

statement, "This is my prerogative to decide whose company I shall keep"— and this House clapped-and said, "Yes." And I ceased to be a Minister! I had already ceased to be a Minister. You accepted the prerogative of the Prime Minister. At that time, the Prime Minister was exercising his prerogative to part company which he did not like. But, Sir, the power to divorce includes the power to embrace! When he has decided that he wants these three Ministers, that he shall have nothing to do with their resignation, he believes in their innocence!

Sir, one last word. Somebody has said, "Why should the Prime Minister make a public statement?" According to me, the Prime Minister owes it to the people of India to make a statement. If the Opposition shouts and shouts that he has kept tainted Ministers in his Cabinet, does he not owe a duty to the people of India to tell them that 'I am not such a wicked Prime Minister that I keep tainted Ministers?'¹ Does he not owe an explanation to the people who have made him the Prime Minister of this country? He must tell them, "I believe in the innocence of my Ministers and I know that no court is, ultimately, going to convict them". I would not express an opinion on the facts of a case which is *sub judice*. This *sub judice* doctrine is a little... *interruptions*)... Sir, one more sentence and I finish. This *sub judice* doctrine that you should not make comments upon a pending case has now been completely revolutionised. The European Court of Human Rights has reversed the law of the British House of Lords. Now, the law is that even if a matter is *sub judice*, you can make comments upon it, if it is a matter of great public importance. And, surely, whether a Prime Minister should continue to have three Ministers in his Cabinet is a matter, in a democracy, of the greatest importance and, particularly, a Prime Minister who did not make this statement until he was provoked by the Opposition, by an angry Opposition, where the anger was wholly unjustified. Thank you.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development
(Amendment) Bill, 2000.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (Amendment) Bill, 2000, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th December, 2000."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

**MOTION EXPRESSING DISAGREEMENT WITH REPORTED
STATEMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER IN REGARD TO
THREE MINISTERS OF THE UNION CABINET AGAINST
WHOM C.B.I. HAS COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS AND
FILED CHARGESHEETS Contd.**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): Mr. C. Ramachandraiah. You have 15 minutes.

SHRI KHAN GHUFRAN ZAHIDI : Up to what time are we going to sit?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA): We will continue as long as you would like to continue. We have to finish it today. As long as you want to sit, we will continue.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, this debate is going on since morning. Every colleague of mine has elaborately exhibited his legal expertise to build up his own case. As one of my colleagues was saying, what I would like to know is whether we are really interested in minorities. Now, I would like to pose a question to my Congress friends: Are you really interested? What made you to respond to this statement? What made you to open the rusty gates enabling the Shilanyas to be performed? Why did Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao behave like the proverbial hero when the Masjid was demolished? In my opinion, the two major political parties do not have any credentials to talk about the welfare of the minorities. Obviously, it might have been raked up because of the UP elections. It may be true. I am rather surprised as to what made the Prime Minister to pick up this controversial issue at this juncture. *interruptions*)... I am not talking in your favour. Something may be palatable to you. But I am not talking in favour of you.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) in the Chair.]

It is true that it has created a very big controversy and tension. I can proudly say that I was the first man to comment on it. It was a most unwarranted and uncalled for statement. It has created tension. It is true

that in some part of the country there was some adverse impact. But, ultimately, the Prime Minister has clarified that he will stick to the agenda of the NDA. The greatest doubt is whether he will be allowed to honour his commitment. Will he be allowed to honour his commitment? I have great personal respect for Mr. Vajpayee,

Sir, I would like to quote two issues. The BJP President, Shri Bangaru Laxman, said that as the Congress was influenced by Gandhi, the BJP is being influenced by RSS and its outfits like the Bajrang Dal and the VHP. They have pronounced, "The judgement of the Supreme Court is totally irrelevant to us. We are not concerned about the judgement. We are going to construct a temple". In this scenario, can the Prime Minister be allowed to honour his commitment? We have got our own apprehensions. Sir, some hon. Members have made some suggestions to the allies. We are not a member of the NDA. We are not their constituents, it is true that we went to the polls with a common agenda. Sir, being a representative of the Telugu Desam Party, I owe an explanation. We went to the polls with a common minimum agenda. We insisted on the BJP to keep the three contentious issues in the cold storage and they declared a moratorium on the three contentious issues for a period of five years. It is on record. The elections were fought with this manifesto and the BJP emerged as the single largest party. We extended our support to the Government not for any advantage. We are not seeking any favour from the Government. We did not support the Government out of any helplessness. It is not that we do not have any other alternative. It is not that we are at the Hobson's choice. We have got our own alternatives. We have got our own choice. I would like to declare that we have extended our support to the Government in the interest of the nation. We are driven between the deep sea and the devil. We have chosen the deep sea. We know how to swim in it. We can swim to the shore. We have got that expertise. We put forth a condition that if any policy of the Government or any action of the Government leads to or is detrimental to the interests of the minorities or secular interests, we will withdraw our support. We have said this umpteen times. It is on record. We cannot pull down the Government on every issue. We have still got full confidence in the Prime Minister who is a responsible leader of a national stature. He will stick to the National Agenda for Governance. The whole country knows that even for a genuine issue of our State like the farmers' issue, we have been fighting with the Government. We have staged dharnas also. Today, the Lok Sabha was adjourned. What are the favours which we are receiving

