

DR. YELAMANCHILI SI-
VAJI : Sir, ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
JAGESH DESAI) : Now it is over

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVA-
JI : My clarification has not been
answered.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
JAGESH DESAI) : You should
have told me at that time. Now
we will take up the Statutory Resolu-
tion and the Bill.

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE RELIGIOUS INSTITU- TIONS (PREVENTION OF MISUSE) ORDINANCE, 1988— Contd.

II. RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS (PREVENTION OF MISUSE) BILL, 1988—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
JAGESH DESAI) : Shri Mo-
hinder Singh Lather—only six
minutes, please. (Interruptions)
The time allotted for this was 3
hours and we have already taken 2
hours 48 minutes. The Minister is
still to speak. There are so many
speakers. Therefore, we should
confine to the time limit. I will not
allow a single minute extra. Mr.
Lather, please proceed.

श्री महेन्द्र सिंह लाठर (हरियाणा) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हजारों बेगुनाह लोगों
का जो खून बह चुका है और बहुत खून-
खराबे के बाद कांग्रेस सरकार को थोड़ी
सी आख खुली है तो यह आधा-अधूरा
बिल हमारे सामने है। मैं इसको आधा-
अधूरा इसलिए कहूंगा कि यह बिल्कुल बेग
है और जो परपज इससे सरकार पाना
चाहती है वह इससे पाया नहीं जा सकता

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जब हम इसको पढ़ते हैं
बिल को शुरू में इसका सैक्शन 1 पार्ट 2
पढ़ते हैं :

“It extends to the whole of India,
except the State of Jammu and
Kashmir.”

मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि उपसभाध्यक्ष
महोदय, सरकार से और जितने आनरेबल
मेम्बरजें यहां बैठे हैं कि क्या मजहब के
नाम पर जम्मू-कश्मीर के अन्दर फसाद
नहीं होते, खून-खराबा नहीं होता है ?
क्या वहां पर धर्म के नाम पर जो मस्याएं
काम कर रही हैं उनका दुरुपयोग नहीं
होता। हम कितने रोज तक जम्मू-काश्मीर
को जो कि हमारे देश का महत्वपूर्ण प्रांत
है उसको अपने मुल्क में अलग रखेंगे
और उसके लिए अलग कानून बनायेंगे ?
दूसरी बात जिसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान
दिलाना चाहूंगा वह सैक्शन 5 का पार्ट “जी”
है ?

“Provided that nothing in the
Section shall apply to any arms
which are used as part of any re-
ligious system or ritual of the
institution as established by cus-
tom or usage.”

यह कौन फौसला करेगा कि कौन सा हथियार
अन्दर ले जाया जा सकता है ? उनके
रिवाज के अनुसार कौन सा हथियार है
और कौन से हथियार की
उनके धर्म को जरूरत है ? मेरी राय में,
मेरा सरकार को सुझाव है कि सैक्शन 5
का पार्ट “बी” डिलीट कर दिया जाए। और
अगर डिलीट न किया जाए तो
“एनी आर्म्ज एक्सेप्ट फायर आर्म्ज” इसमें
अर्मेडमेंट होना चाहिए। क्योंकि फायर
आर्म्ज किसी भी शकल में मंदिर, गुरुद्वारे
या मस्जिद के अन्दर नहीं जाने चाहिए।
नहीं तो कोई भी बहाना लेकर कोई भी
हथियार उसके अन्दर ले जाया जा सकता है।
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे देश में अग्धी
में ज्यादा समस्याएँ मजहब की क्रांति की
हुई हैं। कभी किसी मस्जिद के लिए
मार्च हो रहा है, कभी किसी मंदिर के लिए
मार्च हो रहा है, कभी किसी गुरुद्वारे

से जल्द चलाए जाते हैं। अगर हमें इस देश को एक रखना है, एक राष्ट्र बनाना है जो कि 40 साल के बाद भी हम नहीं बना पाए है, तो मैं चाहूंगा कि मजबूत कदम उठाकर सरकार द्वारा इन सारे मजहबों पर कम से कम 10 साल के लिए प्रतिबंध लगा दिया जाए। मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि फंडामेंटल राइट्स के खिलाफ मैं बोल रहा हूँ, लेकिन अगर इस देश को इकट्ठे रखना चाहते हैं और एक नेशन बनाना चाहते हैं तो इन मजहबों ने जो सारी बीमारी फैला रखी है इन पर कम से कम 10 साल तक प्रतिबंध लगा देना चाहिए चाहे कोई भी मजहब हो या मजहबी पार्टियाँ हों।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैंने यह नोट किया है और मेरी यह मान्यता है, वैसे मैं नास्तिक तो नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैंने देखा है कि जो लोग भगवान में विश्वास नहीं करते, जो लोग मजहब से दूर रहते हैं, वे लोग इन मजहबी लोगों से कहीं बेहतर इंसान होते हैं। मैं ईमानदारी के साथ यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस देश को इकट्ठे रखकर हमें मजबूत बनाने की तरफ चलना है तो हमें इन बातों में ऊपर उठना पड़ेगा। मैं तो यहाँ तक कहूँगा, मोहम्मद इकबाल बहुत बड़े शायर हुए हैं और उन्होंने एक शेर कहा था जो कि बड़ा मशहूर हुआ।

“मजहब नहीं सिखाता आपस में बैर रखना,
हिन्दी हैं हम वनन है हिन्दुस्तान हमारा।”

लेकिन कमाल यह कि उम बुलंद शख्स पर भी आखिरी दिनों में मजहब ने अमर डाल दिया और आज यह हालत है कि आज हमें इसको ऐसे बढ़ना चाहिए :

“मजहब ही है सिखाता आपस में बैर रखना,
हिन्दू हैं हम, मुस्लिम हैं हम, सिख हैं हम, ईसाई हैं हम”।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं समझता हूँ कि मैंने यहाँ पर सारी बातों को जिक्र किया है। इस बिल में कुछ होते वाला नहीं है। इस बिल से हम मजहब को सियासत से अलग

नहीं रख सकते। हमें एक बहुत मजबूत कानून इस बारे में बनाना पड़ेगा जिससे कि सारी मजहबी पार्टियाँ, सियासी पार्टियाँ जो बनी हुई है, उन पर टोटल बैन लग जाय। यह जो हाफ हट्टेष्ट किया जा रहा है, इससे हमारा कोई भला होने वाला नहीं है। इस बिल में जगह-जगह पर मैनेजर का नाम लिया गया है। आप सैक्शन--7 पढ़िए --

Where any religious institution or manager thereof contravenes the provisions of sections 3, 4, 5 or 6, the manager and every person connected with such contravention shall be punishable with imprisonment.

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर एक मंदिर में या गुरुद्वारे में सभा हो रही है। वहाँ पर कोई आदमी सियासी बात करता है, तो वहाँ पर जो मैनेजर, महंत है, वह उसको कैसे रोकेगा? आप तो सजा मैनेजर को दे रहे हैं। आप हर बात में मैनेजर को ही जिम्मेदार ठहराना चाहते हैं। अतः इस बिल पर पुब्लिक नजर मानी की जानी चाहिए। इसकी जगह एक बहुत काम्प्रेहेंसिव बिल, डिटेल्ड बिल मजहबी पार्टियों पर बैन लगाने के लिए लाया जाना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :
श्री शिव प्रताप मिश्र।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
वह पहली बार बोल रहे हैं, इसलिए समय का बंधन न रखा जाय।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :
हम उनका मेडन स्पीच नहीं मानेंगे। जब वे अगली टर्न में बोलेंगे तब भेडन स्पीच मान लेंगे।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
महोदय, मैं डा० पाण्डेय की बात का पूरा समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Then there will be two maiden speeches. (Interruptions).

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरा नाम... (व्यवधान)
बर्ड रीडिंग...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :
वह समय आने दो, तब आप से बात करूंगा।
अभी आप बैठ जाइए।

SHRI SHIV PRATAP MISHRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Hon. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for the opportunity you have given to me to speak in this august House on the Religious Institutions (Prevention of Misuse) Bill, 1988.

Sir, this Bill restricts the carrying of arms to any shrine or to any Gurudwara or to any religious place as well as there is a prohibition in this Bill for the disbursement of money, that money which is the money of the religious institution to any political party for its propagation as well as for its aims and objectives. At the same time, there is a restriction on the construction of fortification by the manager of anything without a valid licence or by the competent authority. But, at the same time, I feel that in this Bill the Kirpan or any arm is allowed to be taken for the ceremonial function. Here, in this Bill, I find that it is not to separate politics from religion, but it is to stop the misuse of religious places for political activity, because as I can see in India, it is a religious country and that is why there is a provision in our constitution about the secular character of our country. Secularism means equal respect to all religions. It does not mean atheism or taking an attitude of dishonour towards any religion. We should follow the principles of "Satyam Badah Dharmam Charah" which is embossed on the gate of

this august house. And keeping this in view, I can say that the good points of religion were always embadded in any civilisation since the time immemorial. In the pre-Vedic period, in the period of Indus Valley Civilisation, we find worship of Maitridevi, worship of Siva, worship of Trident; that was only for the prosperity and well-being of the people, and in contemporaneity, with Indus Valley Civilisation, even in Babylonian culture, we find that the king who was called Hamuravi, had given the code of law to the people to keep them in order for their prosperity which he received from Sun God which was called at that time "Samas." In the Vedic period which dates back 1500 to 700 B.C. we find that religion was never in conflict with politics in the Rashtriya Sabhagar, Sabhagar means the assembly for the people to adopt any law. Always there was a praye for Indra, for varuna, for fire, to get strength from them to keep the society intact, and it was only aiming at giving solution to bread and boundry questions. So, In the Vedic period we find that religion was not separate from the Politics.

