muslims, a Buddhist country for the followers of Guatema and a Christian country for the Hock of Jesus Christ. But this concept is wrong. Countries are not formed on religious lines. Religion is living, vibrant force which inculcates in its adherence, a sense of sacrifice. It inspires mankind to live, to progress, to live in brotherhood and harmony. Today, we don't have in our midst that great man, who visualised Ram Rajya. The man who visualized Ram Rajya eventually fell prey to three unmerciful bullets of a cold-blooded assassin, and yet uttered 'Hey Ram' before his passage to the heavenly abode because he believed in a Ram, who symbolised love, who symbolised goodwill, companionship, who was above all discrimination, who was justice-loving, who looked upon his subjects equally. Gandhiji believed in that Ram. now, you will not realise the extent of damage caused to the country,

due to all these happenings. This realisation will down upon, only after some time, when the commonman will understand the calamity that has befallen the nation, the destruction it has caused to the economy, the all time low, which we have touched in political terms and the kind of conflicts that have emerged between the citizens.

I would like to ask you something. You see, we have incorporated the fundamental duties in our constitution wherein we have envisaged a sovereign socialist, secular republic. These fundamental duties guide us on ways and means to preserve it. I will quote them for your benefit.

[English]

I quote the Fundamental Duties from the Constitution:

"51.A FUNDAMENTAL DUTIES: It shall be the duty of every citizen of India-

- (a) to abide by the Constitution and respect its ideals and institutions, the National Flag and the National Anthem;
- (b) to cherish and follow the noble ideals which inspired our national struggle for freedom;
- (c) to uphold and protect the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India;
- (d) to defend the country and render national service when carried upon to do so;
- (e) to promote harmony and the spirit of common brotherhood amongst all the people of India transcending religious, linguistic and regional or sectional diversities, to renounce practices derogatory to the dignity of women;
- (f) to value and preserve the rich heritage of our composite culture;
- (g) to protect and improve the natural

environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life, and to have compassion for living creatures;

- (h) to develop the scientific temper, humanism and the spirit of inquiry and reform;
- (i) to safeguard public property and to abjure violence;
- (j) to strive towards excellence in all spheres of individual and collective activity so that the nation constantly rise to higher level of endeavour and achievement".

[Translation]

This is our principal, this is our duty, whose execution is our solemn duty. Yadavji was asking just now, as to why no action was taken, why the tragedy was not averted? Even if a single Minister had tendered his resignation in protest, some action would have taken place, but I would like to ask, whether it would have been proper, not we taken action then? How was it possible? Now people are airing scores of opinion as to how the situation should have been dealt with. The State Government, the leader of the Party had given in writing that nothing untoward will happen and that peace will be maintained at all costs. Even the judiciary was assured that everything would be alright. The State Government reiterated time and again that there is no law and order problem and everything is going smoothly. How could we have intervened? All their leaders had given assurance and everyone believed them. But, a death blow was death. When causes attacked and Brutus stabbed Caesar in his chest Caesar remarked.

[English]

"You to Brutus Then let Caesar fall."

[Translation]

That very Brutus was Caesar's bosom

[Sh. Balram Jakhar]

friend. He said that if Brutus is after his blood, then it is better for him to die. He has neither the right nor any desire to live.

I would like to ask you one question. Why didn't you go there? Vajpayeeji, you said that Advaniji was feeling very helpless and that all the leaders prevented him from moving out telling him that everything will go wrong, they will get humiliated and killed. Was there nobody like Mahatma Gandhi, to stand up and speak out? Was there nobody to stand before he crowd and tell that they will have to walk over his dead body, if they move even an inch further. Had such a thing happened, we would have bowed our heads in reverence that there is still a man left, who can take such a bold step. for the sake of this principles, his commitment, his beliefs. It is highly improper and wrong for a man to go back on his words. A commitment has to be a commitment., a trust, a trust. Had that been done, you had every right to say that you did your best, but didn't succeed. Could there have been any Kar Sewak, who would have dared to trample Advasniji and move ahead, who would have had the guts to hit Advaniji and go forward? Had Advaniji lost even a drop of blood, he would have acquired great responsibility and the entire nation would have believed in his details. Everything would have become clear, instead of turning for the worse.

Now, think of the future. You reminded that you had cautioned about this matter in the Parliament. It was right Shri Shahabuddin and others did not listen to you. It was wrong on their part to do. You had yourself suggested the best solution of negotiations I am going to tell you this very matter, the entire House wants you to answer this very matter the entire House wants you to answer this very question. You are a great Parliamentarian with a deep commitment to democratic values. You are allowed to speak, whenever you are on your feet. Consultations and negotiations lead to decisions.

What was so auspicious or ominous about December 6 that you couldn't have

waited further? This issue had been under discussion since 1947, both within and outside the courts and a decision was pending, The Prime Minister had a clear conscience He was expecting the same from others too. He believed that other too wanted to preserve the unity and integrity of the nation and not to disintegrate it. We want to settle all problems peacefully or else we would have dismissed the State Government. We didn't take any preventive steps, for we trusted you. What was the compulsion before you, that you couldn't have waited after 6th? A solution would have finally come within one year. But whatever has happened has created an unbridgable gap. I would like to know the extent the humiliation caused to the country. I would like to know how clouded our future has become. History is witness to this and they themselves will brood over the destruction it has caused.

I would not like to say much, but only this that why you didn't stop that - were you facing the same compulsion encountered by Bhishma Pittamah? Why did not Advaniji and other leaders present there remain silent and did'nt stop them? This question will always remain. If they believe in Ram, then the latter taught all mankind to live together in peace, in harmony, to live and let live. This is what taunted to say.

I would like to appeal to you, that even now if you say that you want solve this problem through talks, then this nation and this Parliament will support you because this problem, should be solved through negotiations. The Prime Minister desires that nothing should be done to create impediments. He has maintained restraint in the larger national interest and you should follow suit. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): You first tell us, as to why you dismissed the Rajasthan Government? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat.

(*Interruptions*)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seats.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record. Mr. Joshi, you have to sit down now. (Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: (Bolpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir we cannot, but oppose this Motion not because we approve of what the Government has done or has not done, but we think that in the aftermath of the sacrilege at Ayodhya, the nation as a whole and this Parliament must affirm categorically the commitment of the nation to the principles of secularism and for the maintenance of the unity and the integrity of this country. We do not think that anything is more important than the unity and the integrity of the country and the rigid maintenance of the principles of secularism.

Sir, a grave situation has arisen in this country. No right thinking person can deny that. We are facing a communal divide and distrust among the people. Even the industrial and the economic activities have come to a stagnancy. The Finance Minister has expressed his grave apprehensions. What is the situation outside the country? Even the Indians outside the country are facing serious problems which is the direct aftermath of what has happened at Ayodhya on the 6th of December. We are concerned not because it is only a dispute about a Mandir and Masjid; we are deeply concerned because we find in the activities a most concerted onslaught on the cherished principles of secularism in this country. In this situation, we want that secular forces in this country should combine to fight this cancer of communalism and the calculated effort that has been made to bring about a communal chasm among the people of this country. That effort is being made for political purposes and I think, the message of this debate to the country will be that India will

come to an end, as a nation we shall come to an end and we shall continue to hang our head in shame if we do not assert ourselves and bring normalcy in this country and the people are made to realise once more that they are misguided and that is not the path which this country should take.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had expected that when Mr. Vajpayee was speaking, he would at least condemn what had happened on the 6th of December. It was a matter of great sorrow and regret that a senior politician like Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee when he speaks on behalf of his party, does not use a single word of condemnation against the ghastly incidents that had happened which have blackened the face of this country before the world community.

He has said he is sorry; it is unfortunate. He used the word "tragedy" once, but not one word to condemn those who perverted that sacrilege on that day. I am not going into the genesis of this controversy in great detail. But my mind goes back to 7th November, 1990 when another no-confidence motion was being discussed in this House brought by the BJP which was till then supporting the National Front Government along with us. That day we had seen who had supported the BJP's no-confidence motion. The Congress Party did it for narrow political advantage which they thought would ensure to it later. You have supported each other. On that day, the motion of confidence brought forward by Shri V.P. Singh was supported by us. Both of you had opposed it. On that day also, we had opposed the attempt to destabilise the Government and we had supported the confidence motion of Shri V.P. Singh because of their principled fight against communalism. On that day, they had sacrificed their Government even for the sake of upholding the principles of secularism in this country. Our decision today not to support but to oppose this motion of no-confidence is guided by the same principle of our attachment and commitment to the principles of secularism and to the unity and integrity of this country.

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

I request my friends on the Treasury Benches that you have also to search your hearts how in this situation you had been avoiding to face the real issues, the real problems. How your actions have complicated the issue and encouraged the BJP to take advantage as a political party.

The dispute was sought to be raised in 1949. We have seen the correspondence between Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Pandit Pant when Pandit Pant was the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wanted to go there and to solve the problem, when the dispute had started. Pandit Pant said, "No, it is our duty to take action as the State Government". The *pooja* and other things were stopped. Then lock was put there. But in 1986, when suddenly a dispute was revived, again the lock was opened and suddenly *pooja* started for the idol. Till then, there had not been any determination whether it was, in fact, a Masjid or a Masjid built after demolishing a temple. The, that was permitted and a great mischief was committed by the Congress Government at the Centre. Then, you followed it up by shilanyass just to get some votes. Probably, you thought, that would help you electorally. Then, late Shri Rajiv Gandhi started the election campaign from Ayodhya stating that he would introduce *Ram Rajya*. We know who were the electorates you were addressing at that time. I had expected that some soul searching at least should be undertaken now and you should also apologise to the people of this country that because of your weakness, your attempt to compromise with the forces of communalism and your appeasement and surrender to the forces of communalism from time to time, it has encouraged this BJP to grow up and try to attempt to divide the people of this country on communal lines. This is the danger, we cannot forget. Therefore we want that the people of this country should be made aware of and we must relentlessly fight against this menace of communalism. We would like to know what is the programme of action that is being contemplated by the Government.

The Prime Minister has given a call but we do not find any concrete programme of action. We do not know how it is going to be fought.

It is being said that the hon. Prime Minister trusted the State Government. Why should not he trust a State Government which has been elected and functioning according to the Constitution? Look at the circumstances that were prevailing and how the situation has been changed deliberately by a political party for the purpose of taking advantage. There was a definite court order. High Court order was there for the maintenance of status quo. Supreme Court intervened. Supreme Court directed that there should not be any construction whatsoever, and that there should be only *kirtan* and *bhajans*.

On the last occasion when we discussed it, I asked what could be the explanation for the BJP to try to bring people there, if construction has been stopped. You do not need more than a lakh of people or a lakh of people to sing kirtans only. What was the purpose? Instead of asking the people to disperse they encouraged people to come and Shri Lal K. Advaniji went out on a Rath from Varanasi and their President went out on a Rath from Mathura and the choice of these places, Mathura and Varanasi, is very clear, the same demand for demolition of mosque and construction of temples. Their only object could be and it was found out to be to rouse frenzy, to rouse fanaticism, to rouse communal passions and religious sentiments, with the object that a mass of frenzied people would accumulate there. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that Shri Lal K. Advaniji tried his best to stop them. Why did you bring out such a situation? How did you guarantee this? Was the time taken and the assurance given by Shri Kalyan Singh, Government to the Supreme Court solemnly in their affidavit, is only for the purpose of gaining time and for the purpose of creating an impression among the people of this country that "Everything will be normal. Don't worry. Don't take any action"? That is why, we had been repeatedly going to the Prime Minister. We had meet him even on

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

the 30th. The National Front Leaders and Left Front leaders had met him., on our seeking. We said " Please take a action " .

Shri Lal K. Advaniji, in his Press Conference, has castigated the judiciary. He said " Judiciary is acting under the pressure of the Government. The judiciary is losing its credibility because it is associating with the Government and in the same manner it is

losing its credibility. Judiciary is becoming an instrument in the hands of the Government." These are the statements made by Shri Lal K. Advaniji, Leader of the Opposition on which we had raised these questions here. That made it very clear that an attempt was being made to tell the people, their own supporters that " Judiciary does not matter and that judicial verdict has not got the sanctity behind it". Therefore, although the court had stopped any construction, he asked them to come along and come along. And these people were coming with all sorts of implements. They look like great experts in demolition of buildings. Otherwise, they could have done it so easily and so quickly. They had come there with all sorts of implements. Now they say " Well, we tried but failed and, that is why, we hold the Prime Minister also to have failed the nation".

What was the basis for the trust? What was the basis for the faith? There cannot be one-way traffic That is why, we requested him " Please take action immediately. You cannot trust them". We asked specifically Mr. Prime Minister, how could you protect that mosque, that structure?" He said " It will be done. " I sympathise with him now. I have nothing against him personally. But he is the Head of the Government. Today, during his Prime Ministership, we have seen the position in this country. I cannot imagine a graver crisis facing the people of this country. There is no protection and security for the minorities in this country. Are they not citizens of this country?

We are reminded today by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee of the Mansai Kata. He said

Naitik Biswas and he says this is fight over Manasi Kata.

16.00 hrs

He says that this is a fight over *mansaikata*. I would like to know most humbly one thing: Has the Indian unity got any meaning? Has the integrity of this country got any meaning? I have been repeatedly raising this question: What was the urgency that this Temple must be constructed in the 6th or the construction must start on the 6th December, 1992? They made an announcement. They unilaterally fixed the date of 6th of December. We have been asking here repeatedly how have you fixed the date; why have you fixed the date of 6th of December. You have interrupted the negotiation. What was the urgency? Till today, we do not know why suddenly 6th of December was decided.