from the Government? In the Lakdawalla Commission, we had been put to a lot of difficulties, in the 11th Finance Commission, we had been put to a lot of difficulties. So far as the procurement of paddy is concerned, we have been totally discriminated against Punjab and Haryana, We are not receiving any favours from the Government. We are not at the mercy of the Government. But we care more about the national interests. At this juncture, we felt that the country cannot afford to go for polls again, it would send a wrong signal to the investors abroad and the country's economy will be in doldrums. Keeping this in view, we have extended our support. I can proudly say that till now we have been controlling the Government so that they do not deviate from the agenda. We have told the Government to keep the three contentious issues in the cold storage as long as we are associated with them. That is why we want to make it clear to other political parties and my friends sitting here that we are not at the mercy of this Government.

We need not be guided by your suggestions. And we are second to none in upholding secularism and we don't need to learn secularism from anybody. Depute anybody to the State of Andhra Pradesh and you will know what the TDP Government is doing for the minorities there. And what was your role in 1984 in the anti-Sikh riots? You are shedding crocodile tears here. Sir, it is a coalition Government, — the Prime Minister is *here*; I hope our views will be conveyed to the Prime Minister -- and his contribution to the political lexiconism is substantial. He has propounded the theory of 'coalition dharma'. What is that 'dharma'? Should it be one-sided or two-sided? So, I urge upon the Government that the so-called 'coalition dharma' should be pursued in the interests of all the coalition parties, of all the friendly parties, of the NDA. Sir, I am making an impartial statement because we are not at the mercy of anybody. We do not need any help from anybody. We have got our finances. We are fighting our own problems in the State. We had gone to the people with a particular agenda, and this coalition Government, which got the moral support of certain political parties won the elections on that agenda. Now, if there is going to be any deviation, then I warn the Government that they would be betraying their allies; it would be a betrayal of not only their allies, but they would also be betraying the nation. Kindly don't do it. And what made the Prime Minister to take up this issue? Definitely, it has created a controversy; it has created a lot of confusion. The country's prestige has gone down in the comity of nations. You may defend yourselves. You can give your own interpretation. And the other side can give their own

interpretations of Islam, Gita and so on. But, unfortunately, everything is a politicised interpretation, if it is a truly spiritual interpretation, then it is well and good; it will be good to the humanity. But every interpretation is politicised. Also, I appeal to the Government to advise its Ministers and its party leaders to talk with restraint. What made Shri Laxman to make a statement that if the Court framed charges against the three Ministers, then there would be a national agitation? What is the respect your groups have got towards judiciary? And the Prime Minister has gone on record saying, at the time while he was demanding the resignation of Shri Ram Jethmalani, that he wanted to ensure that there was harmony among the three wings of Parliamentary democracy. This is what he stated, to be the reason for demanding his resignation. What happens now? You want to undermine the Indian judiciary. What is the signal you want to send to the judiciary? And I need not say that you are trying to pre-judge the decision of the Court. It is quite obvious. Everybody can infer it. Again, Shri Laxman had stated, while speaking in the Lok Sabha, the Motion that was being discussed was totally different -- that Parliament had endorsed the view that the temple could be constructed at the disputed site. I would like to remind the Government that they do not have an absolute majority. The Prime Minister has gone on record; and, with your permission, I quote some portions from the debate of the Lok Sabha. I will take only two minutes more. "I gave reply to a pointed question of a Pressman. I have not made a *suo motu* statement. And I have given the correct answer". Then, a CPM Member asks, "Have you given the correct answer?". The answer was, "Whether this is correct or not, I am prepared for a debate. I am prepared to go to the people on the mandir issue". Is it a threat to us? Is it a threat to the other parties? What exactly is in the mind of the Prime Minister? *interruptions*) He said it. I didn't bring it with me; otherwise I would have quoted him. What is this threat? Who is afraid of going to polls? Very recently, we have won with a thumping majority in Andhra Pradesh. We won amidst the so-called anti-incumbency syndrome. Our contribution to the people of Andhra Pradesh is such that they have tremendous confidence in the leadership of Chandrababu Naidu and the Telugu Desam Party. We are prepared. These people have to decide whether they are prepared for polls or not. We are not afraid. But the only constraint, we feel, is that frequent elections in the country are not good for our economy. It also sends a wrong signal to the industrialists. That is the only constraint that we have been facing. Otherwise, we are ready to go to polls. If you want to deviate from the NDA agenda, have your own

