

[श्री राम नरेश यादव]

यह अभिव्यक्त किया कि पहला काम कीमतों में वृद्धि को रोकना है। किन्तु गंभीर चिंता का विषय यह है कि कीमतों में वृद्धि को रोकने की कौन कौन निरन्तर आवश्यक वस्तुओं के दाम भी बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। इस सरकार के 100 दिन के कार्यकाल की उपलब्धि यह है कि नमक का दाम दुगुना हो गया, खाद की बोरी का दाम 20 रुपये से 25 रुपये बढ़ गए। मिट्टी का तेल मिलता नहीं है और यदि मिलता भी है तो 5 रुपये से 6 रुपये लीटर तक मिलता है। कपड़े के दाम भी 30 फीसदी के करीब बढ़ोतरी हुई है। इसी प्रकार से लोहा, सीमेंट, कोट-नाशक दवाइयों आदि की कीमतों में भारी मात्रा में वृद्धि हुई है। इसका सीधा प्रभाव देश के उन तमाम लोगों पर पड़ रहा है जो बेचारे गरीब हैं, श्रमिक हैं, किसान हैं और बेतन भोगी मध्यम वर्गीय परिवार के हैं। बाट के पशुवात इन चीजों के दामों में और भी तेजी के साथ वृद्धि होना आरम्भ हो गई है। सरकार की सार्वजनिक वितरण प्रणाली सर्वथा विफल सिद्ध हुई है।

सरकार ने आज तक 100 दिन के अंदर इस पर नियंत्रण पाने, जीवनोपयोगी वस्तुओं की बाजार में उपलब्ध कराने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठाया है। इसका कारण यह है कि सरकार को पूँजीपतियों के साथ सौदागंड है। इससे सरकार का दोड़रा चरित्र स्पष्ट हो जाता है। मंहगाई पर नियंत्रण पाने की सरकार की घोषणा चुनावी स्टंट बन कर रह गई है। इससे जहाँ सरकार ने जनता की आशाओं पर पानो फेरा है वहाँ मतदाताओं के साथ विश्वासघात भी किया है।

मेरा आपके माध्यम से सरकार से आग्रह है कि वह कर्म से अपनी पहचान बनाए केवल झेली से नहीं। इसके लिए आवश्यक है कि सार्वजनिक प्रणाली को चुस्त किया जाय, जीवनोपयोगी आवश्यक वस्तुओं की भारी मात्रा में उपलब्ध कराया जाय, स्टॉकिस्टों और इससे जुड़े व्यापारियों के ऊपर उनके घरों या गोदामों में छापे मार कर उन वस्तुओं की बाजार में उपलब्ध कराया जाय तथा मंहगाई के संबंध में सरकार एक श्वेत-पत्र जारी करे।

मुझे विश्वास है कि सरकार इस दिशा में कदम उठाएगी और जनता को आश्वस्त करेगी कि किसी भी कीमत पर जीवनोपयोगी आवश्यक वस्तुओं के दाम वह न बढ़ने देंगी।

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदया, राम नरेश यादव जी के विशेष उल्लेख से मैं अपने को संबद्ध करता हूँ।

1. BUDGET (PUNJAB), 1990-91
2. PUNJAB APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1990
3. PUNJAB APPROPRIATION BILL, 1990

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Punjab, for the services of a part of the financial year 1990-91, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, I also beg) to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Punjab for the services of the financial year 1989-90, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill arises out of a sum of Rs. 274.44 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on the 20th March, 1990 and Rs. 9.39 crores charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State of Punjab. These amounts have been sought to cover the additional requirements in the current financial year. Full details of the provisions are available in the supplementary demands circulated to the Members on 13th March 1990.