Sir, the Prime Minister has taken four months ' time. Well, we had expressed our displeasure and unhappiness that two months had elapsed and nothing was done. But some negotiations had started; talks were going on. But suddenly the VHP fixed a date on their own unilaterally which resulted in the disruption of the negotiation. This huge effort, concerted effort was made to accumulate people there- Court or no Court; whether the country remains one or not, it does not matter; there must be some *karseva*. When the Supreme Court gave a specific order, you openly defied it. Therefore, we say the Prime Minister was wholly wrong; he should have taken action and he has failed to protect the mosque. That is why we had initially demanded his resignation because we say there somebody has to take a moral responsibility for this. But today we are facing a gravest crisis as a direct consequence of the attacks made by the BJP-VHP etc. combine. Today, the country has been burning. About 1500 to 2000 innocent people have lost their lives for no fault of theirs because they belong to a particular religion. In the year 1992 we shall be fighting against each other in the name of religion. This is the stage where we have come to as a nation. Shall we go, surrender and compromise with the forces of separatism., divisiveness, forces

[Sh. Somnath Chatterjee]

of fundamentalism? Therefore, we say that the first task of the Government has to be maintenance of law and order, restoration of the normalcy and to give proper protection to all those who need such protection, particularly the minorities. That is why we say that this should be the first priority which should be given. We have made our demand. We say that you should take over the entire plot of land. You cannot make it a football-playing-ground for somebody playing political football in this. It is the responsibility of the Government now and that mosque should be reconstructed, please give it to those organisations which want to build it. I want that that complex there should be a symbol of national integration in this country in future; that should be the atonement of the people of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hope the Prime Minister has now realised that there has been a monumental dereliction of duty on their part. For six hours we were shuddering. I remember that as soon as I got the information around quarter to two a clock, I rang up the Home Minister saying that this is the report that is coming; the damage is being caused to the structure, to the mosque. What are you doing? He told me: "I have got the information. The Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh has assured me that it has stopped. But I am getting independent verification done." Therefore, the information which the hon. Minister got from the Chief Minister appears not to be correct. Within four or five or six hours, it appears that the entire structure was demolished. Look at the well-organised manner in which it was done. Some sort of a make-shift construction has been made. The deities are brought back there. Some sort of a canopy has been built and it has become a Temple. Therefore, the objective has been achieved. This country of 90 crores of people with Governments here, there and everywhere, we are behaving as if it is a place of a jungle; law of jungle is prevailing in this country. That is why we cannot but express our gravest concern. I want that in one voice we must express our commitment to the principles of secularism.

Sir, what has happened here is very important to remember. What happened at the NIC meeting? The Prime Minister's hands were strengthened by the entire non-BJP opposition. We gave him full authority because of our concern. We were worried. The left party said, "yes it is for you to take action. You have got the information. You have the power. You can take action. We do not have the power. We cannot take any action. We can only warn you. We can ask the people to be vigilant." But that was not done. And this country was engulfed in a savagery of a nature in which we can only hang our heads in shame.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as today's situation is concerned, this Motion is being discussed only in the context of one event that has happened. I wish to make it clear that we have fundamental differences with the Government. Our charge was that this Government takes the assistance of the BJP. You were very happy when they supported your economic policy. I am not going into those now. We will have occasion to discuss them in greater detail. But today, you cannot compromise with forces which do not believe in Indian people and the unity and integrity of the country; which do not believe in the secularism, which is a commitment of this nation; which do not believe in the functioning of the court, the position of the judiciary which has misled the people of this country, the Government of India in this country. They have misled the ordinary people of this country for the purpose of achieving some narrow political ends. We must declare here, most unequivocally, and condemn the desecration and the demolition of the Babri Masjid and that it was done at the instigation of the dark forces of communalism in this country. And that such acts of vandalism has not only been to bring down the structure there but such acts of vandalism has struck at the every foundation of the secular foundation of our country. We cannot but express our deepest anguish at what has happened and we want to express our sorrow. And I want the Prime Minister here to make a commitment that on behalf of the Government of India every step will be taken to rehabilitate these innocent people who

have suffered and that you have to take the strongest administrative measures against any person responsible in any manner with regard to the event that have happened.

So far as ban is concerned, yes, it is a proper step because we cannot allow this poison of communalism to be spread further. This is essential. But we have a grievance. The Prime Minister announced it on the 6th. But no action was taken for nearly a week. How can the Government of India could not issue a notification? Then why do you announce publicly that you are going to ban an organisation. It gave them time to re-organise their affairs. Is this the way you function? Why is this weakness?
(Interruptions)

SHRIRAMNAIK (Bombay North): Over phone you asked for his resignation. After that event....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I will explain. (Interruptions)

Some State Governments have been dismissed. Nobody in this country has any doubt about our party's commitment for the repeal of Article 356 from the Constitution of India. We have brought Bills here. I had introduced a Private Members' Bill here and we have opposed in every for the continuance of Article 356 and the misuse of it by the Congress Government from time to time. But we want now that the Government of India, the Prime Minister should take all necessary action to root out the virus of communalism and for that purpose if he feels that these should be dismissed, it is for him to take that action. He has taken that action. But we are not giving up our objection.
(Interruptions)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission, with the highest regard that I have for his individual commitment to personnel liberty and his opposition to Article 356, would my esteemed friend categorically let us know: Does he support the manner of the arrest of the Leader of the Opposition? And does he and his party support the manner in which three

duly elected State Governments - Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh - have been dismissed and the State Assemblies dissolved? And how does that reconcile with his commitment and to this stated position about Article 356?"

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, I would have been very happy if these questions had been put by BJP and his leader, Shri Jaswant Singh, condemning the incidents that had taken place on the 6th December, 1992. I do not think they have any justification. Even then I say that we have stated what our commitment is. It is for the Prime Minister to take action. If he has taken action illegally, there are authorities to decide about that. But it is the Prime Minister who has to deliver the goods. But we have said that we shall support all endeavors and we demand this Government to take action to root out all this virus of communalism from this country. This cancer has to be fought, fought untidely, by all secular forces. I only hope that my friends on the Treasury Benches have learnt their lessons.

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would, first of all like to thank you for the ceaseless efforts made and restraint shown during the last ten days to protect the dignity of this august House and commencing the business of the House today once again.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the nation had been looking towards this House for the last ten days. The whole nation was engulfed in grief by this tragedy. The tragic event was marked by arson, riots killing of innocents persons and demolition of religious places. Thousands of people lost their lives and a number of children were orphaned and mothers and sisters became widows. It is a matter of sorrow that this legally constituted House could not transact its business for the last 10 days. The question is why the proceeding of the House could not be transacted? It was simply because the political party responsible for the tragedy did not allow to run the

[Sh. Buta Singh]

[English]

business of the House. The Members of our party used to come and persuade the honourable leaders of the Bhartiya Janata Party that whatever they had to say to the people of the country they should say it through this House. We said that this is how the whole of the world could be able to know their view points. But our suggestion was neglected leaving a clear impression that if there is any extremist political party in the House it is the Bhartiya Janata Party which is not allowing to run the business of the House. *(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Member Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that he loves truth. Does that mean that whatever I said is not a truth? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK: (Bombay South): He is calling the Bhartiya Janata Party an extremist party. It was the men of his party who killed 4000 Sikhs in Delhi and yet he calls the Bhartiya Janata Party to be an extremist party. *(Interruptions)*

They should try to peep into themselves.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are grateful to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee for having moved the No-Confidence Motion in this House after a lapse of ten days. We had an impression that Shri Vajpayee is large hearted and a worshiper of morality. We expected that he would bring about a Motion of repentance. The people of the country are repentant for whatever happened in the country. We should hang our heads in shame and be repentant for this. It is unfortunate that even Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is trying to draw political mileage by bringing forth a No confidence Motion. Against whom is this No-Confidence? The day this event took place, the hon. Prime Minister summed up the situation in one sentence. I believe that the sentence uttered by him represents the sentiments of the nation. He said:

"The demolition of Ayodhya structure was an act of utter perfidy".

[Translation]

The word 'Perfidy' is much more stronger than 'disbelief'. I think it is a treachery. The people throughout the country believed that the policy of consensus and co-operation was yielding good results. The hon. Prime Minister had reiterated in this House on several occasions that the service to the country had to be done with cooperation of all. I remember, he told during the last session that even when his party would have got a clear majority in the House, he would have believed in the same policy of consensus and taking all the political parties into confidence. I know that our colleagues Shri Somnathji and Shri Sharad Yadav may have objection the way the hon. Prime Minister handled the politics of the country. They may say that the hon. Prime Minister extended and sought Co-operation from such forces that do not believe in the unity of the country. During his speech Shri Vajpayee said that it was not a question of the demolition of a mandir or a masjid; rather it was the question of psyche of the people and of nationalism. Speaking from personal experience I would like to point out that I held talks with the leaders of many political parties and also religious leaders. I remember well that I had earlier said in this House that the Joint efforts to solve this problem through dialogues will not lead to any conclusion. So we concluded that this issue should be referred to a court of law. With this end in view the Lucknow bench of High Court was specially constituted and all the cases related to Ayodhya issue were referred to this bench of the High Court one month and twelve days before the Shilanyas. I held a detailed meeting with the leaders of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad among whom there were three M.Ps and probably some of them might be present here also - regarding this issue. This meeting was held at the residence of Chief Minister of U.P. and those leaders gave a written assurance to abide by the decision of the Court in toto. Whatever happened, after that is known to

all and has become part of history. There was a breach of trust and after this breach of trust the hon. Member Mahant Abedya Nath wrote a letter to me—a copy of which is with me. I also got a letter from Shri Dau Dayal Khanna who is a senior leader of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Justice Devki Nandan ji personally came with me to the residence of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao, who was not the Prime Minister at that time. Shri Devki Nandan ji expressed regret and said that they were deprived of an opportunity. The question is as to who deprived them of that? The Shilanyas was performed peacefully. It was resolved that after the Shilanyas the senior leaders of the Vishwa Hindi Parishad would go back to their places and would wait for the decision of the Court regarding the construction of the temple. It is written in the agreement that has been published. Shri Devkiji Nandan Ji went to Shri Narashimha Rao with me and during the course of discussions he accepted that an opportunity has been snatched from them. In the context of Ayodhya incidents of the 6th of December whatever has been uttered by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee clearly suggests that whatever happened was really bad. Almost similar views have been expressed by Shri L.K. Advani and other leaders.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT (Varanasi): Shri Buta Singhji just now mentioned a few names of the leaders who were present during the meeting. Here, I would like to remind Shri Buta Singh that he himself visited Lucknow on the 8th November 1989 and along with him...

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Dikshitji what were you during that period?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I am sorry I am not able to recognise the hon. Member properly but if I am not mistaken he is Shri Dikshit ji.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I pity them but I would like to inform that at that time I had completed five years of my retirement. Shri Buta Singh ji himself bears testimony to the fact that talks were held at the residence of Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari.

He has himself accepted that....
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed him to express his views. Please be brief.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: When they had granted permission for Shilanyas we had shown them the map of the temple and the place where sanctum sanctorum would be built. That is on record.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Please excuse me. I could not recognise you Shri Dikshit.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I have met you on many occasions. I would like to remind him the occasion when he had come to the residence of Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari. Mahant Abedya Nath was also there and we were holding discussions we showed him the proposed map of the temple and he approved the site of Shilanyas and he did also commit that the temple would be constructed at the very place where the permission for Shilanyas has been given. Therefore, it is now a natural culmination that the temple should be constructed at the very site of Shilanyas.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think, Shri Dikshit wanted to give some clarification on this issue. Now I would not refer to what I stated or what he stated. I would simply read out what is laid down in the agreement. Shri Dikshit who was a retired D.G. of U.P. was present in that meeting.

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK: Is it an official document which is being quoted? We would like to know which is the document that is being quoted. It should be told whether it is an official document or a secret document, so that we will be benefited by the information. And that should be placed on the Table of the House.

Sir, I have raised a point of order.
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: My decision on this

[Sh. Ram Naik]

(Interruptions)

point of order is this. If the hon. Member is referring to any document, he will authenticate, it and keep it on the table of the House, if it is not already on the table of the House. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: No, Sir I was not there. (Interruptions) I was there and I challenge it. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: All right. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I and Shri Digvijaya have already placed it on the Table of the House. This document was presented to the then. D.G.P. of U.P. Shri Dikshit I would like to read out one of its Paras. It says:

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I challenge it. Let him show my signature.

[English]

[Translation]

"VHP, I mean, Vishwa Hindu Parishad undertakes to abide by the directive of the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court given on the 14th of August 1989 to the effect that the parties to the suit shall maintain the *status quo* and shall not change the nature of the property in question and ensure that peace and harmony are maintained".

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I submitted that Shri Dikshit attended the meeting. This meeting was held at the residence of then U.P. Chief Minister on the 27th September. The name that I read out was of Shri Dikshit who attended the meeting and signed the document. Thereafter....

[Translation]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I want to submit that let him show me my signatures. (Interruptions)

These were the words in the document and Shri Ashok Singhal, mahant Abedya Nath, Mahant Nriya Gopal Das and Shri Dikshit signed it.

SHRI VILAS MUTTEMWAR (Chimur): But you attended the meeting... it is immaterial whether you signed or not. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: No, it does not bear my signatures, I challenge you to show me my signatures. (Interruptions)

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: I was not present. It is wrong (Interruptions)

Sir, he is referring to my name, let him show me my signatures.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

(Interruptions)

[English]

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: There is nothing defamatory against you.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, today Shri Vajpayee said in his speech that..

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You have agreed that you were there.