manifesto. Let us go to polls. The people will decide. Then, we will not create any problem for you. These are all facts that should be taken into consideration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You have to conclude now.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I am concluding now, Sir. I want to tell my friends, who have been advising us since morning - an umpteen number of speakers have been trying to tell this to us - that we need not learn secularism from anybody. TDP is committed to secularism. It is one of the pillars and the edifice of the TDP. So, as long as the BJP is committed to secularism, we will continue to be with them. The moment they deviate from the NDA agenda, we put it on record that we will not hesitate to desert you. Thank you.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA "(West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion that has been moved by the hon. Member, Shri Pranab Mukherjee and on which Motion, 23 other hon. Members of this House have joined. The Motion is, "That this House expresses its disagreement with the reported statement of the Prime Minister in which he has given a clean chit to three Ministers of the Union Cabinet namely Shri L.K. Advani...", and so on. Sir, had I been free or had I been in a position to use my option, I would have substituted the word 'disagreement' with 'indignation'. I would have said, "That this House expresses its indignation with the reported statement of the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee", where he has not only exonerated the three Ministers who have been charge sheeted by the CBI, but, at the same time, he has also expressed that this is an expression of national sentiment. However, before I go into that, let me very honestly and frankly declare, at the very outset, that neither me nor my party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, nor anyone having a rational, modern and humanistic mindset believes that by keeping the religion and religiosity at play, one can be secular. The Indian concept of secularism, according to me, is an Idealisation and romanticisation of the 19th century universalist ideas, integrated into a bourgeois political structure. Our experience from the pages of history of the 19th century is enough proof that neither respect for all religions, nor the idea of unity of God-head in themselves could create secularism. Instead, they circumscribe the social consciousness within religious parameters and thus keep the possibility open for particularistic and antagonistic tendencies to re-emerge at opportune moments. This is precisely the weakness of the Indian notion of secularism. This is what I believe, because it keeps religions in play and

enhances religiosity, it preserves and projects religious identities and thus increases the social distance, the social imbalance between different religious communities. This is so far as my personal faith is concerned, or, so far the faith or the confidence of any rational thinking person is concerned. Even if we take what the Indian Constitution says, that also does not endorse the views, as expressed by some of our friends in the House even today.

Sir, it has to be noted -- as I have very seriously noted -- that many of our hon. Members - I was hearing them very patiently - were confused. They do believe that mythology is history and whatever is written by their friends or their like-minded persons, is history. Also, what is more surprising is that, in the morning, when I was hearing Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, the Minister of Rural Development, he was making a point that the NDA Agenda is the agenda of development. He was telling that the NDA Government was committed to development. If at all development is a criteria, if at all they really believe, when the Members of the Treasury Benches are making loud proclamations about development and their commitment to the developmental programmes, let me inform them, through you, Sir, that even the developments which they are talking about, when compared with the European experience, as we understand from history about the Industrial Revolution, which led to a plethora of developments in the European mainland, that was preceded by the Scientific Revolution in Western Europe, which transformed the outlook of the people of Europe, and made people fight petty particularism. But, in India, unfortunately, the colonial rule was of two centuries or since the 18th century, had created a process of transformation in ideas and attitudes, that had been taking place. It fostered religious obscurantism and intellectual backwardness, as it set up a conformist capitalism in place of the old ones. It did not fight the vestiges or the vices of feudalism, it has conformed with feudalism and capitalism kept the religions and religiosity at play; and at the time of crisis it has used religion, or played the religious card, as and when it suited them. The loud champions of the so-called development are not at all moving in right direction, I proclaim it; because they are now referring to something, they are referring and trying to promote medieval obscurantism.' What has been obscurant, they are trying to promote it and make it contemporary to subserve the interests of the international bosses, in fact.

Sir, I will say that the expression of the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, was not at all on the spur of the moment. I am not a person who has an iota of doubt that there is a difference between Atal

[18 December, 2000]

RAJYA SABHA

Bihari Vajpayeeji and Shri Advaniji or others, the so-called hardliners and softliners, I don't believe in that. I believe that the Bharatiya Janata Party and its cohorts are out to subserve the interests of their imperialist forces. They are trying to follow that policy vigorously. When the dispensation, the fallout of the new economic policy is creating a bad impact on the people, they are trying to divert the attention of the people. When the entire country is throbbing with the strikes, with the protests of workers, when the post? I employees were on strike for their just and legitimate demands, when the electricity workers in different parts of the country were agitating, when the farmers are languishing, when thousands of Maruti Udyog Limited workers were agitating, staging dharanas, day in and day out, spending cold nights near Udyog Bhavan, when the crisis has precipitated; when the people are feeling the backlash of the so-called developmental programmes of the Government of India, Shri Atal Bihari Vajapayee has tried to divert the attention of the people from the real issues to the non-issues. He has created a non-issue as an issue, only with a surreptitious intention of diverting the attention of the people and to subvert' the process of democratic thinking of the people.

Sir, here I am agitated. My indignation is here. My point of expressing indignation is here. Shri Atal Bihari Vajapayee, as a Prime Minister, has not only used the religious card, the communal card, at the same time, he has not only betrayed the minorities—I don't consider that* he has betrayed the minority community alone-- he has not only betrayed the religious people, he has not only betrayed the religious Hindus only, but also he has betrayed the entire nation. He has betrayed the vast majority of the poor people of this nation. By this, he has ensured that the Parliament can't hold its session for 8-10 days. Many important discussions, many notices for Calling Attention were given, on Maruti Udyog Limited workers, on postal employees and on different matters.