Another theme is also embossed on the gate of this august House :

एकं सवित्रा बहुधा वदन्ति ।

That means, truth is one but it is interpreted differently by the people. From Vedic philosophy we can find in the Geeta that in the post-Vedic period, religion was never a taboo in political life to create hatred or anything. That is why, Lord Krishna said :

"निर्वैरः सर्व भूतेषु यः स मामेति पाण्डव ।"

Lord Krishna said that neither by the study of Vedas, nor by giving charity, nor by performing penance, I can be seen. I can only be seen

and realised and you can only know the essence of Dharma by doing the duty, by remembering me.

You should never be biased for your self interest and you should be free from enmity—

“संगर्जितः, निर्वैरः” (गीता)

That was the religion at that time, and that is why I can say in the post-Vedic period, it was Monotheism in which God was considered as personal and absolute both. At that time also there was no caste and creed. Out of that sense, Buddhism also came out. Buddha said we should not run after God ; but he also said that God is not there and he gave the theory of Shunyavād, that is the theory of Nihilism. But Shunyavād was defined as :

“शून्यमिति न वक्तव्यं, अशून्यमिति नो भवेत् ।
उभयं नो भवेत्चेति प्रज्ञप्त्यर्थं तु कथ्यते ॥”

It is neither zero, ‘void’ nor not zero, not-void, nor both nor either. It means :

It cannot be defined, because many things cannot be defined. As the western philosophy said your language is finite; you cannot define what is love, how love is caused. You only feel it. You cannot define hatred. You cannot differentiate between the sweetness of banana and a mango. What is the difference between their sweetness ? At that time Buddha said : Don’t run after God but irrespective of caste and creed, he taught the gospel of non-violence that is :

“अहिंसा परमोधर्मः,”

That is also embossed on the gate of this august House. So I can say that later on our prophet of peace Mahatma Gandhi adopted it :

“अहिंसा परमो धर्मः”

which was the main force behind the Satyagraha and by this Satyagraha, he freed India from the servitude of the British yoke.

The concept of religion in those times, as Mahavir said, was Parama Dharma Upakara. He said that the meaning of religion was to do philanthropic work and that to torture others was not religion. This was the crux of our Puranas.

अहिंसा परमोधर्मः, परमोधर्मः उपकारः

The essence of the Eighteen Puranas by Vyasa was also the same. To do philanthropic work and not to torture others. This was the essence of our Puranic culture. King Ranti Dev said :

न त्वहं कामये राज्यं, न स्वर्गं नापुनर्भवं ।
कामये बुद्ध तत्तानाम प्राणिनाम तितान्शनम् ॥

When he was face to face with God, he told God ‘I do not want anything; I do not want any empire; I only want that the sufferings of the people should be removed; This is the only boon I want if you can grant it to me’. This was the Dharma of our ancient times. After the Vedic Monotheism, after Buddhism, after Jainism, I can say that the inner nature of religion was to keep the equilibrium of mind and action together. That was the Yoga.

योगः कर्मसु कौशलम्

One has to keep the equilibrium between the mind and the body Vivekanand said in Chicago that the objective of self-realisation was the subjective motto of religion, but the objective motto was selfless service to the people.

When religion came in the way of good to the people, when religion was a hindrance, it had to be stopped Secondly, politics is always changing. Politics is to serve the Polis or State. Hence, it should be guided

[Shri Shiv Pratap Mishra]

by right-thinking people. It changes from moment to moment as is said :

व रंगननैव नृप नीतिमनेकरूप :

Politics changes from moment to moment. As the Greek Philosopher Heraculis said, we cannot step twice in the same water. Everything is changing. This is the truth. We cannot stop the change by medicines or any medical care. The world is transitory. This is the truth which has been pointed out by sages and saints. In the name of religion if any obstruction is caused to the functioning of the State, it has to be dealt with firmly. Kautilya has said :

पीडनानाम नृत्पतो उत्पन्नानाम चवारणे ।

This is the duty of the King. If there is any hindrance, if anything comes in the way in the name of religion, if anything comes in the way in the name of politics to destabilise the country, it has to be stopped.

The various religions, Hebrew, Persian, Christianity, Islam etc. and the various Prophets like Amos, Zoraster, Christ and Mohammad have always preached brotherhood and humanity. They always taught love for the people. The greatest essence of Islam was that one should love one's neighbours. It was not to attack the neighbours. It was not to intrude upon the liberty of the neighbours.

I support this Bill which has been brought forward to stop the misuse of religious institutions. I will just take a few more minutes. Sir, the founder of Sikhism was Guru Nanak. His aim was to unify India. It was the most secular religion. The very foundation of the Golden Temple was laid by

Mian Mir. Guru Gobind Singh also prayed to Mother Goddess.

खड्गखंड विहंडम खलदल खडम

अतिरण मंडम बरबडम

सुखसत। करणम दुनमति हरणम

किलविख हरणम अति सरनम् ।

उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) :
आपको स्वीच बहुत वर्णनाम है, लेकिन मेरी यह दिक्कत है कि समय बहुत कम है।

कछ माननाय सदस्य : मेडम स्पीच है
उनकी ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
JAGESH DESAI) : I know it...

SHRI SHIV PRATAP MISHRA :
I will just take one or two minutes more. In Sikhism, I am telling you, in the Gurbani there are banis of 36 saints. Out of them 6 are Sikhs and 30 are Muslims as well as Hindus. In that banis of Kabir Namdev, Ramanand Jaidev, Surdas, Sheikh Farid and Mardana are there. There is mention of the names of Ram, Gopal, Hari and Mukund. After that Guru Gobind Singh also founded the Khalsa Panth with identification with their holding "kesh", "kara", "kirpan" "kuch" and "kangha". That was only meant to save India and it was the front-line of defence. Because you are telling me that I should conclude, I am leaving most of my thoughts. But I am telling you that in our "dharma" we have treated the Motherland as more than heaven :

जननी जन्मभूमिश्च स्वर्गादपि गरियसी ।

Again I tell you that when in the functioning of the State, in the welfare of the people, when in the name of religion something awkward came, then it was stopped not only here but throughout the world. Why I am saying it here is because the Revolution of Marxism led by Lenin

could not be stopped by religion there in Moscow. As well, I can say that Abraham Lincoln said : "To abolish slavery, I trust in God. Trust in God is my religion and abolition of slavery is my politics". In Indian religion, I can say that Lord Krishna when he thought that in the functioning of one's own duty, most of the rituals prescribed in the scriptures come, he said : Do duty for the sake of duty. And in the end, he had to say :

"सर्वधर्मान्परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं ब्रज ।
अहं त्वां कर्मापेक्षया मोक्षयिष्यामि माशुचः ॥"

Abandoning all the norms of religious institutions, take refuge in God and do the duty for the sake of duty because duty itself is "dharma".

"कर्मण्येव धिक्कारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।"

You should not be after the fruits of duty because suppose you are taking sweets, you will not immediately think whether it will be useful or harmful. You will get the sweetness of that sweet. In the same way one should enjoy the duty for the sake of duty and religion and politics should not be taken for the narrow ends.

So, I will request here the entire House, the Treasury Benches as well as Opposition Benches, that on national issues both should be united together and if anything comes Chanakya has said that in the interest of the people, the King or the Government to look after the people.

If anything comes in their way, it should be stopped with deterrent punishment. And as told by our ex-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, who was a great philosopher the Opposition is very much needed for the ruling party, for the administration, for the democracy to do fair and frank criticism, but it should not go to that degenerate state of hampering again and again, to obstruct the work and functioning of Parliament and Government.

With these few words, I can say that I support this Bill and I conclude here with :

विजयी विश्व तिरंगाध्वारा, झंडा ऊंचा रहे हमारा ।

SHRIMATI SUDHA VIJAY JOSHI (Maharashtra) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Religious Institutions (Prevention of Misuse) Bill, 1988. The basic function of the Bill can be described as the first step in separating religion from politics. Further the Bill gives statutory status to the sentiments expressed by various Members at the National Integration Council meeting.

Sir, the Ordinance and the Bill have not come even a day too soon. If we examine the scenario all over, these facts stare us in the face—how, in the name of religion, so many acts of political vandalism have been committed. In a country of vast dimensions, abject poverty and lack of education, it is very easy to rouse passions in the name of religion, and that can lead to creation of disorder and chaos. The teachings of all religions glorify the ideas of love, peace and friendship. The essence of religious teaching is that it provides you a path for betterment of life and, at the same time, taking care that in the pursuit of betterment of our lives we do not cause injury or damage to others.

But what do we find everywhere ? Even the slightest provocation is used for rousing passions. The world history, and the history of our country, are replete with examples. I may venture to say that those who have preached violence and disorder in the name of religion are persons whose religious beliefs themselves are in doubt or else they are so much blinded by personal gains that they are not bothered about sacrificing religious principles.

[Shrimati Sudha Vijay Joshi]

Sir, religion is essentially a very individualistic faith and is a sort of means to achieve one-to-one communion with God. Even though some religious ceremonies or prayers are performed in congregation, they do not come in the way of achieving this one-to-one communion. However, importance of this cardinal principle is lost sight of and then, advantage of such religious congregations is taken for preaching things that lead to the creation of disorder.

The socio-economic imbalances and consequent non-availability of opportunities have been the ills in the development of a socialistic and egalitarian society. There is already tension prevalent in the society, due to economic difficulties, and this unrest is getting exploited in the name of religion. Sir, I may pose a question : If we look at the various acts of violence and disorder in the last few years, are not the majority of them based on tension triggered off by religious sentiments ? Thus religion has been dragged into politics, economic difficulties, etc., without compunction.