SHRI SHREESH CHANDRA DIKSHIT: We had stood up to express our thanks for laying the foundation stone at Ayodhya. You had also pointed out how the temple will be built there. Once again I thank you for the assistance given by you. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Dikshit, it should not be done in this way. This is not all right. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, the office bearers of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad have broken their promise which they made to us. They betrayed us again on the December, 6, when the tragedy struck. In the hon. Prime Minister's words it amounted to 'perfidy' and 'treachery'. The basic issue before the nation as Shri Vajpayee stated and Shri Arjun Singh highlighted is that of nationalism. What sort of nationalisms, is this? What sort of nationalism we are talking about? The freedom fighters who fought the freedom struggle created a sense of 'nationalism' and the Constituent Assembly put its seal thereon. Thereafter the spirit of nationalism was enshrined in the 'Constitution'. The Constitution, described the citizens of this country, the nature of Constitution and the position where in the sovereignty of our country will rest? Democracy was chosen for the sake of sovereignty and Lok Sabha or the Parliament thus become the greatest pillar of democracy. The other pillars of our democracy are the judiciary and the executive. The tragedy that struck on December, 6, marked the betrayal against all these three things. For the first time I witnessed such perfidy against the judiciary. In the wake of the situation the Supreme Court is issuing different orders. On one day there is one order and on another day these is something else. All aspects of the case are being presented one by one. An affidavit was submitted by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and another was submitted by the duly elected B.J.P. Government of U.P. an affidavit was given by the Government of India and everything was being done in a justified manner. It was affirmed by all the concerned parties i.e. V.H.P., B.J.P. and the Central Government that justice will be done. But unfortunately, even after submitting the affidavits, there was contempt of court, and the judicial system was subverted. The U.P. Chief Minister who submitted affidavit started

exhorting as a mouthpiece of parties like the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the R.S.S., the Bajrang Dal and the B.J.P. itself. Shri Arjun Singh said that this issue has been lingering since 1949. I think it started in 1920. It is a very old issue. The Vishwa Hindu Parishad came into the scene as late as 1984. But when was it made an issue by the B.J.P.? It was during a mammoth conference of Saints held in Allahabad which was attended by a senior lady member of this House who is present here, that a decision was taken in this regard. It was at that time that the B.J.P. emerged on the scene. It was in February, 1989 that a decision was taken to observe *shilapujan* all over the country and the policy of the B.J.P. regarding the temple of Lord Rama was accepted in principle so that the B.J.P. could come into power by playing with the sentiments of devotees of Lord Rama. A country-wise planned agitation was launched and people were misled in the name of Lord Rama. They were provoked in the name of religion and several misleading decisions were taken, many pamphlets were distributed and people were administered oaths on various pretexts. There is no account of the money that was mobilised through these programmes. (Interruptions)

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): We have the account of every single penny. Our account is clear. How are you saying that there is no account whatsoever? (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: May big industrialists are running their industries with that money, and are still paying interest to the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. The money collected in the name of the *Shila puja* is still lying with two big industrialists. They are running their industries with that money. Thereafter money was amassed through the '*paduka puja*' and people were misled.

The cardinal question is that the Congress party is not merely a political party. It is the lifeline of this country. The Congress party has chiselled and polished every walk of life. The patriots who sacrificed their lives for the nation while being a member of the

[Sh. Buta Singh]

Congress party never said even for a moment that they were a Hindu, a Muslim, or a Sikh and they always said " *Sarfarooshi Kee Tamanna Ab Hamare Dil Mein Hai* " They never aspired for making a Hindu nation or a Khalistan nor they wanted to draw political mileage out of these sacrifices. They aspired only for the freedom of their motherland. Today our country is standing on a cross road. Today, people of the country are being misguided and mislead. The meek and simple tribals are being misguided and RSS is organising " *Shakkas* " in these areas. Those who did not have any concern with this movement are being involved. Last time I said that truly speaking the devotees of Lord Rama were not these persons, but the true devotees were the tribals who fought for Lord Rama. There was among them one with religious make on one's forehead and bearing ' *Nikkar* '. Pawanputra Hanuman was Advasi Guru Sugreev and Bali were also Advissi Gurus. They had no faith in the theory of nationalism propounded by narrow minded people like you. Today we need such spirit of nationalism which may inspire us to create a feeling of Indian nationalism. We do not want that ideology of nationalism which was being referred to just now. When the talks were going on, a senior leader belonging to ' *Sangh Pariwar* ' came to me. I told him that if the temple construction was their prime objective then it was possible to construct it. It can be possible only through dialogue and co-operation. The example of Somnath temple was cited. It is good that praises have been showered upon Sardar Patel. He was an iron man. But do you know who was its first trustee? John Saheb Wanes was its first trustee. Was the construction of Ram Temple not possible on this line? Do you never thought in this direction. As a matter of fact you do not want to construct the temple but you want to come to a power in the Centre. Like Somnath temple, efforts were made to find a solution. Discussions were held and many people had expressed sympathy. It had another aspect also. (Interruptions)

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani): It was not built after demolishing

a mosque.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am also stating the same thing. It has one more aspect. That mosque belonged to the people of a particular community. Discussions were held with the people of that community.

Syed Shahabuddin Saheb knows every thing. About 18-20 meetings were held with all the concerning people. We held many meetings with the people belonging to Vishva Hindu Parishad. But we have never said such things. Were, the Congress party and Rajiv Gandhi were in favour of constructing temple. We had also given promise of that. But we proposed to construct the temple with the co-operation of one and all and without hurting the religious sentiments of any persons.

Addressing the nation on 15th August, the hon. Prime Minister had said the same thing and the entire nation had accepted that. But what was the hurry? I fail to understand.

You are talking of the arrest of Shri Advaniji. I say the speech given by him before proceeding on this Yatra, was sufficient to order his arrest. Thereafter, what he said in Varanasi was sufficient to impose ban. The way he encouraged Kar Sewaks upon reaching there... (Interruptions)

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: You should call Shri Advaniji in the House so that he may be in a position to reply to the points being made by the hon. Member. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Shri Advaniji was the Leader of Opposition at that time. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK (Bombay North): Sir, I am on a point of order.

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I would like to refer

here all the three speeches given by them. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK: My point of order is hon. Shri Buta Singh is making a specific allegation against Shri Advani. Shri Advani is a Member of this House and he is not present. He is making an allegation not on the basis of his personal information. But he is reading from somewhere. We only pray and again request you to give an opportunity to Shri Advani to come here. You please make arrangements to bring him here so that the allegations can be met. Otherwise, he cannot make allegations in the absence of the Member without giving a notice.

[Translation]

SHRIBUTA SINGH: Hon. Shri Vajpayee was quoting from the ' Jansattya ' and the 'Indian Express '. I would like to quote the speeches made by Shri Advaniji as have been reported in the latest edition of the ' India Today '.

[English]

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): He is only referring to what Shri Vajpayee has said.

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I would like to quote the speeches made by Shri Advaniji as reported by the ' India Today '.

[English]

Let me quote from India Today:

" On November 30, L.K. Advani himself set the tone of confrontation by announcing his resolve to go on Yatra to Ayodhya along with his point President Murali Manohar Joshi... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Ram Naikji, my decision on your party of order is, when Shri Advani comes here, we will give him an opportunity

to explain.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Can you give us an indication as to when he can come Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: I think he should come here as soon as possible.

SHRI RAM NAIK: The other day you said that you would make some arrangements.

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA : Let Advaniji come to the House so that he could say something in his defence Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Advani should be called in the those.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I would like to quote his speech which has appeared in the India Today.

[English]

" On November 30, L.K. Advani himself set the tone of confrontation by announcing his resolve to go on a yatra to Ayodhya along with his party President Murali Manohar Hoshi. He told the press in New Delhi: ' Our faith in the bona fides of the narasimha rao Government has been shaken ".

[Translation]

Vajpayeeji, what do you talk? Your faith was shaken on that day itself. You had said on 30th November itself that your faith in Government had been shaken.

[English]

" Our faith in the bonafides of the Narasimha Rao Government has been shaken".

[Translation]

Then, he has said.

[English]

" While in Delhi the pot was calling

[Sh. Buta Singh]

the kettle black, in Varanasi the pot was showing its true colours. (Advani thundered in Varanasi, from where he started his final Yatra) We are prepared to face any eventuality arising out of the kar seva and are ready to make any sacrifice for it".

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: No, Shri Buta Singhji, quoting opinion of a paper is one thing and referring to the speech reported by the paper is another thing. It should be kept in mind.

[English]

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I am quoting.

MR. SPEAKER: What Mr. Advani said has been written in the India Today and you are quoting it. You can refer to it but you cannot quote it.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: All right, Sir, I will say that I am referring to the report which has appeared in the latest edition of the India Today.

[Translation]

Afterwards you raised a query. When Shri Advaniji was named the Leader of Opposition I congratulated him and said one thing. I would like to repeat that I said to Mr. Advani that he was the leader of B.J.P. till today, but from today he would be the Leader of Opposition. The leader of Opposition has a great responsibility in a democratic set up. The ruling side as well as the Opposition have a great responsibility. I would like to ask Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji whether the act of Shri Advani was that of a Leader of Opposition or Leader of B.J.P. not the leader of B.J.P. but that of Leader of 'Sangh Pariwar'? If ban has been imposed on 'Sangh Pariwar' there is no reason of exempting Advaniji. Shri Advaniji is solely responsible for all this. Therefore the arrest of Shri Advaniji and Murali Manohar Joshi, while on the one side

was in the interest of the nation at the same time it was in their own interest also because there is a widespread resentment in the country. They manifest one ideology. It will further develop resentment and incite riots. Therefore I consider this step of Government as right one.

The option before Advaniji is open. He can move the Court. The doors of judiciary of the country are open for him. He should present his view point before the Court. He should explain his views that have been published by the newspapers before the judiciary. If judiciary absolves him from this blame then he can come to this House and present his views.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, another objection has been raised regarding the dissolution of three Assemblies. I consider Atal Bihari Vajpayee as ignorant; But he is senior to me in the House by some days. But why does he forget that the State Governments were also dismissed during 1977 by the then Central Government.

[English]

Unprecedented political situation in the country had arisen when the States Assemblies of Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal were dismissed. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: What did you do in 1980?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The Chief Ministers of that time... (Interruptions)

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, don't cite the example of 1977. Because the Governments of those states had already completed their term. These Governments had completed their five years term and they were on extension. That is why these Governments were dismissed.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You were also

present. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the three Governments were dismissed within no time. Even reports from the Governors were not sought. They were dismissed after taking a decision here. (Interruptions)

SHRIDAUDAYALJOSHI: Mr. Speaker, you may read the newsitem, published in 'Rajasthan Patrika'. The Governor of Rajasthan has himself praised the Government of Rajasthan saying that the Government was functioning very well. You may read today's edition of 'Rajasthan Patrika'. (Interruptions)

If you say the same words at Jalore, it would become difficult for you to win the elections from there. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I know it very well that excess speaking is harmful for the throat...

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: All this is not going on record.

(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I think the hon. Member is feeling somewhat hurt. For his information, I would like to say that I had been the victim of their false propoganda in 1989. But in 1990 it was your Government and we had lost as number of seats in Rajasthan in 1989 and we had won three seats in the elections held in 1990. It is only Jalore in Rajasthan from where we have won in all the eight assembly segment of a Parliamentary Constituency, I challenge even today. I shall go to Jalore and prove that your false propoganda is not effective there... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Joshi, you should restrict yourself. It is going beyond limits.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): It was a big victory for Shri Buta Singhji. But we are sorry that he was not included in the Cabinet after such a resounding victory... (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Vajpayeeji has referred to three dismissed Governments. The three Chief Ministers had made statements which had appeared in the newspapers also. I shall not quote them otherwise you will object to that. The Chief Minister of Himachal Pradesh has said that if the Government arrests the members of 'Sangh Pariwar', then he will consider himself also as arrested. It proves that he does not approve the Constitutional ban imposed on 'Sangh Pariwar'. He wants to spoil the unity of Himachal Pradesh in the name of 'Sangh Pariwar'. It cannot be tolerated. Regarding Patwaji it was said that he might have issued orders by mistake. If he were a wise Chief Minister he would not have ordered to lock the office and then open it. It is his mistake that he did not apply his mind. That is why the office was unlocked otherwise it would have not been opened. Has he guts to unlock it now? The statement of Kalyan Singhji has appeared in the India Today. Dual policy adopted by Kalyan Singhji has been published by the 'India Today'. On the one hand he gave full freedom to the hon. Member of Parliament belonging to Bajrang Dal to do whatever he likes and on the other hand filed an affidavit in the Supreme Court and assured that only 'Bhajan' and 'Kirtan' will be performed there. No Karsewa will be done. Vajpayeeji, to perform 'Bhajan' and 'Kirtan' you and I should have gone there. How did the people with hammer reach there? It was a great mistake.

I would like to say one more thing that all Minister of Rajasthan and many Government participated in it. Why do we conceal the fact that all the B.J.P. Governments have direct or indirect relationship with 'Sangh Pariwar'? (Interruptions) If they have relation with 'Sangh Pariwar' then.... (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: This is the

[Sh. Buta Singh]

magnanimity of Shri Narasimha Rao that he took steps to create harmony in the country.

SHRIMATI KRISHNENDRA KAUR (DEEPA): The Minister took part in kar seva after giving resignations. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: He tried to cooperate with the all sort of people with their different views and directed the nation and also sorted out national problems. But it is a matter of sorrow that to whom he had promised to give support they were left in a lurch. You should clearly understand one thing that nation forgives the one who seldom makes a mistake and repents the same but do not forgives the cheats. Do you feel that by misguiding the people you are serving the purpose of Nationalism? Would be of a particular sect and another who do not belong to that sect. Would you apply such policy? Would you issue two types of circulars? When the debate was going on, at that time a very prominent leader of Sangh family had said that I know you would be able to construct the temple either because you talk about co-operation or with the help of the judicial verdict but our aim is not the temple but to bring a majority of supporters of a Hindu Nation in this House. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM NAIK: If you have courage then speak out his name....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, this is a very runic path for the B.J.P. B.J.P. has not been able to present any political economic or social policy in this country for the last forty years. But wants to assume power sometime in the name of Lord Ram, Sometime in the name of Mother Ganges or holy cow. The countrymen would not be misguided. I have every hope that this House, which directs the whole of the country would support our present Prime Minister Shri Narasimha Rao ji who showed his patience, fearlessness and objectivity in leading the nation and daringly guiding the nation. The inner self of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is with him. He has to fulfill his duty, now we have to compensate it. Mandir, Masjid and Gurudwaras have

been demolished in this country as well as otherwise also. This is the first duty of the House to show sympathy with those people and write strong worded letters to those Governments. We should seriously take up this matter with them that compensation should be paid for the demolished d temples. I was in U.K. when a temple was demolished there and 6 people were burnt alive inside it. I was deeply moved. Temples have been demolished in many countries. In our country Masjid as well as temples have been demolished. This is a very tragic incident. We should grossly condemn it. Vajpayee ji you should have condemned it first of all. This House express its confidence in our Prime Minister and requests Shri Vajpayee to withdraw this motion and instead bring a motion of repentance so that peace should be established in the country.

[English]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning when Shri Arjun Singh spoke, he referred to the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi and tried to explain to the House the real motivation behind that murder. But I would like to ask a question, who inspired or what inspired nathuram Godse to commit that foul deed. I think he was inspired by the systematic campaign of poisonous ideas which were being spread for a long time by the then Sarva Sanchalak of the RSS. I do not mention his name. The author of a book called 'A Bunch of Thoughts', which you can read in to Library and see how every page and every line of it reeks of communal poison.