Sir, I warn this Government that unless a diversion comes from this sort of mala fide practice, they can't contain the wrath of the people. They can't contain the moods of the people. The people are on the streets now. The people have started moving. The people have started agitating. The people have started expressing their indignation. Unless we see to it that the Government changes this stance, days ahead are very difficult for the entire country of ours.

Sir. I am also not in a mood to continue for long; I know that the House too is not in a mood; I understand your language. I conclude here. Thank you very much.

श्री गांधी आज़ाद(उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव श्री प्रणब मुखर्जी द्वारा लाया गया है मैं न इसके पक्ष में हूँ और न इसके विपक्ष में हूँ क्योंकि ये दोनों दल, बहुजन समाज के लिए एक तो सांपनाथ है और दूसरा नागनाथ है। इसलिए मैं तटस्थ रहकर अपनी बात सदन के माध्यम से आगे बढ़ाना चाहता हूँ।

महोदय, दुनिया के दूसरे देश इक्कीसवीं सदी में पहुंचकर वैज्ञानिक प्रगति के माध्यम से ग्रहों एवं उपग्रहों में विचरण का प्रयास कर रहे हैं। वहीं आज खेद केसाथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि हमारे देश की लोक सभा और राज्य सभा मन्दिर मस्जिद की चर्चा में सिकुड़ कर के मैं समझता हूँ कि चौदहवीं सदी की ओर लौट रही है और इस कृत्य पर मैं समझता हूँ देश ही नहीं बल्कि पूरी दुनिया आश्चर्यचकित है। महोदय, कोई कहता है मस्जिद गिराई गई, कोई कहता है, मन्दिर गिराया गया, कोई कहता है विवादित ढांचा गिराया गया। लेकिन यह सच है कि 6 दिसम्बर को कोई न कोई चीज़ जरूर गिराई गई और इसे गिरा कर के भारत मां के मन्दिर का अपमान किया गया, भारत मां के ढांचे को गिराया गया। यह गर्व की बात नहीं है बल्कि यह दिन देश के लिए एक कलंक की बात है। इस कृत्य के लिए भारतीय जनता पार्टी और कांग्रेस दोनों दोषी हैं और साथ ही साथ समाजवादी पार्टी भी दोषी है। कांग्रेस पार्टी ने ताला खोल कर, शिलान्यास कर के अगर आग लगाने का काम किया तो वही समाजवादी पार्टी ने बाबरी मस्जिद पर परिंदा पर नहीं मार सकता है, यह भाषण दे कर हिन्दुत्व संटीमेंट्स को उकसाने का भी काम किया और वहीं पर बी.जी.पी. के लोगों ने कार सेवा कर के उस जलती हुई आग में घी डालने का काम किया। महोदय, हमारे प्रधानमंत्री बहुत ही नैतिक हैं, चरित्रवान हैं, इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं जो सन् 1998 में प्रधानमंत्री बनने पर ही प्रमाणित हो जाता है। जिस जयश्री राम के भरोसे प्रधानमंत्री जी कुर्सी पर आए थे केवल कुर्सी बचाने के लिए जयश्री राम को छोड़ कर के और भ्रष्टाचार मुक्त सरकार बनाने के बजाय भ्रष्टाचार में लिप्त जय जयललिता, जय जय सुख राम की शरण में गये। यह हमारे प्रधानमंत्री की नैतिकता का द्योतक है। आज भी प्रधानमंत्री जी अपनी नैतिकता और प्रतिबद्धता के प्रति सचेत हैं, इसमें रंचमात्र भी संदेह नहीं क्योंकि आज भी कुर्सी के स्वार्थ के लिए प्रधानमंत्री जी ने बी.जे.पी. का मन्दिर एजेंडा छोड़ दिया है। इतना ही नहीं, धारा 370 को उन्होंने छोड़ दिया है और राष्ट्रीय जनतांत्रिक गठबंधन के राष्ट्रीय एजेंडे से परे हुए हैं। यह सब कुर्सी के स्वार्थ के लिए उन्होंने छोड़ दिया है। यह उनके दल का एजेंडा तो नहीं है लेकिन उनके दिल का एजेंडा जरूर है जिसके कारण अपने दिल की बात कहने से अपने आप को रोक नहीं पाए और उनको कहना पड़ा कि राम मन्दिर बनाना राष्ट्रीय गौरव की बात है। दिल के द्वारा वे हिन्दुत्व की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं और दल द्वारा धर्म निरपेक्षता और संविधान की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं। यह उनके नैतिक और चरित्रवान होने का द्योतक है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम): आपको भाषण समाप्त करना पड़ेगा।