We have also witnessed the phenomenon of religious places being used for holding criminals, for storing unlawful weapons and money collected for religious purposes being used for anti-national activities. I cannot think of graver misuse of religious places than these things. It is against this backdrop that we have to view this Bill and examine its provisions.

In section 3 of this Bill, provisions have been made for prohibition of various activities being conducted in religious institutions. There are nine sub-sections, which define in detail the various activities. These provisions are quite comprehensive

in nature and cover most of the activities which put religion to misuse.

Sir, in sections 5 and 6, there are provisions prohibiting the use of funds and properties of religious institutions for the benefit of a political party or political activity. The further prohibition banning the use of any ceremony, festival, congregation, procession or assembly held under the auspices of religious institutions for political purposes is also very important.

In sections 7 and 8, punishments are prescribed for the manager and/or other employees who contravene the provisions of the Bill. Very stringent punishment has been provided, which is very essential.

Sir, however, I feel that either under this Act or by a separate Act there should be a provision banning publication and distribution by religious institutions of any literature or material on issues which are prohibited activities under this Act. Otherwise, people who are bound to create trouble, would take shelter and print and distribute material in the name of religion with purportedly political overtones.

Sir, before concluding, I would also say that every right-minded person would agree with the basic philosophy of this Bill and also its various provisions. It is necessary for all of us, the political and social workers, leaders of various religious institutions, to remain eternally vigilant and stamp out this misuse of religion.

Sir, I cannot help but conclude by saying :

"Oh religion, how many more crimes need to be committed in the name."

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : I also thank you, you have not exceeded the time-limit, others will also follow. Shrimati Sudha Joshi by not exceeding the time.

Mr. Swaminathan, five minutes only.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu) : Sir, this short time you have been kind enough to give to me.

Out of three hours, so much of time was given yesterday to so many Members.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI) : What can I do ?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN : When the time is allotted, it is allotted to the party. On the first day when six minutes were given to the party, he has spoken for 20 minutes. The next day problems arose.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Satya Prakash Malaviya) in the Chair]

Within the five minutes allotted to me, I will try to convey my ideas in a telegraphic language.

We are very happy, we have the addition of a few new Members, Shri Shiv Pratap Mishra who has come here. I am happy heard his speech. After a long having time we have been able to hear a philosophical discourse with a lot of Sanskrit quotations. I am very happy. I think, he will be able to contribute to the House. Many philosophical thoughts he has told us today. If the Chair had given more time, most probably he would have given

more ideas on religion and politics. We are really happy that he is here.

Regarding the Religious Institutions (Prevention of Misuse) Bill, Sir, I stand before you to support the Bill with some reservations.

One point raised yesterday by my esteemed friend, Mr. Jaswant Singh, is that this could have been placed before the House, and it need not have been brought by way of an ordinance. The same thought was expressed in the Lok Sabha also for which our hon. Minister explained here that ordinance is also a part of the Constitution and that by promulgating the Ordinance and bringing this Bill before Parliament, he is not infringing his duty. But the point is, as I understand, Sir, the Lok Sabha adjourned *sine die* on about 13th of May, and this Ordinance was brought on the 26th of May. The argument of the Minister was that after adjournment of the House, within 13 days thereafter they thought that it would be wiser to bring such an ordinance and place it before the House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : I said, "immediately after the Operation Black Thunder."

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN : After the Operation Black Thunder it happened, and naturally he has brought it here. My only point is that such a Bill should have been thought about not

[Shri G. Swaminathan]

within 13 days or 6 days after the Operation Black Thunder. It would have been brought in the form of a bill. Knowing the functioning of the Government, this Bill should have been in contemplation for a number of months and should have been discussed by officers and Ministers. Even before the 13th of May this should have almost got into shape. If at all the Minister had thought it fit, he could have placed it before Parliament, and he would have got permission for this thing. No ordinance would have been necessary for the same. So, whatever reason has been given, well, I am not able to fully agree on this point.

Sir, regarding this Bill, I would like to say that this has been brought forward for two purposes. One is to prevent the illegal activities and the other is to prevent the use of arms and ammunition. This has been brought forward mainly because what happened earlier and also after the "Operation Black Thunder". We also read in the papers what really happened there. Sir, it was a very sorry state of affairs inside this Temple and even some of the honourable Members mentioned here that there were interrogation chambers, that there were torture chambers inside this Temple, and they were also able to take out 43 bodies or so which were found there. Most probably these people must have been murdered and their bodies, which must have been buried there, have been taken out in this place. It only shows how this place, how this Temple, has been misused by the terrorists. I fully agree that such a provision should have been made in the Bill.

Another point that has been here is the prevention of political activities. I would have personally felt two things. One is that if the Bill had confined itself to arms and ammunition being brought into these places and to illegal activities being carried on inside the temples or religious places, then, most probably I would have fully agreed with this Bill. Along with that, Sir, another section has also been included for the prevention of political activities in religious places. My feeling is that it could have been confined to illegal activities and the provision for the prevention of political activities could have been brought forward later, if necessary, in the form of a Bill. I do not know why he thought it fit to combine both. He could have brought forward one Bill after the "Operation Black Thunder" and another, if necessary, later on. So, I am not able to understand why he has tried to combine both in one.

There is another point also which I am not able to understand. The whole purpose of the Bill is, as the Minister has said, to deal with the situation after the "Operation Black Thunder" and the whole thing is confined to Punjab. But in no other place of the country has this kind of a situation arisen. When such things happened only in Punjab, I do not know why this Bill is now covering the whole of India. I am not able to follow this at all. He could have brought forward a Bill confining it only to Punjab and, if necessary, to the terrorists operating from the gurdwaras. I will even say that a particular religion could have been mentioned and with that he could have stopped. I do not know whether it is possible for him to do so or not. But he has brought

in the Sikh religion, he has brought in the Muslim religion and he has brought in the majority religion, the Hindu religion, and he has combined all these. He has also brought the entire territory of the country within the ambit of this Bill. I wonder whether he could have made it applicable selectively, either to a particular area or even to a particular religion. I am not able to understand this. Even yesterday he told in this House that coming from Tamil Nadu—I also come from Tamil Nadu—he can say that there is communal amity in Tamil Nadu. There is no terrorist activity in the temples there and there has been no religious intolerance in Tamil Nadu. But then why is he bringing in the whole of India under the operation of the Bill? In Tamil Nadu, we have thousands of temples and other places of worship and we are not engaged in such kind of activities and in most of the places in India also no such thing takes place. I do not know why, in that case, he should bring the whole of the territory of India within the ambit of this Bill. I think he will be able to reply convincingly to this point.

Another important point is that India is now surrounded by many countries which are all theocratic States. Coming to Pakistan, the religion of Pakistan is Islam coming to Bangladesh, they have made Islam the State religion; coming to Malaysia—recently I had been there—their State religion also is Islam; coming to Sri Lanka, they have Buddhism there which is their State religion; and, coming to Nepal, which is adjacent to us, Hindu religion is their State religion. So India is almost surrounded by countries which have one religion or the other as their State religion and, naturally, in a country like ours where we

have a large number of minorities, we cannot afford to have one religion as the State religion since it will create a lot of problems. However, in our Constitution, we have stated that secularism is our principle. I do not deny that or I do not oppose it. But the only point that I wish to make is that the Government should promote secularism. During all these years, after the advent of the Constitution, I do not know what action the Government has taken to promote secularism as a principle. I think we have failed in that respect and the Government should not only see to it that there is amity between these religions, but also enunciate this principle and promote it among the people and make the people understand it. Since this is very much necessary, I feel that this most necessary thing should also be done by the Government.

Again, Sir, coming to actually what is being done, as has been told yesterday, is that political parties are furthering communalism and casteism. It has been told yesterday regarding the Allahabad election that Aurn Govil, the principal actor in the 'Ramayana' on the Television was brought to Allahabad and Dara Singh, another actor, was also brought to Allahabad by the Congress Party. I do not know why the party which is in power....

(Interruption)

He has got every right as a citizen; I do not deny. But he has been brought there for a certain principle. Suppose Shankaracharya or some other religious leader does not preach politics inside the temple and he goes outside to preach politics, naturally he has got every right to do it. I think even political

[Shri G. Swaminathan]

parties should shy away from these things, because if we do it for political purposes, for election purposes, then naturally it will boomerang on ourselves. Sir, the same thing is happening in casteism also. How do political parties put up candidates in a particular constituency? If it is predominantly a Muslim constituency, whom do you put up as a candidate—any party, whether it is the Congress Party or any other party? If it is mainly a Muslim area, you put up a Muslim as a candidate. If it is predominantly another community, you put up that particular community person as your candidate, because you want to win. So the political parties also have been doing it all these years for fighting elections and promoting their own interests. Either so far communalism or far casteism we are also responsible in a way.