Who inspired these Kar Sevaks? I do not know whether it is right to call them as Kar Sevaks. These vandals, who are masquerading as Kar Sevaks, who inspired them? Who inspired them to demolish that structure on the 6th of December?

According to my friend Mr. Vajpayee, they should be called here; they should be arraigned; they should be hauled up but nobody knows who they were. That is what we were led to believe that they are

anonymous people, as anonymous as that gentleman, who gave Mr. Solanki that letter in Davos. Nobody knows who he was. I am sure, the Prime Minister knows it! But anyway, I suggest, Sir, that propaganda which has been ceaselessly carried out in this country, injecting poison into the Hindu mind, by the Leaders not only of the RSS, VHP and so on but of the BJP also - not all of them perhaps - was responsible for these group of people taking courage in their hands and doing what they did on the 6th of December. What was destroyed, Sir? Our Muslim friends say that it was a mosque which was destroyed. Because, according to them, and according to the teachings of Islam, a mosque, whatever charges it may undergo over the years, a mosque, once a mosque is always a mosque. So, they think, a mosque was destroyed. The other side had gone on claiming that it was no longer a mosque; that it had in practice been converted into a temple. The idols were there; the *poojaries* were there; *pooja* was being observed everyday; and no *namaz* had been performed in that place for many years. No Muslim was allowed to enter that place. So, according to them, it was a temple. Whether it was a mosque or whether it was a temple, this or that, it was a place of worship. It is that, which has been destroyed. I wish to say and I want all our Hindu friends, who are proud rightly of being Hindus to consider this fact that what was destroyed really are some basic tenets and principles of the Hindu religion itself. The very tolerance, the very compassion, the principle of pluralism, the symbol of that is the Hindu religion. But these people, these intolerant people - What shall I call them, I do not know - who performed this act, have not even been condemned by the BJP Leaders, not even by Mr. Vajpayee. He only says that he did not welcome it. He said, it is very unfortunate. He is very sorry that such a tragic thing took place. But he does not condemn it. I think that, in order to establish their *bona fides* in this House, the BJP must condemn what happened on the 6th of December. They may blame anybody. I don't ask them to take the blame on themselves, they can blame anybody they like, but even without blaming anybody, that act of vandalist and destruction should be condemned. After all, the whole

world is watching us. The Parliament of India is in Session.

17.00 hrs

The whole world is watching to see whether the Parliament speaks out against this act destruction and vandalism.

We had adopted some Resolution yesterday. It is being challenged here was it adopted or not adopted. Some people this motioning raised a big *hulla-gulla* and said that it was not passed. But if they are interested or sincere in condemning what happened, why are they challenging that resolution? They should not challenge it. That is a technicality; whether it was formally put to the vote and passed or not passed. (Interruptions) Do you agree with the contents of that Resolution or not? (Interruptions) I am challenging you to say whether you agree or not with the contents of that resolution. (Interruptions) That is a point.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Such resolutions are always brought, discussed and passed. (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: A similar resolution was adopted in the other House. Your party was present there in the other House also.

SHRI RAM NAIK: Not yet.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It was passed. (Interruptions) Behind all this, I am constrained to say that we should not underate what is happening. There is a long strategy. That strategy is aimed at destroying one by one all the established institutions which are enshrined in our Constitution and then coming to power in a Hindu theoretic State, which they like to call Hindu Rashtira.

The deliberative deception which was practiced on the Supreme Court, the highest Court in the land, was it accidental? It was not accidental.

Then there is a violation of the Constitution, the basic principles of

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

secularism, which means they are pouring a lot of ridicules and scorns on the word 'secularism'. Let us take it as its lowest common meaning: that is equal status and rights for all religions. They do not agree with that. They have challenged that.

Then I must express my thanks to my BJP friends - for whatever reason; I do not wish to go into that- they decided today to allow the Parliament to resume its normal functioning and they gave up the pre-condition on which they have been harping for the last three days. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA
(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That was a good thing you did. I am congratulating you.
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: On the first day, on Monday, you did not allow the Parliament to work.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But my motive behind was not that. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAM NAIK: Whatever it is, but you wanted his resignation. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then there is an Act in this country called the Representation of the People Act by which we are all governed; we all fight elections under that Act. If you study that Act, certain provisions of that Act I am afraid, I have not got number with me just now of the relevant provisions - it is expressly forbidden to ask for votes from the people on the basis of any religion or religious symbols. But your Leader was telling us repeatedly here over the last one year that the reason why we were able to come to power in Uttar Pradesh where our party was virtually nothing before the last election, was this Temple. So it means the appeal is to the Temple, which is an appeal to the religious symbol, which is a direct violation of the Representation of the People Act. *(Interruptions)* Unfortunately, nobody

has hauled you up in the courts. The Bombay High Court has disqualified three Shiv Sena MLAs and one Shiv Sena MP.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): 16.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: They have disqualified them on the ground of their having been proved that in their election campaign they have made religious appeals. The High Court of Bombay has disqualified them. But you people are going merrily ahead. *(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA: You have befriended Sena. With their support he became the Chief Minister....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It is I who is speaking at the moment. You may quarrel with him later on.....*(Interruptions)*

[English]

The outrage, which committed on the 6th of December, now we have analyse whether the BJP leaders were really taken unaware or by surprise as is being made out. That is what is being made out now. 'We know nothing about it. We did not expect such a thing to happen. We could not control the crowd.' In that case their inefficiency, their importance as leaders have also been proved. They have no business, if they are such an important people, to collect such a huge crowd there and then say, we could not control it. If you cannot control it, why did you bring them there? Why was statement made saying 'Oh, we are not going to do *kar seva*, but restrict *kar seva* to *kirtans* and *bhajans*.' Their statements are on record. If I mention that, they will say that what is the proof, this and that, One very important leader, not here now, said, we are not going to confine our: *kar seva* to *kirtans* and *bhajans* our people are going to do *kar seva* with hammers and pic-axes.'

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur): Shovels.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Yes, shovels. It should have been contradicted if it was a wrong statement or wrongly reported.

Then, Sir, all these people were collected at a time when the court had already said that no construction activity of any kind is to be allowed there; Nothing is to be allowed there.

Instead of asking people to go home, two top leaders went out in different directions in order to collect more people and bring them back. People were instigated, incited by saying that the court's order need not be bothered about. This court, as Shri Somnath Chatterjee said, is being utilised as an instrument of the Executive. The Executive is utilising the court to suppress the desire of the masses. Therefore, do not worry about it. Ignore it. Is this not instigation at its crudest form?

I do not believe all these cock and bull stories, that nobody knew anything. They were innocent angels, suddenly they found that some people were disobeying their instructions and rushing ahead.

We had asked the Prime Minister in one meeting, I forgot in which date we met him at his house, that suppose a section of these people, some group of people, tries to force its way forward into that area where the Babri Masjid structure is located, what will happen?

The Prime Minister said that they will be stopped. They have to be stopped. Of course, they also failed to stop them and these people, whether by design or by failure to show their leadership, also said that.

So, Sir, I owe an apology to the House and also to the BJP friends because the last time we decided this question, the Home Minister had made a statement here. I had rightly talked about riding a donkey and a tiger and that has been proved now. That they bought a tiger. They put in a cage. They fed it, fattened it up, then let it loose, got on to top of it, thinking that it is only a dhoobi's donkey. Ultimately, we saw what happened. But the mistake I made was, I freely admit

it, I spoke here saying that these tactics of developing tensions, building up crisis, going up to the brink of the crisis and then again retreating, they have done it once before in the month of June and July, and probably they will do it again.

I made a mistake. I gave them the benefit of doubt, which they do not deserve. It was foolish of me to do that. This time they were determined to go ahead.

Now, Sir, it has been said that is was spontaneous upsurge of the people, therefore, it could not be controlled. Because it was spontaneous upsurge of the people, therefore, it should not also be condemned. These statements have also come out.

So, now I do not know what to say. Many friends say that 'the law of the jungle was prevailing. I think, to call this the law of the jungle is to slander animals which live in the jungle. Wild animals do not behave like this. Wild animals never attack anybody or a human being, unless they are first attacked. This is not the law of the jungle. What was going on then, that is something ten times worse.

Anyway, I do not want to take much time. I can only say that we cannot support this Motion because this Motion means that they want this Government to go to be replaced by their Government. We cannot support such a move. At least it will be done our dead bodies. But at the same time, I wish to make it categorically clear that as far as our party is concerned, we think that the Government, the Central Government, and the ruling party have completely forfeited the confidence of the people of this country by the way they have handled this affair, for bungling, by their failing to carry out the assurance which they had repeatedly given, and in fact, then if you go into the past you have to go into the whole thing which was described here about what happened in 1949, 1986 and subsequently.

I myself went to the late lamented Rajiv Gandhi. My party asked me to go and try to convince him that on that occasion they

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

should not fall along the BJP to pull down V.P. Singh's Government. Because, the issue there was the question of defending the mosque. I told him, "You can take any other opportunity, any other time you like and vote against V.P. Singh's Government, but do not show the country that you are siding with the BJP, on that day, to pull him down". Shri Rajiv Gandhi asked me, "Do you expect me to support that fellow"? I said, "I am not asking you to support him. I am only asking you not to pull him down this occasion." Anyway, he did not listen and we had this dubious spectacle of BJP and Congress together pulling down V.P. Singh's Government for the crime of having stood fast on his pledge that so long as the Constitution is there, I am not going to allow any damage to be done to this Mosque."

Now it has happened. It does not matter if Governments come and go. What has happened now? The Prime Minister, so many times, in so many places, on so many occasions, assured that his Government would protect that structure. Of course, now explanations are coming as to why they failed. You allowed — how many? one hundred companies or more of the Central para-military forces to be handed over to the control of the U.P. State Government, which you have now dismissed, which had resigned and then was dismissed by you. That means you had tremendous belief and faith in Shri Kalyan Singh. I do not blame you. He came and assured you so many times. But, Sir, you should really get an award for gullibility. I must say. You are willing to trust these people more than to trust the other forces in this country. And this Shri Kalyan Singh saw to it that no protection was given there at all.

I also want to ask a question. If the Government had been dismissed and already the Centre had taken over, for 36 hours after that, those fellows were still at there, on the site, constructing that make-shift temple or whatever it is. Already the Government of Uttar Pradesh had been dismissed and the Centre had taken over. The forces were

under the command of the Centre, not of Shri Kalyan Singh. Why were those people allowed to continue there for 36 hours?

Somebody said it was in order to avoid a blood-bath, to avoid a bloodshed! So, you have to weigh these two things. Of course, there may have been bloodshed. But what about the bloodshed which ensured? What about the thousands of people all over the country, not only there, who have been killed, who have been murdered, whose houses were burnt and looted? What about the women who were raped? What about that? That was an inevitable fall-out of what these people were doing. If you have forces of law and order and security forces, sometime you must use them also in order to prevent much bigger blood bath which would inevitable happen. But, I am afraid, this Government failed altogether.

Now, finally, I will only say about what happened after 6th December. It is all right to say that those three Governments have lost their moral right to govern. Because they were being manned by the Chief Ministers and other people who were openly declaring that they belonged to the R.S.S. The R.S.S. had already been banned. So it can be argued that you cannot allow a State Government to be run by people belonging to organisations which have been declared illegal. But I would say that it is better not to hurry too much. Why? Because moral rights are not the same as constitutional rights. If these Government failed to carry out the directives of the Centre, if they openly flouted the directives of the Centre, surely they must be dismissed. I do not know if you have reached that position and if you have got facts in your possession to make out a convincing case - not to us here but to the crores of people outside. They must be convinced that these Governments have not been dismissed simply because they were B.J.P. Governments; but because they were doing something which was a clear violation of the Center's directives and of the Constitution. I would have been happier if you had waited a bit and I am sure they would have given you plenty of opportunities in a day or two to take action against them.

However, it was a sort of pre-emption. But now it has been done. It is no use weeping tears over it.

Now the single task is to fight this monster of communalism and fundamentalism which has emerged - not emerged but has now reared its head and is threatening the entire country and its unity, integrity and secularism. Can this be done by administrative measures alone? Can this be done by security forces and bullets, ordinances or by invoking Article 356 of the Constitution or by putting people in jail? Those may be necessary in certain situation. But they cannot be fought and vanquished by administrative measures alone. This is a political issue. This is an ideological issue. It has to be fought out political and ideologically by all the forces in this country who are genuinely committed to the case of secularism and they must, as far as possible, stand together. I do not know whether everybody is prepared to stand together or not. We will know in another few days, time perhaps.

The Congress party is the oldest among the parties which are here. It is the largest party. It is the party which had the privilege of leading the national independence movement.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your party?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We are a very small party.

The Congress party is a party which has its own platform, its organisation, its working committee and everything. Why are they not saying something? Why are they keeping quiet? Why its working committee does not appeal to all congressmen in the country - at every level, whenever they are - to come out and join hands with all secular forces to fight against this monster? They have not said anything upto now. If other, secular forces feel diffident - and some voices are heard saying: "Oh, they are not serious about it", it is for you to prove that you are serious. You have got a flag. why can you not take that flag and bring your people out on the

streets? Then it would be a much easier task to unify the ranks of the secular forces against communalism. I may tell you that all the people of minority communities, not only muslims, will be with you.

I was in Calcutta two or three days ago. I met some Christian friends also as a representative of the people. There are nineteen members in this House who belong to Christian community. They may not speak here. I do not know why. Maybe for various reasons. But they are thoroughly perturbed and disturbed and asking as to what is their future. They ask: "How will we survive in this country, if this kind of thing goes on?"

So, Mr. Prime Minister, you have got a big responsibility on you. You must give a ringing call to your own people first of all and then to the whole country to stand up and fight politically and not rely only on administrative measures. That unity alone, going to the people, going to the masses, will be able to defeat these things. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Sharad Pawar.

[Translation]

DEFENCE MINISTER (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir. I would like to thank Shri Vajpayee.....(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indian). Mr. Speaker, Sir....