The questions were proposed

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Madam, I wish to raise one point of order. In the statement of objects and reasons of this Bill, it has been stated, this Bill is introduced in pursuance of articles 204(1) and 206 of the Constitution, read with the proclamation issued under article 356 of the Constitution in respect of the State of Punjab on 11th May 1987. Madam, the power which is being invoked for introducing this Bill has been traced in the statement of objects and reasons to the proclamation issued under article 356 of the Constitution on 11th May 1987. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition argued to show that this proclamation ceased to exist on the repeal of the 59th Constitution Amendment. If this proclamation has lapsed and ceased to exist, there is no source of power under which this Bill can be introduced. The Parliament has no power to consider this Bill and there is no constitutional authority for the introduction of this Bill in as much as the source of power, namely the proclamation has ceased to exist as it has been argued by the Leader of the Opposition, on the repeal of the 59th Amendment.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is going to reply. He will deal with our point. Your point is being noted.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (Gujarat): Madam, this is for the kind consideration of the Finance Minister. I had raised this issue yesterday that because section 2 of the 59th Amendment by virtue of which the proviso was added to article 356 (5), had been repealed, the source of power itself lapses and I do not know whether it will be called legal in any form because the proclamation goes. If the proclamation goes, the Presidential rule goes. If the Presidential rule goes, the entire proceedings become illegal.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: I am raising the objection to the introduction of the Bill. The Bill can be introduced if there is a constitutional power to introduce the Bill. This point has to be answered by the hon. Minister before the Bill is introduced and it is allowed to be debated. If the very introduction of the Bill is constitutionally invalid, then further proceedings cannot continue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In the other House, the Bill has already been passed. It was introduced.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA : Madam I respectfully submit that as an independent House, we have the right to raise an objection which probably was not raised there.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The law remains the same whether it is this House or that House.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Madam, may I just make one suggestion for the kind consideration of the Finance Minister? It is one O'clock now. We could start full debate itself if he wants say about 2 O'clock, and in the meanwhile, he could just go into it and look up what could be done. In fact, we are prepared to help if some way could be found out.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is reacting. He is replying.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: We do not want to stand in the way of the functioning of the Punjab Government because it is a matter which is very serious. We shall fully cooperate but the whole thing has to be done in a constitutional manner.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
Lit him reply. Then you can
iptak.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल (पंजाब) :
उपसभापति महोदया, मुझे इतना ही कहना
है कि जो हमारे लीडर ने कहा हम उसके
साथ पूरी तरह से सहमत हैं, हम पूरा
पार्टिसिपेट करेंगे। मैं लीगल बात नहीं
करता, लीगल बात जो लीगल
लामिनरीज है, वे ही करेंगे। एक कामन-
सेंस की बात है कि 11 मई को खत्म
हो रहा है, फरदर पेरियड कांस्टीट्यूशन
के मुताबिक एक्सटेंड नहीं हो सकता तो
छसका बजट कैसे हम डिस्कस कर सकते
हैं।

उपसभापति : वे जवाब देंगे।

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : वे जवाब दे
ना न दें।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
He will give an answer. He will
give his view-point.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR
BANSAL (Punjab): The hon.
Finance Minister should have come
prepared to meet at least the se-
cond part of the argument because
this was raised on the very first
day. In any case, President's
rule, as the provision stands now,
cannot extend beyond 11th May.
That was the point we raised on
that day also. It is not as if it is a
new point for which he requires
time. I remember vividly, we
raised it on the very first day.
And you said that we could refer
to it when we take up the matter
for consideration.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
He has come prepared. Let him
answer.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-
VATE: I was ready even on that
day.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : मैडम,
यह ऐसा है कि जैसे हम सरकार को 5
साल का मैडेन्ड मिला हो और ये 6
साल का बजट ले आए। वह ऐसा ही
होगा।

प्रो० मधु दंडवते : मैं जवाब देता हूँ।
हम बेवकूफ होंगे, लेकिन इतने बेवकूफ नहीं
हैं। मैं जवाब देता हूँ।

PROF. MADHU DANDA-
VATE: Madam, if you recall what
happend the other day, when the
point which the hon. Member has
just now raised was made, I got
up and made some clarifications
and when further discussion was
sought, even at that stage, I was pre-
pared. And I sent word that I was
prepared. Even at that time I was
prepared on that point. (*Interrup-
tions*). Please listen. I was pre-
pared I had sent word. I will
quote the ruling. I have gone
through the records. I said, I
read out, it is vote on account for
six months. Questions arose as to
what the further implications were.
I said that if you wanted to take
it up at that time, I was prepared.
I said it was left to you. Madam,
if you recall, you have given your
ruling that when the discussion
begins, at that time, those who are
objecting may also raise the
issue and the Minister also may make
a reference to that. And therefore,
I did not press. Now I will make
the point very clear in the context
of the past precedents and also the
constitutionality and legality of
the problem. Madam, it is
true that on 10th May 1990,...
(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
He would like the Leader of the
House also to listen.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-
VATE: On 10th May 1990, this
particular proclamation will lapse,
Now the question is like that.
Even if you go through all the
precedents, whenever a vote on
account is introduced for a parti-

cular period, even spilling over a period when the proclamation is likely to end and no further proclamation is likely to come, it is only by way of abundant caution. You imagine a provision like this that only for a month vote on account is put forward, or for two months. Then, at a later stage, there is no more President's rule. Then the elections are to be held. A fresh Assembly is to be born. Let me make it very clear—and the Leader of the Opposition who is an authority on Constitutional and legal matters will agree with—that as far as the constitutionality is concerned, if on 10th May the proclamation ends and it is decided that the Assembly is to be revived, then the elections are to be announced. It would take some time for the new Assembly to be born.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Before 10th May. That means immediately,