Again, Sir, regarding the Television, I have been enjoying 'Ramayana'. Almost every Sunday almost everywhere in this country the people have been enjoying it and we have been looking forward to this programme. But I have got my own sincere doubts whether the Government can promote it. Television is a part of the Government and the expenditure also is being met out of the taxes collected from the people. Sir, is it right on the part of the Television which is a Government media, to promote 'Ramayana' or promote 'Mahabharata' or any other thing like that? Is it advisable or correct on the part of the Government to do it? *(Time bell rings)* Now, Sir, 'Ramayana' is already over. People are looking forward to 'Mahabharata'. Naturally you say: we are not promoting religion, we are only promoting an epoch. But the epochs "Ramayana" and 'Mahabharata' are not only historical but these are also religious. People have got a lot of faith in 'Ramayana' and in 'Mahabharata'

Sometimes when they see the actors there, they think that he himself is Rama, he himself is Krishna, he himself is Hanuman, and so on. Such a feeling comes to people. Is it desirable on the part of the Government to promote such religious epochs? I personally feel that it is promoting religion in an indirect manner.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM:
There are millions of people who want to see it.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN :
There are millions of people wishing to do that. But ultimately you have to think whether it is right on the part of the Government because the TV is a public media, a Government media. Would it not be wrong for you to do that? You have to think about it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN
(**SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA**): You have taken 11 minutes.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN :
Sir, take the Hindu gods. Recently I have been to Calcutta. The 'Kali' and most of our gods have some arms and ammunition with them. The hon. Minister was telling about the temples in Tamil Nadu. They have temples in village sites where there are gods with weapons there. Most of the temples in Tamil Nadu are like that. This is not only religious because social activities also happen there and political activities also take place there. We find, Sir in the ancient history, in Tamilian history, only in temples they used to have... *(Time bell rings)* They used to call it election process. Election process would take place only in a part of that place or temple, either in a village or town. So politics has not been divorced from religion in India, or social activities. The temple has been a part and parcel of social activity and political activity. Why I want to point out this thing is because the people cannot be divided as being political or religious.

Sir, the people have to be taken as a whole. Even in medicine, formerly you used to treat different diseases separately. Now they say that even in medical treatment, the people have to be taken as a whole, as persons, and then only you can treat them. You cannot divide and differentiate whether it is a political party or a religious party. It is a difficult process. I accept that something has to be done. I would only wish that the Government take this thing warily so that a problem may not be created throughout the country by this kind of a bill. I understand that the hon. Minister is going to bring some other Bill also very shortly. I would only request that problems and conflicts may not be created throughout the country because India is a nation and there are many religions. We cannot divorce people from religion because people cannot be taken as two different parts. Except that, I generally support the Bill and I wish that you give benefit to the people, especially in Punjab. I generally support the Bill even though I have some reservations on it. Thank you.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Sir, for centuries, religion has been a vital force moulding our individual and collective life. It has provided us that strength to face socially the vicissitudes of our long history. More than the fetish of rituals, religion has given us a spiritual message, a message of freedom and equality of man, long before such ideals of democracy became tangible in the world.

The founding fathers of our Constitution endeavoured to synthesise the western ideas of democracy with our rich cultural heritage when they were drafting the Constitution. At the same time, they were nagged by the horrifying memories of the partition days when the fire of senseless religious bigotry and fundamentalism engulfed this sacred land of ours. It was in this overall perspective these specific provisions

of Article 15 and Articles 25 to 28 were enshrined in our Constitution to epitomise our approach to religion in free India, i.e., secularism with positive respect for all religions, but with no religion of the State itself.

Sir, when we chartered the course of democracy, we looked forward to an environment where religion would guide our moral values, purify our minds and ennoble our lives. Unfortunately, what we have experienced over the years is that vested interests all over the country have used religion as a tool for self-aggrandisement and exploitation. Politicians who have never bothered to address themselves to the upliftment of their poor brethren, raise a bogey of exploitation and discrimination to woo them at the election time. Communal riots break out on the most frivolous issues leaving behind a trail of human suffering and misery.

Sir, religious fundamentalism has continued to inflict a heavy blow on our body politic. We are often confronted with different manifestations of the disastrous two-nation theory. Temples, mosques and gurudwaras are brazenly converted into patently political platforms and these abodes of God often reverberate with most intemperate, irreligious, political speeches and exhortations that arouse communal passions and propagate hatred against another religion.

Our reluctance to interfere in these matters in the fear of hurting anyone's religious susceptibilities only embolden the anti-social forces further. Camouflaging their anti-national activities as the right of religious freedom, all shades of criminals have been taking shelter in places of worship and using the holy precincts for dumping illicit arms and ammunition. While such tendencies have been noticed in many parts of the

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

country, the situation in Punjab has been particularly aggravating and disturbing. Some of the most important and historic Gurudwaras, including the Golden Temple, were converted into veritable hide-outs of terrorists, backed by Pakistan who had no compunction and no qualms in desecrating even the sanctum sanctorum rooms meant for the pilgrims rest became their torture chambers and the debris of the Akal Takht their grave yard.

In 1920s, when lascivious Mahants used the holy Gurudwaras as dens of vice and corruption, a powerful Gurudwara Reform Movement attracted thousand and thousands of devout Sikhs who suffered brutalities but extricated the Gurudwaras from the clutches of the lecherous Mahants. A marked difference in the situation that prevailed till very recently was the stockpiling of illicit sophisticated weapons which called for an action by the Government. How the terrorists lodged there and resorting to a war-like activity against the State were flushed out in a meticulously planned operation without causing any damage whatsoever to the Harmandir Sahib was an outstanding example of our perseverance coupled with firm action. This however, threw up a very pertinent question for the future. If the managing committees of holy shrines either fail to maintain their sanctity or become a party, overtly or covertly, to their abuse, what ought the Government do? It was in answer to this vital question that the Government had taken a bold step to promulgate the Religious Institutions (Prevention of Misuse) Ordinance, 1988, which is now sought to be replaced by an Act or Parliament.

Sir, some misapprehensions have been expressed against this Bill, but an honest and dispassionate perusal thereof will amply demonstrate that it does not militate against any

religion whatsoever but confines itself to the accepted Constitutional guarantees and parameters. In no manner does it impinge upon or tend to curtail the freedom of religion. Sir, I have come across an argument and that may be pressed in this House also that for Sikhs, religion and politics are inseparable, and the example cited is that of the 6th Guru, Guru Hargobindji's carrying of two swords of *miri* and *piri* symbolising the temporal and spiritual power respectively. Sir, this interpretation is rather misplaced. On the contrary, Guru Shri Hargovind Sahib ordained the separation of religion from politics. That is why when anybody wanted to discuss any temporal matter with him, he was asked to come out from the Harmandir Sahib to the Akal Takht. Nobody was ever permitted to discuss any worldly matter within the precincts of the Harmandir Sahib itself.

Sir, there is no reasons for having any misgiving about the intent of the Bill. An opinion has been expressed that the Bill places all the responsibility only on the manager or any person associated with the affairs of the religious institution concerned. In this context, it is clause 7 of the Bill which is referred to. Though the hon. Minister would reply to these points in detail I would only briefly like to refer to clause 7 itself to say that it very specifically mentions that where any religious institution or manager thereof contravenes the provisions of section 3, section 4, section 5 or section 6, the manager and every person connected with such contravention—Sir, I mark these words “the manager and every person connected with such contravention”—shall be punishable for the offence provided for. Sir, it is time that all the right thinking people speak in unison to preserve the sanctity of the religious places and to fight unitedly any attempt to defile the sanctity of the holy places or to pollute the halo that they exude.

Sir, this Bill has a very limited purpose and no objection could be raised against it. But in my humble opinion, this itself is a weakness also, a weakness which this Bill suffers from. Sir, as long as action is not taken to separate religion from politics by debarring communal parties and members of the managing committees of religious institutions from contesting elections, the provisions of this Bill would not deter some politicians from misusing religious places. On the other hand, they will violate the provisions of this Bill to impress upon the people, upon the unwary followers of their religion that they are being discriminated against, that the Government is victimising them and by using this propaganda they would like to become heroes in the eyes of the gullible people so that they can contest the elections and win on that sentiment, notwithstanding that any action under the provisions of this Bill when enacted as an Act of Parliament, may be pending against them.

So, Sir, while supporting this Bill without any reservation whatever, I urge upon the Government to take another bold step by creating a feeling in the minds of the people about the urgency to separate religion from politics and bring about a comprehensive legislation for that, because in that alone would lie the solution to many problems that confront our country today. And I am sure the Government would have the support of the vast but silent majority of the people in this respect.

Thank you.

(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA): You will get your chance after Mr. Mehta. Yes, Mr. Chimanbhai Mehta.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat) : Sir, I wholeheartedly welcome this Bill because our society is being exploited in the name of religion and religious fundamentalists have been creating problems since decades and every day these problems are accentuated. What is prevented is the misuse of religion. Now to say that our entire life is guided by religion, to say that our morals and ethics are guided by religion, and therefore to separate us from religion in the name of prevention of misuse of religion in politics, some say, is impossible; some say it is an attack on religion itself.

We know that secularism is being practised in several countries. Various countries are known for secular traditions. They have worked out secular concepts, and we can also find out the tremendous growth that a secular society is able to achieve, and if the fundamentalist societies are having a retarded growth or if they cannot change they are facing obstacles in their development. It is their fault. That is also largely because of a belief, a superstition and political ideology emanating from religion.

It is correct that Pakistan was created on the basis of religion and the State declared itself to be an Islamic State. Now, Mr. Zia is dead; we do not want to criticise him for what he was aiming at, but in the name of religion, they were having atom bombs which they called an Islamic Bomb. Now, if the religion becomes so inhuman, if the religion becomes irreligious, if religion is meant to perpetrate crime on others, it cannot be called religion and, therefore, our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru warned in the literature that he produced, that religion is largely used for political purposes. In a democratic society we do not need a religion for political purpose. We can have economic programmes and other social programmes, in the past, for invasion.

[Shri Chimanbhai Mehta]

for attack, for looting property, for rape, for burning, the emperors used the name of religion. So, humanity has been suffering from this kind of distortion—horrible distortions—in the name of religion. Therefore, we must come out still more boldly.

As the hon. Minister said this is the first step. But we should go beyond.

Somebody referred the name of an actor; from this side also another actor's name was mentioned who played the role of Rama and Krishna. He may be here or there, whether in the opposition or the ruling party. But we are using this trick on gullible people and exploiting these things. And we have not covered this aspect in this Bill. A time should come. Ultimately, popular opinion is much more important. I know about one Chief Minister. Any people lay down at his feet and coconut is broken at his feet. His legs are washed with coconut water. I do not want to mention his name. Everybody knows. When they are making speeches etc. the actual photograph of the person is not shown in poster, but only the film role photograph. All these things shows that we are exploiting the people in the name of religious sentiments. Therefore, we have to be very careful.