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you later.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you later. I will give you time.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, may I wish your permission say one thing? I just forgot to mention one point. During this holocaust which has taken place, reports from Bombay — from Maharashtra indicate that the Shiv Sena whose name not been taken here up to now has been playing

[Sh. Indrajit Gupta]

havoc. The leader of the Shiv Sena, Mr. Thackrey, issued a statement saying, "People are saying that Shiv Sainiks destroyed that structure there. I do not know if they did it. But if they did it, I am proud of them". But the Congress Government in Maharashtra, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, does not utter a single word against the Shiv Sena. Sir, I want to know what kind of campaign we are going to run against these people. If, for other reasons, they do not want to annoy each other, they should not let the whole country down.

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank Shri Vajpayee because he showed to his colleagues that the House can be run even in the absence of Advaniji. The motion brought by him gives us opportunity to show their reality to the nation who have destroyed the dignity of Maryada Purushottam Ramchandra. The question of Babri Masjid and Ram Janm Bhoomi was of a sensitive nature. From the very first day, the Prime Minister decided to solve this issue by reasoning, coordination and through negotiations. He had said in this very House that the Government of India wants to restart negotiations in this regard from the point where these were left at the time of ex-Prime Minister Shri Chandra Shekhar. I also received a request to cooperate for the same cause. The meeting of the representatives of Babri Action Committee and Vishwa Hindi Parishad was held in Delhi. First meeting was held regarding the documents. A point regarding certifying the documents was raised and needful was done. I would like to tell the House that in the first meeting Vishwa Hindu Parishad raised a point that the Government of India should not on its own take final decision regarding these documents instead these should be referred to the Supreme Court and only after that a decision in this regard should be taken. I would also like to tell the House that the leaders of Babri Action Committee welcomed this step. And they were told only one thing

that both the parties i.e. Babri Action Committee and Vishwa Hindu Parishad should give it in writing to the Government that whatever be the decision of the court they would abide by it. Vishwa Hindu Parishad as well as Babri Action Committee readily agreed to consider this point. Second meeting was held and all such points were discussed therein. We stated preparing an atmosphere in order to refer this case to the Supreme Court. Several Leaders were consulted, we went to both the parties. It seemed that after taking decision to refer this case to the Supreme Court in the last meeting some solution to this case would come out. Suddenly there was a statement from the Dharm Sansad, till then I did not know that which 'Sansad' was bigger than this Parliament.....

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Roseria): We have told you on 3rd about the Dharm Sansad.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: It decided to start kar seva from 6th. The last meeting, which could find a way out, was badly affected by this decision. I would like to tell the House that the responsibility to mar the prospects of this meeting lies on the organisations who made announcement to this effect.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we talked to all the concerned parties. No doubt, negotiations in this regard were discontinued. But even then we thought that there is a need for separate talks we held separate discussions. 6th December was approaching. The Prime Minister was very much concerned as to how peace and harmony would be maintained there. The Chief Minister of U.P., whose name has been mentioned in this House held an affidavit in the Supreme Court to the effect that in every situation peace would be maintained there.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: (Deoria): He had said something about you also.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Next day, a letter from hon. Vijayaraje Scindhia was received by the Supreme Court in which it

' was stated that they would maintain peace there and were trying to find a way out and the whole responsibility of up keeping the disputed structure intact lies on them. A letter of Swami Chinmayanand M.P. was also submitted to the Supreme Court. What was said in N.I.C. is known to everybody, what assurance was given to the Prime Minister...

SHRI CHINMAYANAND SWAMI (Badaun): The letter written by me did not make a mention about the structure. I had only written this much that on asking by the Uttar Pradesh Government I contacted the saints and requested them not to violate the ruling of the Allahabad High Court regarding the Kar Seva begining from 6th and all saints acceded to it. You should tell the whole truth.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: I want to say that as per the meeting of the Allahabad High Court, you took the responsibility to maintain the status quo there. You gave it in writing to the Supreme Court. But the whole nation knows, what happened there.

Vajpayeeji told us here that they regret it very much, Mr. Advani and other leader did their utmost efforts but some youths went there and started demolishing the structure.

Hon. Vajpayeeji, I would like to tell you two things in this regard. You have said about conducting peaceful Kar seva there but you go through the latest issue of 'Organiser' and let you know the truth about it. 'Organiser' writes. "This time we have a different line of action, the Government of P.V. Narasimharao was trying to clash with the Judiciary but we were not interested in clustering with the Judiciary but with the Government of India. Therefore, Kalyan Singh was asked by the Sangh family to submit an affidavit in the Supreme Court. Sangh family knew about it that what was going to happen on 6th and it also knew that Kalyan Singh will have to leave his official residence therefore Sangh family already made arrangements in this regard." Who was not aware of it? Was it not a conspiracy? Everything was preplanned. If your Chief organ which puts your thinking before the

nation, writes this then what else proof do you want? You said that a lot of efforts were put to stop all this. I wish to say it with responsibility that I have got a video cassette which shows the minute to minute details of 6th December from 6 A.M. to 5 P.M. and also about the happenings which took place between 7.30 p.m. to 11.30 P.M. I invite you and leaders of all parties to view this cassette. It may contain a proof regarding carrying of arms by the Kar sewaks to demolish the mosque.....

SHRI SHARAD YADAV: This we have already told the people. There is no need of viewing this tape.....

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: I also invite you to see it. You may also come. it shows that the leader of V.H.P., Bajrang Dal, R.S.S. and B.J.P. did not try to dissuade them. Some leaders of R.S.S. and some policemen are sitting quietly. The structure, which they had described as temple, they were raising the slogans that demolish this structure, give one more push. Vajpayeeji call it a temple. They have not demolished a temple but a mosque. Whatever preparations you did it were for demolishing the mosque and by misguiding and cheating the countrymen you have hatched this conspiracy. I wish to say that you cannot avoid to take this responsibility. The attack that you made not only an attack on Masjid. It was an attack on the Supreme Court. It was an attack on the Centre-State relations. You have attacked Parliament and you have attacked the Constitution. You chose 6th December the Constitution. Several colleagues have asked as to why did they choose 6th December only. The death anniversary of Baba Saheb Ambedkar, who gave the Constitution to this country, falls on this day. They choose 6th December to attack presumably in order to show the world the way in which we pay tributes to him. You will have to answer if here.

It has been pointed out that we made some mistake. Our mistake was that we believed the assurances given by the Chief Minister in the Supreme Court, we believed the assurances given at NIC, this was our

[Sh. Sharad Pawar]

mistake. Our mistake was that we believed the assurance given by you in the House. You say whatever steps we took are wrong, You say that the ban imposed on some organisations is wrong and you also say that the concrete steps we took against some State Governments are wrong. I want to inform the House that I have some information about Madhya Pradesh Government. I had a phone-call from Bhopal in the 6th that the situation is out of control there...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Tell us what happened in Bombay, the situation was out of control in Bombay as well...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: The situation is out of control in Bhopal and some people are complaining. That the workers of Barjrang Dal are attacking in the areas of minorities, donning Home guard uniform and using Police vans. We have such complaints. I contacted the Chief Minister myself and said...*(Interruptions)* Please, be prepared to listen to me. I have determined to speak the truth. I rang up Mr. Patwa and informed him that since his Government was not able to control the situation, we have sent some military columns which are staying outside the Bhopal city, and asked him to use them. You will be surprised to know that the military reached there at 2.0'clock on the 6th.

PRO. PREMDHUMAL (Hamirpur) Were you owing the responsibility of the Home Minister also on that day?

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: Three military columns reached there but they were not used. The next day I contacted Mr. Patwa and advised him to use the army columns which were placed at his disposal. I asked him to send a D.M. with the army and send it to the disturbed areas. Army was deployed in the afternoon on the 7th. And you ask as to what did the other Chief Ministers do.

When situation came to such a pass on the 6th, Shri Jyoti Basu rang me up at 4.30

p.m. saying that there was a possibility of the communal forces turning violent and that some columns of army would be needed. I rang up after 10 minutes and arranged army. Similarly, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra had sought military assistance and we provided the same to him. The Chief Minister of Gujarat also sought army assistance and we provided it. The difference lies in the fact that BJP States Government ruled did not want to use the assistance provided to them. They didn't want to save lakhs of people and in the other States...*(Interruptions)* The Chief Ministers of non-BJP-governed States wished that the people should be saved at any cost and hence whatever steps were taken, were absolutely right. I would like to submit that in the certain States you got the mandate of the people to run the Government and I agree that you had the mandate of the people, yet after the elections were over and you had taken over the administration of the State you had become the Chief Minister or Minister representing all the people of that State and not representing a single section of society and a single religion but I would like to ask what sort of steps you took in those States. We have received complaints that when the kar-sevaks returned to Jaipur, Ministers went to stations to receive them and they took in their cars and not only that, they sent these kar-sevaks to minority areas and mohallas, which led to riots there and for this...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA (Nagaur): The Chief Minister himself had gone there to see them off. They were told there to go...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: I want to submit to the House that those Kar sevaks were sent to minority areas to indulge in infarious activities and to create chaos. The people in those States voted you to powers but you did not use your powers properly in the larger interest of the people. Keeping in view the way you used or rather, misused your powers there while running the Government, you had no right to remain in power any longer. So, the decision taken by the Union Government to dismiss all such

Governments was absolutely right, our Prime Minister had no other alternative and I also support that decision.

In view of the situation that had arisen in the country when even the journalists were not spared as attacks were made on them, thousands of people were killed, there was large scale blood-shed, property worth crores of rupees was damaged...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Please tell us as to why the Himachal Pradesh Government was dismissed, there were no riots in that State. Why the Maharashtra Government was not dismissed.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: The need to take stringent step was felt when property worth crores of rupees was damaged. And I am happy that the Government under the leadership of Shri Narasimha Rao decided to take strong steps and I support his efforts.

You want to come to power in the garb of religion but it is very difficult task. Don't you know that the path through which you want to come to power is the path which will disintegrate this country, attack the unity and integrity of the country and you cannot come to power through that path. It is not wrong on your part to try to come to power, but if you want to come to power by way of disintegrating the country and the society, the country will never forgive you and this is what I want to tell you.

Some points were made about nationalism here. When Shri Vajpayee talked about nationalism, a friend of ours Shri Buta Singh asked as to what nationalism he is talking of, I was surprised to hear it. Why did Shri Buta Singh ask such a question? He should know that they have a different type of nationalism. Their nationalism is the nationalism of people belonging to a particular religion which does not have room for any other religion. There is no room for Mr. Buta Singh in that religion. There is no room for people like honourable member Shri Ayub Khan who had fought valiantly in the battle against Pakistan and earned

fame...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM NAIK: You were given a chance. Please don't say like this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR: There is no room for Shri Paswan there is no room for Shri Sharad Yadav and there is no room for other colleagues also. This nationalism belongs to some intellectuals which is being brought into the country by some forces. And it is our as well as your duty to fight against such forces I hope that the secular public of this country would deal with such nationalist forces well. The forces that had assassinated Gandhi are the very forces which are violating the ideals of 'Marayada -Purushottam' Sri Ram. One thing has become clear that their devotion to Ram is not the devotion that takes one to the path of truth. Ram is only on their lips whereas there is Nathu Ram in their heart. That is all I want to say that we should be prepared to fight against such forces.

[English]

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indian): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that my friend Shri Indrajit Gupta has compelled me to rise to speak. I hope, I do not sound to be ultra egotistical because I was paid a tribute by the late Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That is not going on record.

(Interruptions)*

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I was paid a tribute by the Chief Justice that apart from being a front rank criminal lawyer of the Supreme Court I was very much a front rank leader on the constitutional side. And the other day I was given a special trophy by the Vice President for being the senior-most member of the Constituent Assembly. I still have a programme of eight to ten hours a day. Let me mention something of my continuing career. Shrimati Indira Gandhi when she was the Prime Minister, she presided over the centenary of the All-India

[Sh. Frank Anthony]

Anglo-Indian Association in October 1976. She paid me a tribute for having brought my community, microscopic in size, to the same size of the Parsis into the Indian mainstream. That was in 1942. I had the privilege of celebrating my Diamond Jubilee this year - fifty years of leadership of the Anglo-Indian community every triennial being re-elected president-in-Chief. Every Prime Minister of the leading party from Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri always put me into the front seat in Parliament. Today I believe, I am the senior-most member of the Parliament. The other day, the Vice-President gave me a beautiful silver tray as the senior member of the Constituent Assembly. I had the privilege of defending Shrimati Indira Gandhi as a criminal lawyer for two and a half years. For two and a half years, I defended her before the retired Chief Justice Shah. (Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY (Jagatsinghpur): What have you to say about Babri Masjid?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Just a minute. I will say that in a minute. Let me finish. It took me two and a half years to get her acquitted from Mr. Shah who was the Chief Justice. She selected me from the whole range of the senior advocates of the Congress party knowing that I was never a member of the Congress Party. And that is the tribute I have paid to the Congress party. From the time of Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who sent me as an independent representative to the first delegation of independent India to the United Nations, I am a life member of the late Jawaharlal Nehru Trust. He made me a member in the National Integration Council and I continue to be there. Indira Gandhi paid me the tributes for bringing out my community into the main stream. I defended her case for 2 1/2 years before the former Chief Justice. When she came to attend the Centenary celebrations, she said that I had brought my small community into the Indian main stream. She was convicted by the former Chief Justice and I got her out going in for an appeal before the Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court,

Justice T.P. S. Chawla. He had written 376 pages judgment. It was a classic judgment, wherein he had set aside and upheld every objection that I made before him. Indira Gandhi, after I got her out, offered me the post of Vice-President of India. But I declined it because I said that nobody is indispensable but I am really indispensable as a leader of a small but front-rank community.

Sardar Patel was the Chairman of the Minorities Committee. I happened to be in the Minorities Committees of the Constituent Assembly. He helped to save me by granting me special provisions and which was granted to no other minorities.

Before the Minorities Committee, every minority community asked for continuance of reservations which the British had given. He refused them. He refused the Muslims, he refused the Sikhs, he refused the Indian Christians and he refused me. I phoned him at night and I said: "For God's sake, let me meet you". I met him in the private lawns, the next day morning. After one hour, he came back and he referred the case to the Special Sub-Committee. Because of that, we are the only minority community, who have got special provisions in the Constitution of India. And one of those provisions is to nominate members in this House. And I sat in this House, in the first seat, for the last 40 years and I have been claimed as one of the front-rankers.

As I said, Indira Gandhi offered me the post of Vice-Presidentship of India, after I got her out.