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I make it very clear. When the new Assembly is born, it is accepted, even constitutionally, legally and morally, that that newly born Assembly has the full right to make alterations even on the vote on account which had been passed by Parliament because only during the pendency or during the dissolution of the Assembly or when the Assembly does not exist, it is Parliament that takes charge of the powers of the State. And the moment the Assembly is born, even for six months and for that matter, seven months, a vote on account is passed by Parliament, from that moment when the Assembly is born, it has the sovereign authority to make any alterations. I have checked all the precedents. Therefore, very often, when the vote on account is carried, on, sometimes for four months, sometimes for six months, this convention is only to follow the procedure by way of abundant caution. It is because all the things cannot be changed

but that authority is there. This particular Vote of Account for six months does not take away the authority of the new Assembly that might be formed. It becomes sovereign and it has right even to make any number of alterations that they want to make and, therefore, we are perfectly within our right to proceed with the matter... (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI MADAN BHATIA: His point of order is totally different from the one which I raised. My point of order, I respectfully submit, Madam, still remains unanswered. My point of order is totally different.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Hon. Finance Minister, I have no dispute with the observations that you have made with respect to the Vote on Account which could spill over the period of the Presidential Rule. I do not have any dispute. My dispute is something different. My dispute is under article 356 itself, the Constitutional provision places an embargo that no Presidential Rule can be beyond three years in any form whatsoever. Article 356(4) and (5) both of which you kindly read 356(4) for six months; then for another six months, it could be extended. And for another two years it could be extended only if an emergency is imposed and the Chief Election Commissioner certifies impossibility of election. So the total period has to be only three, not beyond that. So the total period in this case under the Constitution elapses by the 10th of May, 1990. Therefore, after three years you cannot go in for the Vote on Account. I just give an example so that my point may become clear. If the Presidential Rule has been imposed for six months and four months have elapsed and then you come for a Vote on Account for six months, then there is no problem because

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

the Constitution itself gives you the power to impose the Presidential Rule up to three years. Now three years period is also elapsing. That is the point which I am trying to bring to your kind notice. Since the Vote on Account is also under the Constitution and the Presidential Rule is also under the Constitution and the period has been clearly specified for three years, the Vote on Account beyond 10th of May, 1990, which will be more than three years, would be wholly unconstitutional.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: I will answer that point. Hon. Leader of the Opposition may recall that previously also when situation had arisen, you realised how we overcame the difficulty by making the Constitutional Amendment at that time even when the provision was not there for such an extension. Therefore, at that time we have to face that situation... (Interruptions)... Therefore, as he has technically pointed out regarding the maximum permissible period after the new provision how much is the time for which proclamation can continue and can be valid? That is the position about the Constitution as it stands today. But it is possible, theoretically I may say, that there are possibilities that before the 10th of May, 1990, the proclamation may end. If that ends, the difficulty won't arise. You have realised that. Suppose before 10th of May, the Presidential Rule is terminated... (Interruptions)... Please listen to me. Is there any harm in listening to me?

उपसभापति : यह लॉगल, कांस्टिट्यूशनल मैटर है, लीडर ऑफ दी हाउस बोले हैं, इन्हें जवाब देने दीजिए । इसमें कोई बहस का सावल नहीं है, सब लोग पंजाब के लिए कन्सर्ड है ।

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: Is there any constraint in listening to me? There are various options. One option is, before 10th of May, the Presidential Rule can be terminated. If this is terminated, this difficulty does not arise. The honourable Member will bear me out. There will be no Constitutional difficulty, no legal difficulty.

Suppose by the 10th of May the Government decides that it is not in the interest of the country and the State to terminate the Presidential Rule. But there are certain restrictions, as has rightly been put forward by the honourable Members, under the Constitutional provisions. In that case, the only alternative that might be available is to go in for a Constitutional amendment in which case a further option can be provided. Now, what option will be available? We cannot anticipate just now. But I will keep this point in view and I can assure the honourable Member that we will try to manage the matters in such a way that the requirements of the Constitution will not be violated.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Just a moment. Madam, I must appreciate Prof. Madhu Dandavate because, notwithstanding the fact that he has not been a lawyer, he has very beautifully, extremely beautifully, analysed the thing.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: The hon. Member, Mr. Shiv Shanker, may also know that though I was not a student of economics, I have presented the Budget ! My subject is nuclear science.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It is more a matter of common sense. Now, my point is that this three-year period is the maximum that has been provided in the Constitution under article 356.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: I concede that.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Today, the Vote on Account exceeds that period, and that period, in excess, becomes totally illegal unless you amend the Constitution first...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That is exactly the point.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: and take the powers. If you amend the Constitution, take the power and extend it to four years, then your action would, of course, be perfectly justified. Whether you will go ahead with the extension of the Proclamation at some later stage or not is a different matter but, without going in for a Constitutional amendment, if you take the powers to extend it beyond three years, then this Vote on Account becomes illegal. That is what I am saying.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: Madam, I concede the substance in his argument. But he should also concede that there are two possibilities. We can proceed with the particular Bill on the ground that there is an enabling provision to have a certain option to see that even if we extend it for six months, that won't become unconstitutional and illegal; at least till the period—the Proclamation period is up to the 10th of May—till that particular time, as it exists today, there is no difficulty. But, Madam, since the options are open to us and when we are announcing in the House that we will manage the matters in such a way that the constitutionality is not allowed to be violated, I think, in that case, there can be two opinions; I concede. But there can be one interpretation which can say that we propose to do it because there is the enabling provision and because we have got the option and also the time required to make the necessary Constitutional amendment. Of course, if the Presidential Rule is ended by the 10th of May, this question won't arise. These are the two interpretations.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I do not propose to enter into any argument with the honourable Minister on this issue and I leave the matter there but I respectfully disagree with the approach that you are taking because I very strongly feel that we are entering an area of illegality.