We should provide for strong checks. Of course, we have said in this Bill that religious places will not be allowed to be used for political activities, storing arms etc. What is a religious place? Can you say Parliament is a temple and, therefore, it is a religious place? Religious places normally mean places like temples, mosques, gurdwaras etc. You cannot say that every tree is a religious place. You cannot say that every cow is a religious place. It is only a symbol. Even religious leaders would not

like their religion to be ridiculed like this. But those who want to defend obscurantism are trying to find some loopholes in this Bill.

This Bill, as I said, is inadequate. It is only a first step and, therefore, I cannot demand that everything should be covered here. Sir, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru never visited any temple or a mosque or a gurdwara. It is a debatable point whether he was an atheist or not. But as the Head of the State, he was conscious of certain limitations. He knew that in a multi-religious society, there will be different interpretations. But later on, what happened? As our political standing dwindles, as our progressive image gets eroded, we resort to casteism, communalism and we also give concessions to religious sentiments. Therefore, we have to strengthen this aspect.

You may have your political philosophy; democracy, socialism etc. You may believe in anything. You may believe in capitalism even. I have no objection. But once you start finding that your political philosophy is not going down the throat of the people—it does not mean that your policies are wrong, it does not mean that your philosophy is wrong but it is the way you try to operate your policies and programmes — this is where you fail—when you are faced with failure, this failure leads to the use of fundamentalism, communalism, casteism, regionalism etc. Therefore, all these factors should be taken into consideration.

I would appeal to all the Governments. The Opposition is also ruling in some States. I would appeal to all of them not to resort to this sort of thing. I do not say that you should not believe in any religion. It is your own personal belief. You can have your beliefs if it is confined to your own premises. But once you start it outside, it creates problems. Now, communal riots are a frequent occurrence. Other kind of

violence is also a frequent occurrence. This happens. In those riots, it is not the religious leaders who are taking a lead. I know that. They may just foment somewhere. But then the anti-social elements, really crooks and criminals take up the fight in the streets, loot and do arson. So the whole approach towards religion has to be changed.

Secondly, the politicians, those who come to Parliament or the State Legislatures, know the value of religion. Most of them do not observe any kind of religious ethics in their life. We have been seeing them in elections how they operate. But when it comes to a discussion whether this sort of religious practice should be curbed, they say : "Define religion, what is religion? Define a religious place, what is a religious place?" And then attack the Bill as an improperly drafted piece of legislation. This shows that you are not alive to the danger. This shows that you do not know what division of India brought about, which division, let us hope, might not bring about further ghastly results. We have to prepare ourselves for our own defence where religious fundamentalism is leading to destroying each other. So such a ghastly picture and scenario that is emerging out of this kind of fundamentalism should be tackled. Therefore all concerned people should also consider this as the first step and after some time next steps must be taken. I know that unless you become secular, it is difficult to prevent some sort of bills that are coming up here. Nobody likes to pass them, but we have to pass them. There are adverse reactions. Now in the showing of Ramayana and Mahabharat, I do not find anything wrong in it. I am not such a vociferous person. I see them. Good lessons are being taught of ethics. Of course some magic and other things are shown. But that

is mythological aspect of it. The same is the case with Mahabharat. I do not mind any other religious picture being shown, which might have good valuable lessons. It may be a Muslim leader, a Sikh leader or a Christian leader. In a secular society, life of Christ is being picturised. Nobody thinks, it is an anti-secular act. So let us not take this opposition to this kind of length. Once again, I appeal, it is for the leaders because ultimately it is the public opinion which is very vital. We have to create public opinion. Let us not mix ourselves up with all sort of religious activities. Even our leaders go to caste functions. Sometimes I am ashamed, who elected me here? Whether a particular caste elected me that after getting elected, I should go to their function and have garlands from those caste brothers, or from those communal brothers? This is the first betrayal of the electorate if you go to a caste function to have a garland, if you go to a communal gathering to be garlanded. Mahatma Gandhi said "politics without religion", actually meaning that politics without ethics is no politics. His entire emphasis was on ethics and that is how he operated throughout his life. If some quotations are brought out from Gandhiji's book, that is how we have to act upon them. We have to be ethical because we have degenerated too much—there is no doubt about it. But don't go to religious books for that. Most of them are outdated. I am sorry to say. But the teachings given there are also relevant today and we can use them for the advancement of our own democratic society. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I am not against this Bill. I support the spirit of this Bill. I am one of those who firmly advocate that the Government has every right to intervene

[Shri Aladi Aruna alias V. Arunachalam]

in religious matters. This policy has been well acknowledged in our State of Tamil Nadu. That is why the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Board has been constituted there and Government has been entrusted with enormous powers in the administration of Hindu temples.

Sir, at the same time I rise to protest against the promulgation of the Ordinance in relation to this. In the year 1987, the Government of India had promulgated ten Ordinances. As far as this year is concerned, to the best of my remembrance, seven Ordinances have been promulgated so far by the Government of India. It means that this Government by passed Parliament seven times, that this Government has undermined the value of democratic process seven times. As far as this Ordinance—which was promulgated on 26th May—is concerned, we know it well that Parliament was in session up till 13th of May. Now the defence from the Minister is that due to Operation Black Thunder the Government was forced to promulgate this Ordinance. Sir, if it is a genuine cause for the promulgation of this Ordinance, then this type of an Ordinance could have been promulgated soon after Operation Blue Star. The policy of the then Government was not different. The same policy is being followed by this Government also. Now, just to satisfy us by saying something, the honourable Minister is giving this one reason. The point for the consideration of the House is that this measure could have gone through the due democratic process.

Sir, though I extend my full support to the object of the Bill, I totally oppose the manner in which

it has been drafted. If you examine clause 3, from (a) to (i) it clearly reveals how this Government is having sweeping and arbitrary powers. The prime object of this Bill is to see that religion is not mixed with politics. We welcome this object, but it is not an easy task. A controversy emerges and chaos is created when religion is utilized for political purposes.

In India we are interpreting secularism in a peculiar way. If you go through the dictionary, secularism means anti-religion, but what we interpret is that secularism means extending support to all religions. A person who has no faith in a particular religion goes to a temple one day, a mosque on another day and a church on yet another day. It is not a secular character.

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG (Gujarat) : It is a western concept.... (Interruptions)... That the meaning of secularism is anti-religion is a western concept.....(Interruptions)...

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM : It is not western concept. It is genuine. Extending support to all religions is not secularism. That is my contention. So, a person who has no faith in a particular religion or has no faith at all in religion, one day goes to the temple, another day to the mosque and yet another day to the church. Sir, this is not the way of developing secularism. Really this is a fraud on religion.

Sir, the Bill prevents religious institutions from political abuses. At the same time it has totally failed to prevent the misuse of religion. Religious fundamentalism is rampant in our country. Because of religious fanaticism, I would like to remind this House that our President, Mr. Venkataraman was not at all allowed

to enter a temple in Chidambaram. It is reported in the press that Mrs. Prime Minister was not at all allowed to go into the Sri Ranganatha Temple. It has been reported in the "DINA MALAR". That is your journal. That journal is supporting you, I am saying. That is why, my point is, unless religious fanaticism is curbed, no law, no court, no order is going to be successful.

Sir, the object of this Bill is not a new feature. It is incorporated in the Indian Penal Code under Section 153 (A) and (B) itself. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what the difficulty is in exercising this IPC 153(A) and (B). Because religious institutions are misused, the Government has the right to file a case against the persons who are responsible for abuse. But the Government has come forward with a new Bill. What was the need when a proper Act is available with the Government?

Sir, an insurmountable impediment is the concept of religion itself. Fortunately, Hinduism is in no way connected with politics. But, if you take another religion, the concept of religion itself is connected with politics. That is why, it is very difficult to separate religion from politics. I do not know how far the law is going to respect the sentiments of the concept of religion. In this Bill, under clause 8(2) the court has been entrusted with power. If a *prima facie* case exists, it shall pass an order or direction restraining the person from exercising the powers or discharging the duties of his office or post pending trial. When the matter is under trial, the court has a right to remove the person from the office. It is an extraordinary power given to the Government. It is against

the present, prevailing concession to the alleged person.

In clause 9 the more alarming thing is, it is applicable to the managers and other people who are serving in the institution. IPC section 71 deals with public servants. The people, the persons who are working in religious institutions, are not at all public servants. So, what is the need for bringing them under this clause?

Sir, though this Bill is drafted in a general way, though the Bill is applicable to all religions, all religious institutions, it is aimed against gurdwaras. Thereby we are isolating them.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I stoutly deny that allegation. It is unfair and improper for the hon. Member to make that insinuation.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM : It is not an insinuation. He has himself said that the Bill has been brought after the Operation Black Thunder.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : A statement of that nature does not promote amity and goodwill among various section of the people; on the contrary it will promote disharmony and disunity. I would earnestly appeal to the hon. Member not to make such a statement.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM : Sir, the Minister has already stated that the Bill was necessitated due to the Operation Black Thunder.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : I did not say that. I said why the Ordinance was promulgated on the 26th of May. I said why it became urgent and necessary to promulgate the Ordinance on the 26th of May. I did not say that the Bill was necessitated by that.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM : I am to remind that earlier we isolated the Muslims. Now, this Government has deliberately isolated the Sikhs. It is dangerous to the unity and integrity of the country. With this note of warning, I conclude my speech.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU (Crissa) : Sir, I strongly support the Bill to prevent the misuse of religious institutions for political and other purposes. The Aims and Objects of this Bill are very laudable. It has been brought because of certain happenings in the recent past.