श्री गांधी आज़ाद: बहुत जल्द समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। हिन्दू बाहुल्य देश में अगर यह कहा जाए मन्दिर वहीं बनेगा तो यह माइट इज़ राइट अर्थात् जिसकी लाठी उसकी भैंस की कहावत को चरितार्थ करता है। अगर इस देश में यह कहा जाए कि मस्जिद वहीं बनेगी तो यह प्रमाणित करता है कि यह धर्म निरपेक्षता और संविधान की रक्षा का द्योतक है। मेरी राय में देश के हित के लिए, जनहित के लिए, न्याय के लिए, यह आम बात भी है कि जिसका घर जहां गिरता है, वहीं पर दोबारा घर भी बनाता है। मेरी राय में मस्जिद वहीं गिरी है तो मस्जिद भी वहीं बनानी चाहिये। यह मेरी राय है और मेरी पार्टी की राय है कि मस्जिद वहीं बननी चाहिए। रहा सवाल

9.00 P.M.

मन्दिर का, उपयुक्त जगह खोजिये और मन्दिर भी बनाइये। मेरा अपना मत है कि अगर इससे भी काम नहीं चलता है तो संविधान के सम्मान के लिए, विवाद की समाप्ति के लिए उस स्थान को राष्ट्रीय स्मारक घोषित कर दिया जाए।

या इससे भी काम नहीं बनता है तो आइए अदालत के फैसले का इंतजार ही कर लिया जाए। जैसा होगा वैसा किया जाएगा। लेकिन आए दिन ये तीनों दल — कांग्रेस, भाजपा और समाजवादी पार्टी जो नूरी कुश्ती करते हैं — दौरा नूरी कुश्ती का दिखावा करके जो देश की जनता को भ्रमित करते हैं...(व्यवधान)... इन दलों से अनुरोध है कि इस प्रकार का नाटक करना बंद करें। यह देश हित में नहीं है। देश की जनता से इस सदन के समक्ष या सदन के माध्यम से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि इन नूरा कुश्ती लड़ने वालों के धोखे में न आएं। भ्रम में न पड़ें और मन्दिर मस्जिद का झगड़ा छोड़कर ऐसा सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण बनाएं ताकि भारत मां का मन्दिर सुदृढ़ हो सके और उसमें कहीं किसी प्रकार की दरार न आ सके। धन्यवाद महोदय, आपने समय दिया।

SHRI CHO S. RAMASWAMY (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if this House passes this resolution, I am afraid we would be holding the concerned three Ministers guilty because the resolution reads, "This House expresses the disagreement with the reported statement of the Prime Minister giving them a clean chit." The Prime Minister has said that they are innocent, and if the House expresses disagreement with it, it means that they are guilty. Hence, I would urge the House not to pass this Motion because we are not the forum which can hold anyone guilty or not guilty either. Sir, let me make one thing clear. I had condemned the demolition of the Babri Masjid in no uncertain terms. In fact, I went to the extent of publishing a black wrapper in my journal to mark the sorrow of this nation over this incident. That is my attitude today also. But then how can we hold that these three Ministers are responsible for it? Mr. Kapil Sibal also conceded at one point that it is for the courts to decide a person's guilt or innocence. But he opened his remark with a poem in which he said that these persons must be put behind bars. That was his judgment. It was a contradiction, but it has made his attitude clear. The courts are there, but if you are going to question the propriety, let me ask this, what is the ground on which the propriety is questioned of these Ministers continuing in office? It is this that they are in a position to alter the course of investigation. In that case, there are several cases filed by the Government, investigated by the CBI, against so many politicians who are not well disposed towards the Government. Will they not be able to alter the course of investigation in those cases? Can they continue in office then? Then, how can a Government function? So unless a person is held guilty, I think, it will be

for the person to decide whether he should continue in office, at what stage of an investigation or a case. It should not be the prerogative of the House to say that. It was an exhilarating sight to see the sudden upsurge in various sections of this House of respect towards the judiciary because, very recently, we circumvented the Supreme Court's decision in the case relating to reservations and promotions. Again, when there was the court order to remove the polluting units in New Delhi, the court was taken to task. Mr. Kapil Sibal went to the extent of saying that if those people who are guilty of creating public disorder, creating a riotous situation, being an unlawful assembly, damaging public property, if they are hooligans, then I am also a hooligan. Why did he make that statement? Because he made a difference between a crime and another crime. He thought that these persons, who were agitating on the streets of Delhi, indulged in riots because they were agitated over their cause. That is why he made a difference between them and a common criminal. Then he went on to say: "How can there be a difference between one offence and another?" He himself differentiates between two offences, and then he himself puts the question, "How can there be a difference between one offence and another?" As has been pointed out by Mr. Ram Jethmalani, there are political offences known to law. When Mr. Kapil Sibal can hold a brief for those who indulged in rioting on the streets of Delhi as not criminals, when he can argue like that, why should not the hon. Prime Minister say that these are political offences not involving moral turpitude? He has got every right. But, when I say all this, let me say one thing. Let no one go very near to Rama. It is always very dangerous. We have read so in the Ramayana. Sir, Laxmana was Rama's close associate. He had to go to the forest with him. That is what had happened to Mr. Kalyan Singh in U.P. Then, Hanuman and Sugreeva became his allies and friends. They had to wage a war on his behalf. That is what is happening to the NDA partners here in the Parliament. Sita was wedded to him and she had to go through Agni Pariksha. That is what is happening to the BJP. They are going to go through the Agni Pariksha for vote in this House, probably. So, keep a safe distance from Rama. But, at the same time, let me say another thing also. Being a total antagonist of Rama is not good either, because Ravana was a total antagonist, he was killed; Maricha was one, he was finished; Dhara and Dhushana were total antagonists, they were finished. So, do not do that either. Do what Bharatha did. Pay respects to Rama. Take leave of him. Go and look after your own business, you can rule for 14 years, That is what he did.