I am a permanent member of Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial; I am a member of the Indira Gandhi Memorial. I am still the Chairman of a whole lot of All India bodies. I established in 1958, with the then Vice-Chancellor of Delhi University, the Council for Indian School Certificate Examination. We had affiliated to it 260 schools with 48,000 students. And that is the best run examining board in the country of the 26 boards.

At the age of 85 years, I celebrated the completion of 50 years of leadership of the

Anglo Indian Community. I have written a 500 pages history of our community and that book was sold out. I came to Parliament at the age of 34 elected by my community. I continued, as I said, for fifty years ..(Interruptions)... I have served from 1942 for fifty years as President -in-Chief of my community. I came at the age of 34 to the Central Legislative Assembly I was nominated by the then Viceroy.

MR. SPEAKER: May I request you to leave all these things, please?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I was a member of the National Defence Council and from that time I have always been on the Central Defence Committee. First I was on the National Defence Council. I just wanted you to know something. My friends should have known that I sat on the front bench of Parliament for 38 years.

Let me just tell you one thing about my community. I got this special provision. For a hundred years we were treated on a par with the British. The Anglo-Indian son of a British Colonel commended his father's regiment. Then the British changed. They thought we were a danger to their primacy in this country. They thought we would rise and drive them out of this country. I just wanted to say this.

Today I am the Chairman of four or five All-India bodies and I have three stenographers; I keep them busy for six to eight hours a day. I am surprised that he should have said this because he sat along with me for some time.

SHRI RAM KAPSE (Thane): Are we extending the time? if at all we are extending, up to what time? When will the voting take place? I want to know this (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Please, don't extend the time of the House beyond 6, O'Clock.

[English]

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: We may extend the House by two to three hours because we have already ordered for the dinner for all the Members of Parliament; all the Members of the House, the staff and the press also.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: Let the No Confidence Motion be continued tomorrow. You sit one hour more; but not more than that.

[Translation]

SHRI SURYA NARAYAN YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, please do not extend the time and take this business tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a long list of speakers. It would be better if all members speak on such a subject. It is Friday tomorrow and Private Members' Business is slated for tomorrow. We have to keep in mind.

(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN: There is, no more important business than the No confidence Motion. Let this be continued on Monday. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: We have to go to a temple for offering prayers. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: On a number of occasions we have sat up to 5 o'clock in the morning. If I remember, when Indiraji was here. I do not know whether my friends are very eager for the No Confidence motion or are at the same time eager to go home also...(Interruptions) ...We may continue tomorrow also because a number of hon. Members want to speak. (Interruptions)

18.00 hrs.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): No. Sir, we have to go to the temple for prayers. How can we stay (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please, be seated. This is your No-Confidence Motion and if the Government is ready to allot more time to it, then it should be welcomed. It is Friday tomorrow, we will continue the debate tomorrow also.

(Interruptions)

ANHONOURABLE MEMBER: We shall discuss it on the day after tomorrow as well.

MR. SPEAKER: If the need be there, we shall see what is to be done. But today there is a long list of speakers and everyone should be given a chance to speak. We shall have a sitting.

(Interruptions)

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA (Mandsaur): No, Mr. Speaker No,.....(Interruptions)....

MR. SPEAKER: This is a No-Confidence Motion. I am giving you time. Do you not want time?

(Interruptions)

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA: Only one member of our party has spoken whereas as many as four members of the Congress Party have spoken. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That is not so. It so happens in the House that the people are given time proportionate to their number and you will also be given enough time, we will not give time to others without giving you adequate time.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Where is the

proportion? We have not been allotted time proportionate to the number of our speakers (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please, sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KAPSE: So, what has been decided? How long would we sit and up to what time. We should decide it together. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Let us sit upto 9 'O Clock.

[Translation]

You may come back. Don't do so. after all you have tabled this No Confidence motion.

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA: To have a proper debate, it should be taken up tomorrow morning. At the moment it is not right. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Jaswant Singh, please listen to Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI RAM KAPSE: First, decide the time. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr. speaker, Sir, the debate that we are having today is very unfortunate.

Today, when Shri Sharad Yadav was speaking, he said that the debate may be continued if at all they wanted to create an atmosphere of hypocrisy, I had a feeling that Mr. Sharad Yadav was using extremely bitter words but the way this debate has been carried on and the speeches that have been made have given an impression that Mr. Sharad Yadav understands the background of the debate better than I. Because this debate had started with Atalji's speech, who is not present here, and who taught us a lesson of nobility, sincerity and tolerance. He informed us as to what are our

traditions. He presented the glorious chapter of India's past before us. It appeared as though all the nobility, tolerance, grace, fraternity and universal brotherhood which have been a part of our history since time immemorial, are once again regaining their glory. It appeared to me as if he does not have any association with the party which proudly announced that a stigma has been wiped out from Mother India. Perhaps he does not have any association with people who said with great pride and ego that with the demolition of Masjid a sign of barbarism has been removed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it appeared to me that neither they are aware of their own history nor of the dignity of the nation. It was not the Masjid that was demolished, in fact it were the India's glorious traditions, India's history, India's tolerance and India's humanistic traditions that were thrown to winds. Here many sanyasis are present, the people well-versed with Hindu culture are present, but at least, I have no knowledge whether a king, a valiant person, believing in Hindu culture, might have ever pulled down a place of worship.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I say Sir, I say this also that there has been ups and downs, many times we won and defeated but it must be remembered that in spite of the invasions of Mohammad Gori, Mohamood Ghaznavi and Changez Khan the people of India did never abandon their tolerance. But we could not erase the memories of those periods of tolerance and bitterness from the history. Today, I would like to submit Shri 'Atalji and Shri Jaswant Singh ji that out of excessive enthusiasm or for the sake of monetary political gain we have violated all the conventions. today the biggest newspaper of France "La moud" has written that secularism in India has ended forever." In India many times we witnessed the ups and downs but barring the Egyptian culture which never extincted nor broke down and met any downfall, the Hindu religion is the only surviving religion hitherto. Once I said in the House that I was proud of being a Hindu because it accepted everybody and rejected none. The Hindu religion respected all religions and accepted the merits of every religion. The Buddhism tried to abolish the

Brahmin culture in the Hindu religion, but the Hindu religion accepted Lord Buddha as an incarnation of God and worshipped him. This has been our convention, feeling, civilization and culture. Why these sobriety elegance and sensibility are no more now? The next day of the Ayodhya incident Shri Atalji stated that they were ashamed and constrained. His statement appeared in the newspapers. Shri Advani, the leader of the opposition too resigned from his post. He stated that he could not fulfill his liability and promise. He further said that his party was responsible for the blot on the country and the government arrested him. Then why you suddenly changed your attitude the very next day by breaking all the conventions when Government arrested you under an ordinary section of the IPC. You were kept in jail as a special guest only You forgot all sobreties, elegance, Indian customs, civilization manners and culture due to arresting of some persons? I was also of the view that arrests should not be made and I was against that, I was not in favour of that arrest. Even today I am not in favour of it but why after the arrest of some people you suddenly changed your attitude. Why did you change your role. Shri Indrajit Gupta rightly warned you not to ride on this lion. You turned a deaf ear to his warning and collected so many people there. Shri Advani says that one and a half lakh people were under control and were disciplined and only five hundred people were demolishing the mosque. Were the one and a half lakh people so inactive that they could not prevent five hundred persons from demolishing the mosque. Whom do you want to believe it in this world? To whom does he want to clarify it? It may be possible that they may succeed by raising this slogan. It is also possible that their number may increase in the Parliament. Three days back, I heard some of my colleagues challenging as to who would dare to build the mosque and if somebody lays even a brick there he will have his house and doors destroyed. If you do some then it must be remembered that with the destruction of the doors and houses, the glorious past of India too will be lost and its responsibility will be yours. You will be held responsible for transgressing the constitution

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

and dishonouring the Indian civilisation. This is not the only example, history has witnessed a lot of that. Those who propagate civilisation and culture in the world and talk about past glory and conventions the same people, culture, attitude and political activities produce Hitlerlike dictators. The world has witnessed it once. It shall not be witnessed again. It may witness it anywhere else in the world but it would be better if it is not of in our country. Because inspite of all bitterness India has not violated its tenets. Mr. Speaker, Sir, how did all this has happened so suddenly? I will not go into that matter. On the one hand sobriety, elegance, tolerance are being talked, on the other hand we witnessed the exhibition of valour and power, heard the provocation worlds of valour, the belligerent cries. Shri Arjun Singh is not present here this time. When he was speaking, it appeared to us as if Arjun of the Mahabharata is speaking here.

"Arjunasya pratigya vadai, na dainyam na playanam" Neither will we withdraw, not will we submit. When our colleague Shri Sharad Pawar was speaking so, I was proud of him that an hon. Minister of Defence is speaking. But what happened to such valour on the day of Ayodhya incident? I do not understand whether we are acting in a theatre or discussing a situation. This House is not a theatre, characters do not come to act here, they come to express here the sentiments of the people of the country. Drama is being inacted from both sides. Therefore, I believe that Shri Sharad Yadav understood them better than I, such politics of hypocrisy, and hypocritical exhortions will neither create the history of the country nor would check the deteriorating situation.

What is the situation in the country today. Whom will you fight? Our hon. colleagues Shri Somnath Chatterjee and Shri Indrajit Gupta were calling on table on to be united and start fighting. But with whom should we fight. Under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister we unanimously passed the resolution in the National Integration Council. We drafted that resolution. Many of

our colleagues had doubts in this regard. We assured that we will fully support you. That day, we were not relying upon Shri Indrajit Gupta Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav or Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. That day our confidence was upon Shri Advani, upon Shri Bala Saheb Deoras, saints and sadhus and we were asked to co-operate. We appreciate your feelings of co-operation, but I have a doubt in my mind which I want to put forth before the country, its people and you hon. Members. Why the meeting of the National Integration Council was summoned? Why we were asked to move a resolution for their assistance? We are not innocent children. We had no such aspiration that our co-operation should be sought to be accepted by the Prime Minister. We have no power. We are not in the Government. We do not have the support of the elites. But we respect the hon. Prime Minister with great deliberation and regard. But I have pity for the stubborn outlook of the Hon. Prime Minister. Therefore, I have again and again said that we all stand by you in this fight, because this fight is not against any particular party. I do not speak about the communal forces. This fight is for the cause of protecting the dignity and prestige of the nation. This fight is intended to survive the soul of the country. In Ayodhya incident it was not the demolition of a temple or mosque only. We were not worried so much about the demolition of a temple or a mosque only. We were not worried so much about the demolition of temples or mosques. But today the hearts of crores of people have been broken which cannot be repaired. The Government cannot awaken them merely with its speeches. The faith of 15 crore Indian people has shattered. I remember, I am forced to speak out those very things which people do not like when the sentiments of one and a half crore Sikhs were hurt, that time also I warned the Government of not doing so. That time we were ridiculed and criticised too much. History has been witness to it, and what is happening in Punjab now. Could the Government subdue them with the military force? These 15 crore Indian Muslims did not come from any Arab country or other foreign countries. They are

our brethern. Would the Government suppress them or throw and down them into the Arabian sea. Where will these 15 crore Indians go and what will be the consequence when 15 thousand of their youths will be ready to challenge the Government? I want to submit that today nobody dare to go to Punjab to accept their challenges. Nobody dare to go to accept challenge in Kashmir. In order to accept challenges the sermons of Lord Rama regarding love and humanity was made in Ayodhya, the birth place of Lord Rama. I would like to request Shri Vajpayee ji to break the small barriers even today. I do not know whether he will condemn the Ayodhya incident or not. Even if he condemns it or not but he had great regret in his heart the day he made a statesmen to the 'India Abroad'. But did everything change after the arrest of Shri Advani? Did the situation, facts under went any sea-change? Have your ideals shattered totally that day? The country has to be rebuilt. Many times arrests are made, excesses are subjected to people due to the excess which are caused by the activities of unworthy person. And you are ready to blot on this country and set the entire world allege that efforts are being made in India to deprive the people of their religious freedom.

Should all of us not feel ashamed of it. You made a statement and said that you have not portrayed a true picture here. I did not say that it was merely a structure, where 'puja' was performed there. 'Namaz' was not offered - this is true Atal ji, though nothing was there, yet, the building was as old as about 500 years or 421 years. When it will be known to any country in the world that a place of worship or whether it is not a place of worship has been pulled down in this country for political reasons, nobody in the world would appreciate you and rather the world would condemn it because our civilisation and culture are a part of our glorious history which you have damaged. Do the members of Bhartiya Janata Party feel that they would be applauded for this act in the world? I have not the least hesitation in saying that the Islamic countries leaving aside one or two, deserve thanks for the attitude they have shown towards our

country. They did not give up their tolerance. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you must be remembering you were not present there, Shri Somnath Chatterjee was there in the N.I.C. meeting when I told Shri Advani that I could understand Shri Kalyan Singh or Shri Patwa. They have to run the administration in Bhopal and Lucknow but he is the leader of opposition and has a wish to run the country and it may be possible that this responsibility may come on his shoulders too. Did he ever think what would be its reaction on the world. A new BJP leader has emerged on National scene. He told me that they did not bother about anybody in the world and that they could face everyone in the world. I did not argue anymore. I think they are very great men, who are capable to face the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad that other countries have continued to maintain their cordial relations with India honouring our ancient glorious traditions. It is worth remembering that the Islamic countries have kept alive our age old traditional friendship and kept intact their relations with this country and these people have broken the age old convention. You may call yourself as true disciple of Hindu religion and a true follower of Indian culture. I do not have any objection to it. But Atal ji Shri Jaswant Singh I had high expectations from you. (Interruptions)

I had expectations from Rajmata ji also. I had expected that she could do anything for the sake of religion but I never expected that she would let the mosque demolished.

I would like to say in clear words but I would not like to use the words Shri Indrajit has used. I would submit that Shri Muri Manohar Joshi and Shri Advani have the courage to challenge the world but why could not they stand before their own 500 workers. Why could not they face them? In view of all these happenings, I would like to know from them as how they would be capable to manage to run the country and take the nation out of the crisis. History will ask this question from you and you will have to answer it. We may not ask this question from you. Perhaps I do not have the capability

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

or the right to ask this question, perhaps the Government too may not ask in this regard. But history takes its own course, its verdicts are very hard, it ever spares anybody. In this course, there may be some delay but it will certainly decide the matter.