India is a cradle of some of the ancient civilisations of the world. It has given birth to many religions like Hinduism, Jainism, Sikhism and is also a meeting point of many religions. So, on the Indian soil we have developed a very rich culture and tradition of respect for other religions. This religious philosophy and the need for peace was propagated and developed four to five thousand years ago in India while many countries of the world remained backward. That being at the back of our mind, our forefathers the framers of the Constitution, very rightly accepted in the Preamble of the Constitution the democratic, socialistic and secular republic as our governing principle. They made provisions for it. But what do we see now? Even after four decades of our independence we are confronted with four dangers which not only the Congress party, but even every national patriot irrespective of the party affiliations has to be conscious of. We cannot close our eyes to what is happening in our surroundings and round our country. India has accepted religious tolerance as its guiding principle. We have accepted secularism giving respect to all religions, while our neighbouring countries have made their religion as the State

religion implying thereby intolerance for other religions. At present many countries of the world are faced with the problem of religious fundamentalism. At the same time linguistic chauvinism and regionalism and casteism threaten the very fabric of our existence. Such attitudes quite often aggravate the situation and threaten the freedom of the motherland. At this juncture we have to stand united and think afresh taking stock of the situation. This Bill has come at a time when it was very much needed. Are we not realising that these dangers are threatening the very ideology of religious tolerance and goal towards brotherhood and peace. Don't we see that within the very precincts of the religious places, within the sanctum sanctorum criminals from outside the country even have taken shelter in an effort to promote destabilisation and to threaten the freedom and unity of our country. If criminals are harboured in any religious place, they have to be dealt with firmly. When fundamentalism is increasing we have to ensure religion and politics are kept apart. When we consider the question that politics and religions are to be separated, we have to see how far we will be successful in this direction. The fundamental problem is that we make laws, but are weak on the implementation side. We have to look afresh and create public opinion. As rightly pointed out by many of the Opposition Members have supported the Bill and have given their suggestions. At the time of the national movement for independence our leaders of different religions had created an atmosphere whereby we had only one goal — freedom of the country. So, we have to think afresh and create that urge among the people so that the people do not have the feeling of communalism and fundamentalism.

India is a sub-continent where many cultures and many religions

exist. Every religion is influenced by the culture of its soil and tradition. When there are many religions, we have to co-exist and we have to tolerate each other so that we can survive. In the history of India where there was religious tolerance over any period of time it was glorious period and where there was intolerance and suffering that was the cause of the downfall of that empire. If we analyse the history, we will know about it.

I do not blame any Gurudwara, Mutt or any religious institution but they must discharge duties perfectly so that the ideals of the religion, inculcating a spiritual faith, high thinking and better life are fulfilled. It must usher in a better hope in the mind of the people. That is what is necessary in this country today. So our institutions should create that kind of atmosphere.

We must pass a Bill of this nature but, at the same time, I urge upon the Minister that he must take consensus of different political parties at critical times. Regular meetings should be convened with them to focus national crisis. I think every body is a patriot and we must work together and concrete steps should be taken so that we can have a new and fresh look to stop this regional chauvinism. Religious fundamentalism and the question of linguistic divisions have created bottlenecks in the progress of our country. If we want to keep our heads high in the world, we have to look from all these angles.

Now I will come to the Bill but refrain from going into all the details due to shortage of time. After the Bill is passed, it becomes very difficult to implement it. In clause 2(c), we have defined "manager", I quote ;

" 'manager', in relation to religious institutions, means every person, including any religious functionary (by whatever name called), who for the time being, either alone or in association with other persons, administers, manages or otherwise controls the affairs of the institution, its functions or properties;"

According to "anybody" when it is interpreted in a court the Manager cannot question the idea which carried in the Bill. By adding many clauses to the Bill we have stretched it farther. I would only like to know whether it would include "trustee" also. The main message behind the authority of sanctum sanctorum can create all the mischief. He can guide it. But he is the invisible head. Sometimes this is done. He is the greatest mischief-maker. If he come under this Bill, then, this Bill serves our purpose. that is one of the important things. We have also mentioned in clause 2 (c) that anybody concerned with the management, anybody concerned with worship in the same institution can be included in this Bill and he can be punished. But there is another question and I appeal to you and to the hon. Minister to create a national consensus. We make laws but when you go to the court, if the people have not the mind to support, we don't get evidence in the court and we simply fail. That is why we have to create a strong public opinion. It is a question of our survival. It is not a question of one religion. It is not a question of one man. Unless and until we create a national thinking and national awakening probably it is very difficult to achieve the goal.

It has been rightly pointed out that politics and religion should not

[Shri Santos Kumar Sahu]

be inter-mixed. While opposition parties have supported this Bill, they have expressed some grave doubts also. The whole question is religious institutions should not be misused for political purposes. That is very clear in this Bill and there should be no second opinion about it. Many have supported it. How can we do it? The whole question is there is no clear definition though only two or three things have been explained in the definition. That has been very clear. The fund collected for spiritual upliftment, for the management of religious institutions should not be spent for other purposes like religious propaganda of political parties. It is very clear that it is for a limited purpose. As my hon. friend said just now, suppose a man goes outside and speaks something, that is his individual opinion, what will be the position according to this Bill, I would like to know whether this Bill will provide punishment for that or whether he is free to do it. It would be better if the hon. Minister clarifies this position because it will clear many doubts.

Many things have been told by various Members. I do not want to repeat them. India is a sub continent of many languages, many cultures which have developed into one culture and which has survived throughout due to tolerance towards other cultures in course of time. We have taught and preached religious tolerance to the world thousand of years back. If we want to glorify that national awareness, that national awakening, then that sense of pride for the country must be there. We must accept that viewpoint and it should serve as a guide to our young men, students and others so that they are able to rise with that new national awareness and national feeling which can only create a 'New India'. In this way, we

would be able to solve these problems. In fact, leaders of the religious institutions sometimes mislead the people and with their religious fundamentalism, they create communal tension. This religious fundamentalism is not only existing in this country but it is existing in many countries of the world and is threatening them like anything. We must focus their attention on this danger so that every nation can realise the magnitude of the danger that is there.

I think this is a beginning. This is a good Bill. I support it and hope the hon. Minister will take steps which in future will create national awareness and he would come with a more comprehensive Bill. Thank you.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, यह जो धार्मिक संस्था (दुरुपयोग निवारण) विधेयक, 1988 इस सदन में गृह मंत्री जी ने रखा है, उसका समर्थन करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं 1988 में एक अध्यादेश के माध्यम से धार्मिक संस्थान के दुरुपयोग को रोकने के लिए यह विधेयक माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने पहले ही संचालित कर दिया था। इसमें स्पष्ट लिखा हुआ है, बड़े अच्छे ढंग से सारी चीजें परिभाषित की गई हैं। इसमें कहा गया है कि जो विभिन्न धार्मिक मूल-वंशीय, भाषाई या प्रादेशिक समूहों या जातियों या समुदायों के बीच असमंजस या शत्रुता, घृणा या वैमनस्य की भावना संप्रवर्तित करता है, या संप्रवर्तित करने का प्रयास करता है या कोई ऐसा क्रिया कलाप करता है, जिसमें भारत की प्रभुता, एकता और अखंडता पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ता है या राष्ट्र-गौरव का अपमान निवारण अधिनियम, 1971 के उपबंधों के उल्लंघन का कोई कार्य करता है और किसी धार्मिक संस्थान के भीतर कोई आयुध या गोला-बारूद आदि जुटाता है या रखता है या प्रबंधक जो उसका है, या जो उनकी निधियों का, कोष का, संपत्तियों का रक्षक है, उन

संपत्तियों का उपयोग किसी राजनीतिक दल के फायदे के लिए था किसी राजनीतिक क्रियाकलाप के प्रयोजन के लिए था किसी विधि के अधीन अपराध के रूप में दंडनीय कोई कार्य न तो वह करेगा और न करने देगा और प्रबंधक जो इसका उल्लंघन करेंगे, उन्हें 10 हजार रुपये जुर्माना और 5 वर्ष की सजा तक दी जा सकती।

मान्यवर, बहुत दिन नहीं हुए जब कि पंजाब की समस्या इतनी जटिल हो गयी थी कि गुरुद्वारा हरमिंदर साहिब में भिड़रावाले की एक धार्मिक राजनेता के रूप में पूजा होने लगी और उस जगह को उसने अपना अड्डा बना लिया। ऐसी स्थिति आ गयी कि वहां घृणा, द्वेष और मानव-मानव में सद्भाव का नाश हो गया और इस तरह रक्तरेजित रक्तपात चारों ओर किया जाने लगा। वे खून के प्यासे हो गए। वहां आतंकवादी शक्तियां विदेशियों के इशारे पर काम करने लगी। उनके द्वारा दिए गए आयुधों, हथियारों, उनके द्वारा दिए गए साधनों, नशीले पदार्थों की तस्करी करा के हमारी सीमा को कास कर के जिस तरह का दुरुपयोग हमारे धार्मिक स्थलों का किया गया उसी का परिणाम था कि आपरेशन ब्लू स्टार हुआ। हमारी नेता इंदिरा गांधी ने हिम्मत से काम लिया। लेकिन विदेशी ताकतों ने उनको हम से छीन लिया। किसी सिख ने इंदिरा गांधी की हत्या नहीं की बल्कि जो विदेशी ताकतें इस देश की आत्मा में अपने उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति के लिए बैठी हुई थी उनके कारण न जाने कितने हमारे देश के निरीह प्राणियों का रक्तपात हुआ और इस देश को सबसे बड़ी हानि यह उठानी पड़ी कि हमें इंदिरा गांधी को खोना पड़ा। उसके बाद इस गतिविधि पर निषेधण लगाया जाना चाहिए था। सरकार को उसी समय इस चीज को हमेशा के लिए समाप्त कर देना चाहिए था। लेकिन 'दर आयद, दुस्त आयद', आपरेशन ब्लक थंडर हुआ और उसमें गजीब गांधी के प्राणों के लिए घात लगाने के जो दस्तावेज माननीय चिदम्बरम् जी ने जैसा बताया था, उन्हें सदन के नामने खा वे रोंगटे खड़े कर