In conclusion, I would say that the Prime Minister does not cease to be the leader of a party, one of the leaders of a political party. He has two images. One is that of the Prime Minister and the other one is that of a party man. That is why we see Prime Ministers campaigning in elections. Can we say that the Prime Minister should not campaign in a by-election? It is an accepted practice because we see him also as a party leader and also as a Prime Minister. So, as a party leader, should he not have the right to think that building of a temple for Rama is an expression of a national desire or national sentiment? Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan condemned him for that. But, then she said, "the entire South opposes," Sir, I am from Tamil Nadu. We oppose. How can she speak either for Tamil Nadu or on behalf of the entire South? She cannot speak for either...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I did not say that.

SHRI CHO S. RAMASWAMY: ...because these are hyperboles which are indulged in by parties. As she has a right to think that she is the voice of the South, the Prime Minister has a right to think that he is the voice of the nation. That is all. Because, politicians, generally, indulge in hyperboles, exaggerations. But, he has a right to do that. I do not think that he has committed any offence or any wrong by saying that he considers these persons innocent. That is what the law of the land says. As has been emphasized by several speakers, the law presumes a person to be innocent until he is proved guilty. When the law itself says that, as of today, these three persons are innocent, could not the Prime Minister say it? Could not the Prime Minister assert what the law says? Is it illegal when the Prime Minister says what the law says? No. I think the Prime Minister has got every right. So, I am against this Motion and would vote against it. One more thing, Sir. I have a great satisfaction of having addressed the House because there are no Members, there is only a House. Thank you.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम): श्री राजीव शुक्ल — नॉट प्रजेंट।
मिर्जा अब्दुल रशीद।

मिर्जा अब्दुल रशीद (जम्मू और कश्मीर): जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन, आज सुबह से हमने मंदिर मस्जिद के जरिए बड़े-बड़े लीडरों से बड़ी-बड़ी इंटेलैक्चुअल बातें सुनी हैं। मैं मुख्तसिर बात करूंगा इस हाउस से:

“बात जो दिल से निकलती है, असर रखती है
पर नहीं परवाज मगर रखती है।”

अगर ये बात जो अटल जी के मुंह से निकलवायी किसी ने, अगर ये बंगारू लक्ष्मण जी के मुंह से निकलती तो न इस का असर होता, न शोरगुल होता, न दोनों हाउसेस परेशान होते और न कोर्ट को ये सवालिया निशान जानने की जरूरत पड़ती। लेकिन यह सच है कि जब बात निकलती है तो असर रखती है। उस सिलसिले में हम जो एन.डी.ए. के साथी हैं हमें भी इस की परेशानी हुई और हम ने भी उन से कहा कि इस का क्लैरीफिकेशन होना चाहिए क्योंकि एन.डी.ए. का जो एजेंडा है, संघ परिवार के जो जजबाती स्लोगन थे, जो इश्यूज थे, उन को इस एजेंडा से हटाकर, एन.डी.ए. के एजेंडा से हटाकर कॉमन सिविल कोड का, आर्टिकल 370 का और मंदिर-मस्जिद के झगड़े का यह झंझट इन्होंने डाला हुआ है, इस पर कोई बात नहीं होगी और जब तक एन.डी.ए. के एजेंडे पर यह सरकार चलेगी, हम एन.डी.ए. के लोग इन्हें भरपूर समर्थन देते रहे हैं और देते रहेंगे।

जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, हमारा मुल्क बड़ा अजीम मुल्क है। एक सौ करोड़ की देश की आबादी है। हमारी जनता बड़ी रवां-दवां है और उछल-कूद कर के आगे जा रही है। हमारे मुल्क भारत में दुनिया के जितने भी धर्म हैं, यहां मौजूद हैं, जितनी जुबानें हैं, जितने कल्चर सारी दुनिया में हैं ये यहां मौजूद हैं। हमारा भारत सदियों के उतार-चढ़ाव के बाद बना है। दुनिया के मजलूम जो भागकर यहां आए, इस भारत ने उन को पनाह दी, फाकाकश आए उन को खुराक दी, जिलावतन आए तो जगह दी है, गर्ज यह कि हमारा भारत शुरू से ही सेकुलरवाद की परंपरा का हिस्सेदार है, मेहमाननावाज है और हर भारतीयों में मोहब्बत की सांस रची-बसी है। इसीलिए कहा गया है कि

“सर जमीने हिंद में अकवामे-आलम के फिराक,

काफिले आते रहे और हिंदुस्तान बनता रहा।”