Many hon. Members from this side said that nothing could be done in those circumstances and that it was not possible to open fire. I would like to know as to why it was not possible? Why the Police and Army are there? Are they meant for saluting you and not to take action when required? Why this police and army are meant for? Is it not meant to take action when required? What is the concept of State? State is an aggregation of corrective powers, the society has given the responsibility to the Government to tackle the anti-social elements and if the Government fails to use the service of police and army, it means that it does not fulfill its duty. Hence, these excesses should not be made here.

It is said that there has been a gross betrayal with them. Who has betrayed to them? Who cheated them? We have not been cheated. Not myself alone but all the Members sitting this side had also warned the Government in this regard: I observe the hon. Members Shri Indrajit and Shri Somnath sitting this side that today their language is quite considerate.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Midnapore):
In whose favour?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: In favour of the Government they have suddenly become sympathetic towards the Government, we also have sympathy for the Government because these people have understood the Indian traditions, secularism and history more than the people of that side also protected it - I have no hesitation to admit this fact.

However, friends, I would not like to mention about Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and few others; because these are the persons

who took disadvantage of the name of Lord Ram for their political career and we do not have any expectations from such people. But we had a great expectation from you. When one of my friend, I do not remember who he was, perhaps he was Atal ji. He said to Shri Arjun Singh that instead of becoming so agitated, he should have resigned. Shri Arjun Singh replied in a very dramatic way that he was such a person as should run away from the responsibility; he can give a good fight. Would the fight have become ineffective if he had resigned from the Cabinet? There are a large number of Congress members, are they not capable to face the crisis, are only the Ministers capable of tackling the situation. Can he not fight if he is not a Minister? I would like to submit to him that politics is not drama, it is not an easy play. Politics require a politician to take some harsh decision too.

I would not ask you to take decision, because every persons has his own parameters of moral values and dignity. But if we fail to discharge our duties, we are supposed to perform as a public representative, nothing can be more shameful than to remain in the same post. Why is the Government finding itself in a helpless position? The people have nothing to do with the incapability of the Government. They want decision. They want to see whether the Government faced the circumstances boldly or not. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government holds the responsibility to take decision. But on the contrary, the Government blamed the police force, the army, the Intelligence Department. Do they mean that they were unaware of what was going to happen? I knew what was going to happen. I would not like to mention the names of the persons including some of the high position members of the treasury benches to whom I told in advance that the mosque would be demolished? Did I not warn the Government to prepare themselves to challenge the destructive forces? I was told at that time that if the police opened fire, it would take several lives. I said that if the Government was not ready to kill 10.20 persons. It would be responsible of killing thousands of persons.

Today, a member - again I forget who he was — Atalji said that he is very much displeased with Shri Mulayam Singh's Government. He was displeased with it at that time also. But when Shri Mulayam Singh's Government ordered to open fire, 16 lives were lost and when Kalyan Singh Government did not allow for it, 1200 lives were lost. They again say that they are not responsible for it. Shri Advani has stated that "Kalyan Singh cannot be Mulayam Singh". I do know that there is no comparison between Kalyan Singh and Mulayam Singh. Mulayam Singh could do anything to safeguard the Constitution whereas Kalyan Singh could do anything to get his order obeyed. One person obeyed the order of Re Constitution and the other obeyed the order of Sangh Pariwar. There is a difference in these two orders and we will have to know about this difference. I did know the difference but the Hon. Prime Minister did not know this difference nor Shri Arjun Singh or Shri Sharad Pawar knew it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Yes, we knew it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: You know all it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know, whether Government can justify the action of the people to the world. The irate mob climbed the mosque at 1.45 or 1.30 p.m. on December 6 and the Government remained silent till 6.15 A.M. the next day. Such an inactive Government says that they had been deceived and kept in the dark. You were not deceived, you have deceived your self and the people of the country. Therefore, I submit that participating in this discussion is very difficult. Hypocrisy is at its peak on both the sides. Where should we go? Sometimes we feel that this is a worth less Government and it should go. But then we think, on which side should we go. Should we support those who are even more hypocrites. I would like to point out that people like us, have never witnessed such a situation and never been in such dilemma. We went to jail directly from the Congress Working Committee, and there was no dilemma in our mind even for a moment. But how should I say that I have faith in this Government. Atalji it is also not possible for me to declare

this Government a useless one and to issue you a certificate of Patriotism on the basis of what was has been done by your friends. The Congress Government and not the Congressmen are responsible for this miserable condition of the country. Do not say that I want differences among the Congressmen or I am indulging in politicking. The newspaper reporters often write that we held a secret meeting with Sharad Pawar and Arjun Singh. We have their glimpse only in the House. They are afraid of losing their posts in case they meet and speak to us. None of them has met or spoken to us. They can not urge upon the hon. Prime Minister to take some action, since they want to save their position. Why should they lose the post by coming and meeting us? I do not want to go into the details. I do not want to divide the Congress Party. I would like to point out to my friends, belonging to the Congress Party, that they are responsible for this slur on the nation. You know hon. Arjun Singh ji since 1947 and you are aware of his many facets and manipulations. I have been his good friend. Even today, I consider many of them dedicated and idealists. I do not hesitate to say that you were holding the reins of power and you know everything but you remained silent. Do you also want a Krishna to teach the sermons of the Bhagwad Gita. You have gone through the Mahabharata, learned something quoted a few things from it in your speech.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, today the country is passing through a crisis, where taking a decision is very difficult. I am saying this, because our values are at stake today. Our trustworthiness is at stake today. For the first time, there is a Government in the country on whose reliability no one has faith. For the first time there is an opposition who wants to destroy the values and the entire would know about it, at least I do not have any doubt. The situation of this country is miserable. Those who are running the country are handicapped and those who are in the opposition want to have an upper hand on the Government. They want to break the traditions and destroy the values of the country. I would like to request Gurudev to help me. Where should we go and what

[Sh. Chandra Shekhar]

should we do in these circumstances. There is no use dying as 'Bhesham Pitamah' with a stigma. No one will listen to his advice. I do not know whether they have listened to his advice.

Sir, the country is facing a dreadful situation today. I want that the House should understand it and instead of levelling charges and counter charges we should realise our existence. If we have committed crime we should accept it. Atalji do not be afraid of the statement you made to 'India Abroad'. It is not good to play politics every time and change the stance. Politics does not teach us save our skin. We should bravely face the situation. I would like to submit to the hon. Prime Minister that enough is enough, but at the same time he should not take any steps in haste to save his prestige, which has received a set back because of indecision. Sacking the Governments unnecessarily is not an act of bravery. But it is a clumsy to save your prestige. Can the charges leveled against Advani ji be proved in any court? Advani ji has been arrested on the charges levelled by a police inspector. Who had advised this? Today you ban it and on the next day the High Courts give the verdict that the ban order is wrong. Don't do anything wrong to earn credit. The country will suffer and there will be clashes and conflicts. You claim to have started the politics of concensus but perhaps none of the earlier Prime Ministers have done so much harm to the political scenario of the country as during your period. Therefore, those who are in power should take care while speaking of their personality, ability and limitations and it would be gracious. The hon. Prime Minister has said that the mosque would be constructed there. Can it be constructed? The hon. Home Minister has said that it would be constructed after some time and the hon. Defence Minister has said that it would be constructed after one year or within a year. Now it is said that both the temple and mosque would be constructed there. The Bajrang Dal and the V.H.P. say that the temple would be constructed but the map will be made public, likewise hon. Narasimha Rao ji go for both

temple and the mosque but the map will not be disclosed. I do not know whether there is nexus as Shri Sharad Yadav ji has rightly pointed out. But the fact is that today the country is in trouble. Has it happened all of a sudden or some mystery is there behind it? I do not know what is the mystery behind it. It is brought to light by the people sitting on this side. But I would like to say that this sort of imertness and indecision has caused a serious set back to the image of the country. In reality if a person is conscious and has a sense of guilt he should not continue in office at any cost in the large interest of the country and for the sake of patriotism. Similarly, if Atalji has repentance for it in the real sense then he should disassociate himself with all those who have committed this crime which is a slur on the face of the nation so that the country may look at him with expectation.

Let us start afresh, and I would appeal to all sections of the House to come forward and build a new society and new values for the progress of this country.

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD (Saharan pur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I come here from my constituency, where dead bodies are lying on the roads. There are no words to describe the situation prevailing in the area. I came here to participate in the discussion which would deal with problems of assuaging the worlds of the injured, rehabilitating the displaced ones, building the nation and leading it ahead. I expected a discussion on restoring the shattered confidence of the minorities the educated once and the journalists. But I am distressed to say that none of these issues were taken up in the House. Instead a no confidence motion raised by a leader for whom I have highest regard has been taken up. I have separately said to my colleagues that today when the nation is burning, it is not an appropriate time to move a no-confidence motion, instead we should work for the restoration of confidence in the entire country. But I fail to understand why my colleagues, chose moving no confidence motion instead of making an earnest effort to restore that confidence and

remove their distress and pacify their anger. When I say this it does not mean that the person sitting on other side are totally innocent but it is not in the interest of this country to move such a motion when the whole country is burning. Today, it is the need of the hour to work for the stability of the country and we should give message to the nation to this effect that we are able to face the situation. Shri Vajpayee ji is a good friend of mine and I feel if there is any true Hindu by deed in the B.J.P. it is Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. We had a father of Nation like Mahatma Gandhi who had a true and strong will and who gave a message of unity, brotherhood, love and affection and fighting against the oppression and atrocities to this nation. He gave the message of one religion. Some two three days ago, I read a statement of Shri Vajpayee ji. But I know, there are organisations in this country who spray bullets at true, honest and good Hindus like the father of Nation Mahatma Gandhi. Its another example is Shri D.D. Upadhyaya because when he started deviating from those policies he was also given the same treatment like Mahatma Gandhi. Now Vajpayee ji also has started making statements quite the opposite of his own style. Please be beware such people. Your life is precious for us. We wish him to live long and give the message of humanity. Because fasists do not have any religion that is why they do not want true Hindus to live. They do not want to let live the people who talk of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee has raised certain issues, which he never raised earlier. He also raised the matter of having a uniform civil code and referred to the incident that took place at Sharjah and made a mention of demolition of temples in Pakistan. I appreciate his feelings and agree with him but I do not agree to the context in which he raised these matters because it may flare up sentiments and may result in a tense atmosphere. If temples have been demolished in Pakistan, every Muslim M.P. has condemned this act. It is a shame on Islam if temples are being demolished. If you wish to punish those who have demolished temples in Pakistan then we are

ready to accompany you. But do not provoke people. You made a mention of uniform civil code. There can be two argument about it. Should it be there or not? One is Directive Principal of State Policy and other is the unity and integrity of the country. Both are dear to us. I would like to tell Shri Vajpayee ji that this is the only point in the Directive Principal of State Policy which ensures unity of the country. It also has issue like removing poverty and providing education which are separate from the unity issue. Is it essential to take up this issue first. I am not prepared to accept that Uniform Civil Code provides any guarantee for the unity of the nation. An editorial was published in Indian Mirror in this regard. That is why they are under the impression that Hindu civil code is a guarantee for the unity of this country. If it is necessary to have a Uniform Civil code for this country and if you and your party think that the nation is above the religion then I ask for a Islamic Civil Code. Then we would accept it. But this is not the solution. They are not clapping, they are giving an indication that this is not the solution. Religion is much more solid than the Uniform Civil Code.....(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: The Uniform Civil Code does not give publicity to any particular religion. If it is so you may prepare a Brahmin Civil Court as well as an Islamic Civil code. You appear to be much confused.

SHRI RASHID MASOOD: I do not agree to this opinion because Civil Code is a no guarantee for the unity. Religion is a much stronger point than the Uniform Civil Code but today Pakistan and Bangladesh are two separate countries. Both these countries came into being in the name of religion as Pakistan after seceding from India against our wishes. But even after having one religion and same official language they could not remain as one country. Because the Pakistanis did not give due regard to the feelings of those living in the present Bangladesh. Therefore, Vajpayee ji in order to save this country what we need is to give due respect and love to each other feelings instead of having a common civil code and you are killing that love with your hatred. This

[Sh. Rashid Masood]

country cannot exist if we do not love each other.

Right now, you said that the rivers Yamuna and Ganga, become one, after their confluence at Allahabad, but you forgot to mention that both the rivers chart different course through Haridwar and Saharanpur before they finally converge at Allahabad. The Hindus and Muslims are like the Ganges and Yamuna in the path of India's progress. Our Hindu brethren are educated economically strong, progressive etc and they have reached Allahabad, but you don't allow the Muslims, who are akin to Yamuna, to flow beyond Saharanpur. You want to check its flow by building dams throughout its course. If these dams are built on Yamuna's way and if the river doesn't reach Allahabad, how is its Sangam or confluence possible? How will then they chart together their future course? Therefore, I would like to submit that the Indian Muslims are very backward from educational point of view also. The ordinary Muslim in the country is by and large uneducated, unemployed and insecure about the safety of his life and property. You may remember the case of Shahyar in Jamshedpur and poet Basheer Bader in Meerut. They courageously moved out of Muslim localities and settled in Hindu localities and endeavored to follow their life style, but when your party instigated the riots, the houses of Shahyar and Basheer Bader were set afire..(Interruptions) Today nobody in the Muslim community is prepared to become a Shahyar, none is willing to be a Basheer Bader(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have my reservations about it. Sir, Shri Rasheed Masood had held a responsible position like that of the Health Minister and it doesn't behove him to level irresponsible allegations to the effect that our Party had instigated the riots. If he can prove this charge, I am prepared to resign from the Lok Sabha and if he fails in it, he should tender his resignation from Lok Sabha. He has leveled such a baseless allegation, which has not been proved by any judicial authority, and

which has never been made by any other person in the past. He should accept my challenge. (Interruptions)

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit here that one Gyan Prakash Commission of Inquiry was constituted to probe the Meerut riots and it has submitted its report. I request that it may be placed before the House, so that the truth is brought to light.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: If B.J.P. is not named, then?

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: I will resign, if it is proved that your people were not involved...(Interruptions) If my Party is not satisfied with my work it can expel me. So, I am saying this with full consciousness.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH: Why is it that the riots always take place in your areas only?