देने वाले हैं। ये वे तथ्य हैं जो बताते हैं कि धार्मिक स्थलों का गलत ढंग से राजनीतिक इस्तेमाल किया गया, मानव-मानव में नफरत पैदा कर के, दूसरे धर्म की निंदा कर के विदेशियों के इशारे पर अपना मकसद पूरा करने की कोशिश की गयी। धर्म की परिभाषा बदलने का प्रयास किया गया।

महोदय, धर्म, धारण करने की प्रक्रिया है। महोदय, कल जो हमारे सदन के वर्य अछे ताकिक वक्ता हैं, माननीय जसवंत सिंह जी, वे बता रहे थे कि यह विधेयक निजी आस्था पर आक्रमण का प्रयास है और कानून की दृष्टि से बाधक है। महोदय, मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि धर्म को राजनीति से अलग किया जा सकता है कि नहीं, कल यह भी जिज्ञासा उन्होंने की थी। महोदय, धर्म धारण करने की प्रक्रिया है। जिस को हम ग्रहण नहीं कर सकते, जिस को हम आत्मसात नहीं कर सकते, जिस को हम अपने जीवन में उतार नहीं सकते, जिस पर हम आचरण नहीं कर सकते, वह धर्म नहीं है। वह अधर्म है और उस अधर्म का नाश अनिवार्य रूप से होना चाहिए। मान्यवर, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, धर्म को राजनीति से अलग करने के विषय में मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहूंगा। जब राम ने बाली को मारा तो बाली ने कहा कि, "धरम हेतु अवतरेहु गोसांई, मारेहु मोहि व्याध की नाई"। आप तो धर्म की रक्षा के लिए उत्पन्न हुए हैं, फिर आपने मुझे व्याध की तरह, बहेलिए की तरह क्यों मारा? तो उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि "अचल करौ तन राखौ प्राना"। कहा कि तुमको मैं अचल कर दू, निर्जीव कर दू, "अचल करौ तन राखौ प्राना। बिहासे कहा सुनु कृपानिधाना॥"

"जनम जनम मुनि जतन कराहीं।

अन्त राम कहि आवत नाही॥

सो गोचर लोचन मम अणे।

रखिहौ नाथ प्रान केहि नाते॥"

(वही राम मेरे सामने प्रत्यक्ष खड़े हैं जिन्हें जन्म जन्मान्तर तक मुनि लोग

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय]

स्मरण करते हैं परन्तु अन्त समय राम शब्द जिह्वा से नहीं निकलता। प्रत्यक्ष राम मेरे सामने है, मैं अब मोक्ष पा रहा हूँ। अब मैं प्राण क्यों रखूँगा। प्राणोत्सर्ग से स्वर्ग राम के समक्ष मिलेगा।)

राम ने आगे जो कुछ कहा राजनीति और धर्म का भेद उन वक्तियों में झलकता है कि :

“अनुज बधू, भगिनी सुत नागी, मुन सठ कन्या मम यही चारी इन्हीं कुदृष्टि विलोकयी जाई। तुहि बधे कछु पाप न होई॥”

यों अनैतिक आचरण करता है, जो पर नारी गमन करता है, जो हिंसा में विश्वास करता है, जो परम्परा परम्परा-गनुष्य में भेद करता है वह चाहे कोई धर्म हो उसमें राजनीतिक नतिकता नहीं है और उसी अनैतिकता के आग्रह ने धर्मियों का उपयोग अपने-अपने स्वार्थों की पूर्ति के लिए किया जाता है ता यह स्वार्थ अशुचित है और उम संबंध से यह बिल लाया गया है। यह मैं अत्यंत पहेलपूर्ण मानता हूँ साथ ही मैं कुछ सुझाव देना चाहूँगा।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश की बहुत सी साम्प्रदायिक संस्थाएँ हैं। श्री शिव सेना के नायक बाल ठाकुर जी का इंटरव्यू मैं पढ़ रहा था। एक साप्ताहिक में उन्होंने स्पष्ट कहा है: “शिव सेना विशुद्ध हिन्दु संगठन है। मुस्लिम संगठन समय आने पर एक हो जाते हैं, हमारे यहाँ यह बात नहीं है। यह बहुत दुख का कारण है। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि सारी कीमती प्राणों के नीचे आ जाए। मेरा विश्वास भी यही है। मैं राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ या भारतीय जनता पार्टी से अपने को अलग नहीं मानता। पंजाब में शिव सेना में जगदीश कांगड़ी काम कर रहे हैं, दिल्ली में ... हो गया है। उत्तर प्रदेश, हरियाणा, ... काश्मीर, हिमाचल प्रदेश में इसकी शाखाएँ खुल रही हैं।” अगर आतंकवादी विदेशों द्वारा

दिए गए आयुधों के आधार पर इस देश में नग्न रक्त रंजित इतिहास के पन्ने लिखने की शुरुआत कर रहे हैं तो शिव सेना हिन्दुवाद को बढ़ावा देकर के जिस रूप में आज सारे दलों को जो धर्म को राजनीति से अलग नहीं मानना चाहते हैं, उनका लेकर के चलना चाहती है। तो ऐसे राजनीतिक दलों पर पाबंदी लगनी चाहिए।

माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत सी राजनीतिक संस्थाएँ चाहे विश्व हिन्दु परिषद् हो, चाहे बखरी मस्जिद एक्सा कमेटी हो, चाहे बजरंगी दल हो चाहे आदम सेना हो चाहे राम जन्म भूमि बचाओ समिति हो चाहे जयश्री संघ हो चाहे एस.सी. हो, आगली खाली दल हो, जिसे क्या हो, माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, आपने साधना के हैं यह नहीं जी ने कहा जाता है कि जिस गति से आप विधेयक लाए हैं उस गति से संसद का समाधान नहीं होना चाहिए इन सभी तथाकथित धार्मिक राजनैतिक दलों को बैन करना होना चाहिए और जो धर्म का राजनैतिक से अलग करने में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं ऐसे लोगों को आपको धर्म से तानून बनाकर के एक ऐसी कड़ाई के साथ उनको नियंत्रण में लाना होगा जो कभी राम जन्म भूमि के नाम पर, कभी बखरी मस्जिद के नाम पर, कभी हिन्दु के नाम पर, कभी मुसलमान के नाम पर अपने काले कारनामे करते रहते हैं।

आज जो हमारे धार्मिक स्थल है उनकी अर्थव्यवस्था पर नियंत्रण करना चाहिए और धर्म परिवर्तन पर नियंत्रण करना चाहिए। आए दिन खबारों में हम पढ़ते रहते हैं कि इन जगह हजारों लोग मुसलमान हो गए, हिन्दु ने क्रिश्चियन हो गए। यह सब क्या है? जो विदेशी चाहे वह पैट्रो-डालर नेतृत्व हैं, चाहे सी.आई.ए. का साध्य हो, धर्म के नाम पर जो हमारे धार्मिक संस्कारों पर प्रहार हो

रहा है चाहे हिन्दु हो चाहे मुसलमान
हो चाहे इस देश का कोई भी नागरिक
हो, उसे स्वतंत्रता है अपने-अपने धर्म
में अपनी इच्छानुसार अपनी आस्था
व्यक्त करने की और उस आस्था व्यक्त
करने के मूल में आर्थिक कमी का जो
ताण्डव नृत्य चल रहा है उनकी आर्थिक
कमियों को दूर करके, धर्म परिवर्तन
का जो कुचक्र इस देश में चल रहा है
उसपर भी बैन लगाना चाहिए और
जितनी भी हमारी धार्मिक संस्थाएं हैं
चाहे वह मन्दिर हो, चाहे मस्जिद हो,
चाहे गुरुद्वारा हो, आज इस देश में
न जान कितने संत-महात्मा पैदा हो
गए हैं। वे संत महात्मा ऐसे हैं चाहे
वे भगवान् राजनीति पैदा हो रहे हैं,
चाहे बुद्धियों के जन्म पर ताण्डव नृत्य
स्वामा पैदा हो रहे हैं चाहे बाल योगेश्वर
पैदा हो रहे हैं जो अभी महरीली में
सीढ़ी पार कर चुके हैं। आज मुझे एक में एक परिचित
मिला जो गुरुदेव का कि इन बिल
को पालने वाले हैं। तो ऐसे जो
तर्क हैं चाहे इसका बुझा हो उन
बात को निश्चित रूप से देखना चाहिए
कि इन को रोकना चाहिए। अभी पुरी
के शंकराचार्य ने श्रीनाथ मंदिर;
हरिजनो के प्रवेश को लेकर जो नितंदावाद
खड़ा किया है, इस देश के शंकराचार्य
ने हमारे देश का चारों हों में हर
जगह उन्होंने शंकर पीठ स्थापित करके
इस देश की गरिमा और महिमा की
चौहद्दी निर्धारित की। वहाँ आज उनका
कई प्रतिनिधि आज सती प्रथा का
समर्थन करते हैं, राजनों के मंदिरों में
प्रवेश को निषिद्ध करते हैं और
हमारी सरकार बार-बार समा समाज बनती
है। ऐसे लोगों को सजा नहीं देनी है।
इसे मैं सरकार की कमजोरी मानता
हूँ। उसे दूर करना चाहिए।