इसलिए इस सेकुलर मुल्क में सेकुलर राज ही चल सकता है, सेकुलर सरकार ही चल सकती है। आज तो आजादी का जमाना है, बादशाहों के दौर का भी अगर हम जिक्र करें तो अनगिनत बादशाह इस मुल्क के हुए हैं, लेकिन तारीख ने जिन बादशाहों का जिक्र किया है उन में अकबर द ग्रेट या अशोक द ग्रेट का नाम है और वह इसलिए ग्रेट कहे गए तारीख में कि वे सेकुलर थे अपने-अपने जमाने के। जनाब वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, जहां ये बात उन के मुंह से निकली कि नेशनल सेंटीमेंट्स की बात है, ढांचे की जगह मंदिर बनाने की बात है — तो सारी कौम को इस की तश्वीश हुई, परेशानी हुई। तो उस सिलसिले में वे संघ परिवार के लीडर नहीं हैं, वह एन.डी.ए. के लीडर हैं। वह भगवे झंडे के वारिस नहीं हैं, वह तिरंगे के वारिस हैं, वह तिरंगे के भी जामिन हैं, वह सेकुलर कांस्टीट्यूशन के भी जामिन हैं। उन की जिंदगी, पूरी जिंदगी 30,40,50 साल की एक बेदाग जिंदगी है। उन्होंने बड़े अच्छे ढंग से हर मुकाम पर अपने सब्र का दामन नहीं छोड़ा है, उन्होंने कभी तवाजुन नहीं छोड़ है, एकदार नहीं छोड़ है बल्कि उस दिन भी उन्होंने अपना तवाजुन नहीं छोड़ा जिस दिन संघ परिवार और उस वक्त की मरकजी सरकार की वजह से मस्जिद शहीद हुई। उस दिन भी उस पार्लियामेंट के हाउस में वाजपेयी जी ने कहा था कि हमारा सिर शर्म से झुक गया है। यह हमारी संस्कृति के खिलाफ है, इसलिए हमें अफसोस हुआ जो उन के मुंह से ये बात निकली। जनाब वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, हम दुआ करते रहे और ह दगा करते रहे, एक ही नुक्ता से मेहरूम को मुजरिम ठहरा दिया। तो ये एक सवालिया निशान बन गया, लेकिन हमें खुशी है कि लोक सभा में उन्होंने अपनी आखिरी स्पीच में पूरी कौम को समझाया और हमें भी मालूम हुआ कि वह एन.डी.ए. के एजेंडे के पाबंद हैं और

जब तक वह एन.डि.ए.के एजेंडे के पाबंद हैं, हम तन-मन-धन से उनका सपोर्ट करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि वोह इस मुल्क को आगे लेजाएं। जहां तक इस बात का तअल्लुक है कि 6 दिसम्बर को मस्जिद गिरी, इस सिलसिले में इतना कहूंगा कि हमें अकल आनी चाहिए और इबरत आनी चाहिए। उस दिन जब यह लग रहा था, सारा मुल्क देख रहा था, सारी दुनिया देख रही थी कि संघ परिवार जज़्बात में आकर मस्जिद को शहीद कर सकता है तो उस वक़्त सेंटर में जो सेकुलर सरकार थी श्री नरसिंह राव जी की उसको तुरंत कदम उठाना चाहिए था और भारत की जो सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट होती है वह इतनी मज़बूत होती है कि उसके सामने चीन को पसीने निकलते हैं, पकिसतान की बोलती बंद होती है। भारत का अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर बात करे तो जंग शुरू हो सकती है, दूसरी बात करे तो जंग बंद हो सकती है। वह एक लफ़्ज़ से तशद्दुद को भड़का सकता है और एक लफ़्ज़ से तशद्दुद को मिटा सकता है, लेकिन उस दिन, जिस दिन यह मस्जिद शहीद हुई, मरकज में नरसिंह राव जी की सरकार थी उन्होंने उस वक़्त तक अपनी जबान नहीं खोली जब तक कि राम लला बनकर पूजने के काबिल हो गया। अगर उस वक़्त मस्जिद बचाई जाती तो उस वक़्त जो फ़साद हुए, वे नहीं होते। हजारों जानें जो तल्फ़ हुई, वे बच सकती थीं, अरबों की जायदाद को जो नुकसान हुआ, वह बच सकता था। अफ़रा-तफ़री, नफ़सा-नफ़सी और ये इंतशार और निफ़ाक जो पैदा हो गया है, इसकी नौबत नहीं आ सकती थी। लेकिन हमें अफ़सोस है कि उस वक़्त की मरकज़ी सरकार ने उस वक़्त इस मस्जिद को शहीद होने दिया, दानिश्ता तौर पर और आज ये दानिश्ता तौर पर एक दूसरे पर इलज़ाम तराशी करके अपने आपको साफ़ करने की कोशिश करते हैं।