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: Because, you do not win in our area and you know very well that 76 percent of my constituents are Hindus and only 24 percent Muslims and Rasheed Masood cannot win an election on the strength of the latter alone. So, you instigate these riots. Still, I have received the votes of one lakh Hindus, owing to which I won at the Hastings and in future too, I will win hands down, because I don't differentiate between Hindus and Muslims. I convey the message of love and affection while you convey that of hatred. The message of hatred has always been vanquished and it can never be victorious. Why don't you also try it out? You will also come out with flying colours. Then your victory won't be the out come of any wave, where you romp home once and lick the dust next time. So, try to win hearts through love. If you do that, your place is safe here. If not, God knows where you will be next time....(Interruptions) God willing, I will return to Lok Sabha next time also. So, don't worry on my account.

Many matters came up for discussion here, including the ban on communal outfits. I feel that this is a correct step on the part of

the Government, but some Parties which indulge in communal politics, have been spared. They should also be banned, who profess and practice the politics of hatred. All such parties should be banned. All of us should live up to that standard.

Thirdly, I would like to say that, right now, our friend Vajpayee ji was heard saying that his Party is not responsible, nor can anyone be held responsible. Now whether Vajpayeeji didn't have any such intention or whether he never expected the Kar sevaks to demolish the structure we call 'Babri Masjid', but we were fully convinced that some thing untoward will happen. That is why, on 25 th itself we apprised the Prime Minister of the situation and requested him not to wait and to take some steps on the 25th itself. If such a large crowd is allowed to be assembled there, the Government won't be able to control it, without bloodshed. Had some steps been taken at that very moment, we wouldn't have had to sit here today with our heads hanging in shame. Today, there is no uproar from this side, they are not in an aggressive mood anymore, it is good that even they are feeling ashamed. They are ashamed over the happenings in Ayodhya, but don't want to express it. I would like to know, as to why Advaniji and Joshiji went to collect the crowds, if their intensions were sincere. If symbolic Kar seva was the objective, why was it necessary to collect two lakh people there? Even 10,000 people could have carried out the symbolic Kar seva. It could have been done, while sitting in Delhi and by issuing an appeal. A symbolic Kar seva could have been carried out in Delhi also, by gathering some people. What's more, Advaniji in his speeches at Benares and Kanpur had openly said that the Kar seva would not be limited to a symbolic Kar seva. I can produce the newspaper reports to this effect, if you may desire so and everything will become clear to you. What more evidence do you require? He has spread hatred between the Hindus and Muslims.

Just now Shri Sharad Yadav gave the example of the relationship between Mother-in-law, daughter-in-law and brother-in-law,

may be he has left the House now, but so far as the question of Minorities is concerned, I find all of them to be birds of the same feather. The Mother-in-law-Daughter-in-law quarrels are understandable, but will the Brother-in-law be kind enough to tell us, whether you kept any promises, you made to the Muslims in your manifesto, when your Government was in power? Despite being a Minister, I wrote a letter to you requesting you to make only those promise in the manifesto, which can be fulfilled, otherwise it's better not to incorporate them. I wrote to you when I was a Minister and also earlier that you have not kept any of the promises made to Muslims. It was read out at the meeting held at Shri Syeed's residence. Not a single promise has been fulfilled. We should not try to make political mileage out of the current vitiated atmosphere in the country. The need of the hour is for all the patriots, all those who want the country to progress and develop, all those who want to create an atmosphere of love and goodwill, all those who want to follow the path shown by Lord Ram, to unite and march forward.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhansi): You should have resigned, when you failed to keep up the promises made to the minorities. Why didn't you resign ?

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: I would have certainly done that. If you had allowed that Government to continue for a few more days, I would have certainly resigned. In that letter also, I had mentioned that I would be left with no option, but to resign, but the Government didn't last long.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in this very Parliament. The people of this country had sent me to this august House. I am not here at your mercy. I would like to ask a question, whose answer I am yet to get. Ram is considered as a God by all Hindus, but who has given that copyright to the B.J.P.? If Ram is a God, it's of all mankind, not of B.J.P. alone and of the B.J.P. wants to become the sole proprietor of Ram, then it is an insult to Ram. Therefore, it is my request to you that we should all unitedly endeavour,

[Sh. Rashid Masood]

at the grassroot level itself, to restore the confidence of all those whose confidence has been shattered and secondly, we should fight against communalism, not only at the political level, but at the social level also. (Interruptions)

I am more eager to fight for the cause of temples than you are prepared to join Vajpayeeji in his mission to inflict punishment on the vandals who destroyed temples in Pakistan.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. V.S. Rao, you please conclude by 7'0 Clock,

[English]

SHRI SOBHADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words on this important matter.

It is an irony today that the Motion of No-Confidence has been moved by a party which has acquired the status of main Opposition party in both Houses of parliament and was also in power till very recently in four States... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SATYAPAL SINGH (Shahjahanpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, they caused all the quarrels, but we didn't allow them to succeed in Shahjahanpur. They created trouble in Bareilly. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Anola): Mr. Speaker, Sir, please allow me to clarify.

MR. SPEAKER: You see, it's not a question of clarification, please don't talk about friendship and enmity. We have to conclude it by 7'0 Clock. Therefore, please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record. Shri V. S. Rao to continue please...

(Interruptions) *

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is going on recorded...

(Interruptions) *

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Sir, the party which is the main Opposition party in both Houses of Parliament and which, till very recently, was in power in four States has not shown respect to the Constitution. We have made it clear in our Preamble that this country will stand for secularism. Originally it was thought the word 'secularism' need not be there in the preamble. During the time of Shrimati Indira Gandhi an amendment was made through which we have very clearly stated that we stand for secularism. But this party has made it very clear that it has no respect for that secular characteristic of our Constitution. And also, in spite of its solemn undertaking to the Supreme Court, it did not keep its word. It is most unfortunate that some hon. Members of this very House, who have given an undertaking to the Supreme Court that nothing will be done to negate the Court orders did not keep their word.

Sir, the events of 6th December are really bad. They can only be described as the events of the blackest day in the post-independence era of our country. The consequences are disastrous. We have witnessed many things. How many hundreds of people have lost their lives? Property worth crores of rupees has been damaged. The loss is much more. The greatest damage has taken place to the communal harmony. The repercussions outside the country are also enormous.

This country, with a population of 85 crores of people, has shown the path of

peace and non-violence by the Father of the Nation. this country, under the leadership of late Jawaharlal Nehru, has given a distinctive path. The leadership was given by Nehruji and other leaders. This country has emerged as a strong force of non-alignment. Today the prestige of this country has been eroded to the greatest extent.

What is the position of our country amongst foreign countries? Here is a Government which has failed to protect a structure with all the army and central paramilitary forces at its command. The hon. Prime Minister has declared from the ramparts of the Red Fort that this Government will protect this structure. But we have witnessed that it was crumbled to peaches by the 'kar sevaks' who gathered at Ayodhya on the 6th. This has clearly shown to what objectives the B.J.P., the V.H.P., the R.S.S. and the Bajrang Dal and other organisations stand. What is their real face?

While Lord Rama has sacrificed his power to keep up the word of His father, here is a party which has given an undertaking to the Court; but it has not struck to the words and the commitments it has given to the Court just to grab power and to achieve its political objectives. I do not understand how can they really claim to be the devotees of Lord Rama. Lord Rama stood for truth, and the 'Satya'. But this party and their friends stand and represent untruth and riots.

It is most unfortunate that the hon. Prime Minister has belovéd their words.

19.00 hrs.

When we all met him on 2nd, we told him, 'You take all necessary steps, Sir, to protect the structure and implement the court order. Most probably he had a strong belief and faith in their words that they would not touch the structure and they would not do anything which might go contrary to the court order. We do not deny his, or we do not question his idea to bring a solution to this problem a few months back when he negotiated with the Sadhus. We have appreciated his stand and his efforts to bring

a stop to the kar seva programme there without shedding any blood and through peaceful means. But here lakhs of people were being invited by BJP and their friends to gather at Ayodhya and when their were contradictory statements by various leaders of VHP, Bajrang Dal and RSS, though some had given a solemn undertaking to the Court that they would abide by the Court Order, but some others said, 'No, we need not abide by the Court Order, we are not bound by the Court Order.' When that was the situation, the hon. Prime Minister should have taken the alternative measure. In fact, when the Home Minister was replying to the debate on 3rd of this month, he said, there was a contingency plan. But what has happened to that contingency plan? What happened? You had sent 135 companies of para-military forces to Ayodhya, but with what result? When that structure was bring demolished, they were at Faizabad. Sir, I question the wisdom of the hon. Prime Minister with due respect to him. What has happened to the Intelligence reports from your people from there? Are you not aware that the District Magistrate of Faizabad and the Senior Superintendent of Police of Faizabad were not given the power by the Kalyan Singh Government' to take necessary steps to meet the situation if something goes wrong. If somebody goes mischievously to damage the structure, you take all necessary action, you issue orders, if necessary, including taking to firing also.' If that was not so, when the powers were not given, how were you sure that the structure would remain safe? So, Sir, I say with all agony and anguish that apart from this treachery of the Constitution on the part of the BJP, this Government also has failed miserably to protect the structure and to implement the Court Order. And it is also your bounded duty which the Constitution has put on your shoulders. And today this country has lost the credibility among other countries as this Government is most incompetent and it is not effective enough to protect the interests of the minorities of this country. Sir, I also say with all due respect that it was the first citizen of this country who had to advise this Government that 'something is going wrong at Ayodhya. There are reports that the structure is being

[Sh. Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde]

demolished and it is going to cause a lot of communal holocaust. Act now, you immediately act. It is, Sir, much later this Cabinet has met and it appears to have taken a decision to dismiss the Kalyan Singh Government.

But by that time itself Kalyan Singh Government has resigned and the Chief Minister has sent his resignation letter to the Governor of Uttar Pradesh. If that is so, is it fair on your part to do like this. Is this the proper way to discharge the responsibility that has been given by the National Integration Council. What had happened then? On 7th also you had not acted and you had allowed the *kar sevaks* there to clean the ground, to level the ground and then to instal Ram Lala's idols there and construct a compound wall there. What is the position today? Now, you have promised to construct the masjid there. Where will you construct and how will you construct the masjid?

Sir, the events that had happened are creating an impression to the people that the Government have a certain understanding with the BJP and their friends in allowing all these things. On 7th also, the security forces had not moved and they simply allowed the *kar sevaks* to be there to construct a compound wall there. On 8th of December, when the central forces went there, the so-called *kar sevaks* also had left Ayodhya. So, it has given a strong impression that this Government has some underhand connection with the BJP and their friends which has shattered the confidence of the people of this country.

Sir, we support the Government's action of banning the communal organisations whole-heartedly. These communal organisations are trying to out communal hatred in the country. I remember that one of the leaders, who was there at Ayodhya after the demolition of the mosque, having said that it is but natural that the suppressed feelings of the large number of people have found their way. But, it is not so. You have inspired the communal hatred and you have

made a subtle and concerted propaganda of communal hatred among a section of our population against the others and you have incited them. Some hundreds of years ago, some atrocities or some aberrations might have taken place. In that way, several aberrations have taken place. There were days when Dr. Ambedkar, after completing his education in India, after getting Doctorate from abroad and being Defence Secretary, in a princely state he was not given a house to reside at Baroda. When he stayed in a Parsi choultry in a choultry, his belongings were thrown out because he came from a mahar community. Can somebody go now and say that it had happened like that in those days and so now retaliate? Do you support that? Do you want to go forward or do you want to go centuries backward? So, our party supports the Government's efforts to take stern action on all the communal organisations.

I also urge upon the Government that if anybody says that there is still the issue of Mathura or Varanasi, the first people who advocate such things should be taken to task and they must not be permitted to do it. Enough is enough. Already the country has paid the highest price. No more price should be paid and, therefore, there should not be further communal hatred and other things.

I also express our strong reservations over the Government's decision of throwing out the three State Governments in Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh. Through those Governments belong to the BJP Party, the reasons shown are those Governments have failed to maintain law and order. Whereas in Maharashtra where your Congress Government is there, more number of people have died. More number of people have died in Gujarat. We fully agree that we entertain the same idea which Shri Indrajit Gupta has said. If those three State Governments had not implemented or did not implement the ban orders issued by your Government, if they did not arrest those persons and leaders belonging to the communal organisations which are banned and if those Governments failed to take any steps against such communal elements or

organisation then, you should have dismissed those State Governments. We do not question that. We do not dispute that. But without doing that, your action of dismissing them may help the BJP indirectly because they will exploit the issue. Till now they were in a great disadvantageous position or in a defamed position to explain the people how they have demolished the Babri Masjid structure or how they are responsible for the communal holocaust. Today they will try to picture your Party as a Party which has murdered democracy or which has no response for the Constitution and the federal set up. You are giving a handle to these communal and political parties, which want to take the political advantage out of your wrong decisions.

While we support the Governmental efforts to contain communal organisations, we only appeal that the Government should not allow such things to happen in future. We urge upon the Government to take all necessary steps to help the dependents of those people who have lost their lives and those who are put to a lot of sufferings.

My suggestion to the Government is, you do not allow communal organisations, to whatever community they belong to, to take advantage. The issue is not yet resolved finally. The main issue which you want to refer to the Supreme Court is still there. You refer the matter to the Supreme Court under article 138 (2) whereby the fact be ascertained

whether there was a temple before construction of masjid or not. If the Supreme Court comes to a definite conclusion that there was a temple, let Ram temple be constructed there and masjid can be constructed adjacently. If it is proved that the temple was not there before the construction of Babri masjid there, the Babri masjid should be reconstructed in the same place and the Ram temple may be constructed adjacently. I appeal to the Government also to construct a church and a Gurudwara at Ayodhya as a symbol of communal harmony for which Lord Ram, Gautam Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi have shown the path not only to this country but to the entire world.

MR. SPEAKER: It appears that everybody wants to leave the House now. But only request I have to make is, tomorrow happens to be Friday. Immediately after the question hour, we should start the discussion. Let us have question hour. Immediately after question hour, we will start discussion.

I thank you very much for extending cooperation. The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow Friday, 18th December, 1992.

19.15 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven
of the Clock on
Friday December 18, 1992/Agrahayana
27, 1914 (Saka)*