आज हमें पंजाब में अंतकवाद से निपटना
है तो धार्मिक संस्थाओं के पब्लिक अंगर उनका
मूलन फायदा उठाते हैं तो बेजेल जाएं, ऐसे
लोगों के स्थान जहाँ में होने चाहिए जेल
की दीवारों के भीतर रहना चाहिए बाहर
निकलकर उनके लिए कोई स्थान

नहीं होना चाहिए। पूजाघरों में लोग
जाते हैं चाहे वे क्रिश्चियन हो चाहे
मुसलमानों की इबादत करने की जगह
हो, चाहे हिन्दुओं का मंदिर हो, सबको
स्वतंत्रता है अपनी धार्मिक भावनाओं को
प्रकट करने की, अपने पैगंबर की, अपने
ईसामतीह की और अपने गुरु ग्रन्थ
साहब की भावनाओं को प्रकट करने
की और इसके लिए हमारे यहाँ सर्वधर्म
समभाव का सिद्धांत अपनाया गया है।
लेकिन जिस तरीके से माइक लगाकर
उत्तेजा फैलाई जाती है, उसको बंद करने के
लिए सरकार को सोचना चाहिए। जैसा
कि गृह मंत्री जी ने कहा है, वे आगे भी इस
संबंध में और बिल लाना चाहते हैं, हम इस
चीज को निश्चित रूप से शुद्ध्यत करें कि
अगर हमें धर्म को राजनीति में अलग
करना है तो बड़े कठोर कदम उठाने
होंगे, सारे धार्मिक स्थलों का राष्ट्रीयकरण
की नीति लागू है हिन्दुओं के हों, मुसलमानों
के या क्रिश्चियन के और और उसमें
किसा प्रचार का संकोच नहीं होना
चाहिए। ऐडवाइजरी कमेटियाँ उनको
चलाएँ। काशों विखनाथ मंदिर में
अभी ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटर नियुक्त किए गए
हैं। इसके साथ ही इनके द्वारा जो
इंस्टीट्यूशन चलाए जाते हैं उनको
स्वतंत्र करिए ताकि वे धार्मिक संस्थानों
के नियंत्रण में न रहें बल्कि आटोनामी
उनकी होनी चाहिए। उनकी स्वायत्तता
पर सरकार को सोचना चाहिए।

सांप्रदायिक राजनीति के खिलाफ
सर्वो को आज सबसे बड़ी जरूरत है।
जो राजनैतिक विशेष सांप्रदायिकता के
प्रारण हो रहा है इससे राष्ट्रीय एकता
को खतरा है। इसमें उग्रवादी संगठनों पर
प्रतिबंध लगाना चाहिए चाहे वे अमानि
इस्लामी हों, मुस्लिम लोग हों,
मजलिन मृत्युवर्त, इन सब पर
रोक लगाने के लिए इनके राजनैतिक
स्वरूप को समझना पड़ेगा, धर्म
के नाम पर आतंकवाद करने वाले व
आध्यात्मिक गुरुओं का परीक्षण होना
चाहिए। धर्म की सोमाओं में नैतिकता
और मानवीय जीवन के अभ्युत्थता व्याप्त
है। इसलिए राजनीति को इसमें नहीं

[डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डे]

घसीटना चाहिए। राजनीति सेवा का माध्यम होता है। हमारे यहां राजनीति सेवा का माध्यम है और जब-जब हम ऐसी राह पर चलते हैं; कठिनाइयों का पहाड़ आता है हमें व्यक्तिगत म्थार्थों को त्याग कर उस मार्ग पर चलना होगा।

सब कुछ अपने में भर कैम व्यक्ति विकास करेगा,
यह एकांत शांत भीषण है अपना नाश करेगा।

चाहे समाजवाद हो चाहे सनातन धर्म हो सब एक दूसरे के पूरक हैं। सनातन धर्म ही कहता है :

‘औरों को हसते हुए देखो मनु और मुख पाओ।’

अपने पन को विस्मृत कर दो जग को सुखी बनाओ।

तुलसीदास ने तथ्य इसी को कहा है जो सारे संतों में, सारे महात्माओं में भगवत धर्म ग्रंथों का निचोड़ है :

“परहित सरिस धरम नहीं भाई ।
परपीड़ासम नहीं अब भाई ॥”

दूसरों को पीड़ित करने से बढ़ कर कोई पाप नहीं है और दूसरों का उपकार करने से बढ़ कर कोई पुण्य नहीं है। धर्म नहीं है। राजनीति के क्षेत्र में राजनीति सेवा का धर्म होता है और सेवा के धर्म की बात जब आती है तो जब राम को मनाने भरत जाने लगे तो किसी ने कहा चित्रकूट सिर के बल क्यों जा रहे है तो उन्होंने जवाब दिया कि :

“सिर मह जाहू उचित अमर मौरा ।
सबसे सेवक धरम बठौरा ॥”

सेवा का धर्म बड़ा कठोर होता है। जो राजनीति में हो, सत्ता में हो और चाहे विरोधी दल में हो। आज उन्हें मानना चाहिए कि इस देश के

नक्शे को जो लोग छोटा करना चाहते हैं इस देश में साम्प्रदायिकता का विषवमन कर रहे हैं। इस देश की गरिमा, महिमा और प्राचीन परम्परा जहां गूट हो रही है।

“प्रथमे नाजिते विद्या, द्वितीयं नाजिते धनं ।
तृतीये नाजिते धर्म, चतुर्थे कि करिष्यति ॥”

का गान होता रहा है उस हिन्दुस्तान को छोटा न करे और साम्प्रदायिकता की, भाषा की और छाटी संकीर्णताओं की दीवारें न खड़ी करे।

इन शब्दों के साथ इस विल का समर्थन करता हूं और विश्वास करता हूं कि आने वाले दिनों में राजीव गांधी की सरकार जो और भी धर्म से राजनीति को अलग करने वाले विधेयक लायेगी उसमें जो विदेशी पैसों पर धर्म की राजनीति करने वाले लोग हैं या जो इस देश की भोली-भानी निरीह जनता को धर्म की अफीम खिला कर उसके नशे में लाकर उसके मद का उपयोग करके इस देश में साम्प्रदायिकता का विषवमन करना चाहते हैं, उसको नियंत्रित करेगा और उस नियंत्रण के माध्यम से हम एक नये भारत का स्पष्ट आज देख रहे हैं। 21वां शताब्दी में पहुंचने का जो सारे विश्व को चमत्कृत कर देगा, उसका हम स्वागत करेंगे।

डा. इकबाल ने कहा था सबसे बड़ी चीज है :

मस्जिद तो बना ली शब्द भर में इमाम की हरागन वालों ने,

मन अपना पुराना पापी था बरसों में नमाजी बन न सका।

हम ईमानदार बनें, नमाजी बने और जो कहें वह करें। इसलिये जो विरोधी दल के लोग हैं और चाहे सत्ता दल के लोग हैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आज सबसे बड़े इमान के साथ इस देश में साम्प्रदायिकता के जहर को जड़ से उखाड़ फेंकने की जरूरत है। आज साम्प्रदायिकता के नाम पर विदेशी ताकतों के इशारे पर इस देश के लोग इस देश में जहर उगल कर इस देश

के नानन-कानन को उजाड़ना चाहते हैं
जहाँ मानवता सर्वोपरि है।

“पर दुखे उपकार करे बहुमन अभिमान
न माने रे।

वैष्णव जन तो तेने कहिये पीर पराई
जाने रे ॥”

इस भावना को हम विश्वव्यापी, जो टूटे
हुये लोग हैं, दबे हुये लोग हैं उनके उत्थान
में लगे और सर्व धर्म समभाव जो हमारे
देश का है जहाँ पूर्ण स्वतंत्रता है हर व्यक्ति
को अपनी धार्मिक आस्था के अनुरूप आचरण

करने की उस आस्था को विश्वव्यापी प्रतिष्ठा
दिलाने का यत्न करेंगे इन शब्दों के साथ
मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN
(SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALA-
VIYA) : I have to inform Members
that the Business Advisory Committee
at its meeting held today, the 18th
August, 1988, allotted time for
Government Legislative and other
Business as follows :—

* Business

Time Allotted

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 1. Consideration and passing of the Punjab
Pre-emption (Chandigarh and Delhi
Repeal) Bill, 1988. | 1 hour |
| 2. Discussion on the 35th and 36th Report
of the Union Public Service Commission. | 4 hours |

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE RELIGIOUS INSTITU- TIONS (PREVENTION OF MIS- USE) ORDINANCE, 1988 (NO. 3 OF 1988)—Contd.

II. RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS (PREVENTION OF MISUSE) BILL, 1988—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN : (SHRI
SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA) :
Sardar Jagjit Singh Au-
rora.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH
AURORA (Punjab) : Mr. Vice-
Chairman, Sir, at the outset...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : श्रीमान्, मेरा
व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मेरा व्यवस्था का
प्रश्न यह है कि आपकी कुर्सी से, अध्यक्ष
की कुर्सी से, जो भी सूचनाएँ जारी की
जाती हैं, क्या वे सब अंग्रेजी में ही तैयार
होती हैं या नहीं? सदन की भाषा हिन्दी
है, इसलिये हिन्दी में भी सूचनाएँ दी जानी
चाहिये। अभी तक यह देखा गया है कि
अध्यक्ष की कुर्सी से जो भी सूचनाएँ दी जाती
हैं वे हमेशा हिन्दी में ही दी जाती हैं। ऐसा
क्यों होता है?

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : मैं श्री राम
अवधेश सिंह जी के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन
करता हूँ। इन सूचनाओं को केवल अंग्रेजी
में ही नहीं, हिन्दी में भी होना चाहिये।