नेशनल कांफ़्रेंस जम्मू-कश्मीर की एक जमात है जो कि एख़ पौनी सदी से एक सैकुलर जमात है और पौनी सदी से वह इस देश का यह साथ दे रही है। अब की बार भी वहां 75 फ़ीसदी वोट नेशनल कांफ़्रेंस को मिले हैं और वह सरकार फ़ारूख़ साहब की कयादत में चल रही है। उस सरकार ने यहां कम से कम 8 मैम्बर आफ़ पार्लियामेंट लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में भेजे हैं और ये सब के सब एन.डी.ए. के साथ हैं और इसलिए साथ हैं कि हर साल जो इलेक्शन होते थे और मुल्क बार-बार इल इलेक्शन्स को बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकता था, उससे बचा जाए। इसलिए एन.डी.ए. की तमाम पार्टियों ने इनको सपोर्ट दी, इनका साथ दिया, इनको सहारा दिया, ताकि मुल्क के सामने जो चैलेंज हैं उनका मुकाबला किया जाए। आज की साइंस और टेक्नोलॉजी की सदी में देश को दुनिया के साथ हमरकाब बनाया जाए। सेल्फ़ रिलायंस के सिलसिले में मुल्क इकनॉमिकली और पोलिटिकली स्टेबल हो सके और मुल्क को इस मुश्किल से निकाला जाए। इसलिए एन.डी.ए. का साथ हुआ और सबसे बड़ी बात थी कि जम्मू-कश्मीर की रियासत जो पिछले 15 साल से प्रॉक्सी वार में फंसी हुई है और 50 साल से जिसका मसला हल नहीं हुआ, हमें पूरी उम्मीद थी कि वाजपेयी जी की सदारत में, इनकी रहनुमाई में, इनकी कयादत में जम्मू-कश्मीर का मसला हल होगा और हमें यह कहते हुए खुशी है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर में आज से साल-डेढ़ साल पहले जब लाहौर बस यात्रा उन्होंने की और लाहौर ऐलानिया करवाया तो उस मुल्क को ऐहसासे कमतरी हुआ। फिर करगिल की जंग में जब पाकिस्तान को आइसोलेट किया तो उस मुल्क में एक ज़लज़ला आया, एक इक्लाब आया, वहां की जम्हूरियत ख़त्म हुई और वहां डिक्टेटरशिप आई और आज वह मुल्क इतना कमज़ोर है कि वह बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार है और उसके यहां जो बात करने वाले हुरियत के लोग थे, आज वे दिल्ली की गलियों में यहां दरवाज़े पर दस्तक देते हैं दोस्त बनने के लिए। हमें उम्मीद है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह जो एक तरफ़ा सीजफायर किया, इस सिज़ फायर को और लम्बा करके, रमज़ान शरीफ़ के बाद

भी लम्बा करके इस मसले का हल वे तलाश करेंगे और उनकी कयादत में हमें पूरा यकीन है कि इस मसले का हल होगा और मसला-ए-कश्मीर यदि हल हुआ तो हिन्दुस्तान की जो तरक्की रुकी हुई है, उसके मार्ग में जो रुकावटें हैं, वे दूर हो सकती हैं।

जहां तक इस बात का ताल्लुक है कि **we are being ruled by the Constitution of India. The law is the king of kings.** तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा है और आज यहां पर बहुत सारे साथियों ने और खास कर सुषमा जी ने बड़ी तफसील से यह बात बताई है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जो फैसला होगा उसके हम पाबंद होंगे। **The law is the king of kings.** तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जो फैसला होगा, उसके पाबंद होंगे। **The law is the king of kings.** तो उसके लिए हम इनकी सपोर्ट करेंगे और सुप्रीम कोर्ट जैसा फैसला करेगा वह पूरी कौम को मानना पड़ेगा वरना हमारी तरफ से एक तजवीज भी आ सकती है। इस वक्त सुप्रीम कोर्ट के अलावा जो आपस में बात चीत करने की बात चल रही है तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि वह बाबरी मस्जिद की जो जगह है, 8 एकड़ की जगह है।

उस पर मुश्तरका सांझी दीवार बनाकर मंदिर और मस्जिद को बनाया जाए ताकि मुल्क में ऐतहाद औ इत्तफाक पैदा हो सके। इसमें किसी को ऐतराज नहीं होगा। मैं इतना कहते हुए एन.डी.ए. का पार्ट होने के कारण प्राइम मिनिस्टर के स्टेटमेंट के खिलाफ जो डिसऐग्रीमेंट का मोशन है, उसका विरोध करता हूं और यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हम एन.डी.ए. के हक में बात करेंगे। मैं आपसे यही गुजारिश करूंगा कि हम उस वक्त तक इनके साथ हैं जब तक ये सेक्यूलरिज्म और एन.डी.ए. के एजेंडों पर चलेंगे।

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Indian council of World Affairs Bill, 2000 - Contd.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha :

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2000, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th of December, 2000."

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Hon. Members, the discussion on the Motion is over. Tomorrow, the Prime Minister will intervene at 12 o'clock. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री राजनाथ सिंह 'सूर्य' : सर, मुझे 2 मिनट का समय दे दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री मोहम्मद सलीम) : सभी पार्टियों का जितना समय था, उससे ज्यादा