PROF. MADHU DANDA-VATE: Let us cross the bridge when we reach it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bansal.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Madam, the performance of the new Government in the first hundred days may not be a foolproof basis for passing a judgement on its failure on many counts. But it is a period sufficient enough to have a look at the direction of the policy which the Government adopt and also to assess the impact of any such policy on the national life, particularly when the occasion is used by the honourable Prime Minister to give a list of what he calls many achievements during this period.

Before taking over the reins of the Government, Shri V.P. Singh had gone on record to say that the Punjab imbroglio could be resolved within a period of fifteen days given the political will and the capacity. Madam, after taking over as the Prime Minister, Shri V.P. Singh went to Punjab. I for one would say that it was a good gesture. But what does he do after that? He gloats over this visit. He becomes poetic in his expression. And what result his poetry has achieved is before us to see. I had put a question at that time in response to the Government's claim of being an open Government. I wanted to know as to what was the number of security personnel who had accompanied the Prime Minister on his visit to Amritsar. The reply I had was that this in-

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal] formation was of a secret nature and as such it could not be divulged. I want to dwell on that for a moment. I had not sought information about the number of people who would accompany the Prime Minister on a future visit. I had sought some information on a visit which was over and that information was not provided to me. I say so because the situation in Punjab today is deteriorating at an alarming rate. Some gains that had so painstakingly been secured by the previous Government have been squandered.

Under the previous Government more than half the police stations in the State of Punjab had not reported a single incident for over two years. And today no part of Punjab is safe. Terrorism today is on the rise. There are bomb explosions. There are kidnappings for extortion all over the State. More police officials have been killed during the last three months than were killed during the last four years. The morale of the police has plummeted to a level that was not heard of, that was not imagined ever before. The Prime Minister goes to Ludhiana in an all-party rally. But a day before that a senior police official, the Senior Superintendent of Police of the district, was killed in his office. There was no word of sympathy or condolence from the Prime Minister. At that time he was under the influence of his allies and was perhaps toying with the idea of bringing peace to Punjab by condemning the police. Madam, it is because of the policy of appeasement pursued by the present Government—and incidentally that is the only policy they can claim credit for—the police, as I said, is demoralised. It cannot take up, it cannot stand up to the task that is expected of it and over 600 homeguards have abandoned their jobs. The previous Government had set up village defence units almost all over the State and today

they have either been disbanded or have been rendered redundant. As a result of the confidence-restoring measures taken by the previous Government, migration of the members of the minority community had come to a halt. But this has resumed at an alarming rate again. The only reassuring factor today is that communal harmony has been maintained in the State thanks to the understanding, to the mutual goodwill, of the ordinary people of all sects and communities.

Madam, the hon. Home Minister visited Punjab yesterday after a gruesome incident at Moga a few days back and at Chandigarh yesterday. He, in a Press interview has given a feeling of his mind to an impending change in the administration. I concede that it is the prerogative of any Government to bring about administrative changes for the result that it seeks to achieve. But my fear, Madam, again is that a statement as that would further lead to demoralisation of the forces in the State. I again do not want to enter into the domain of the allocation of business of the Government nor do I want to get into the question of rather a fight between the IAS officers and the IPS officers about supremacy in a particular field of activity. But in this context, I do want to refer to a para from a note on the law and order situation in Punjab as prepared by the Punjab Government. Permit me to read it out, Madam :

"The dormant powers of Civil Administration *vis-a-vis* law and order machinery have been re-activated. There is a civil interface in the police and general administration to win cooperation and confidence of the people. Instructions have been issued to the District Magistrate to exercise their powers under the Punjab Police Rules and according to other provisions of law. This is again in consonance with the objective

of reviving faith in the State Administration."

What does it throw up ? Either, the District Administration was not so far, including the last three months, coming up to its duties or as I see it, henceforth the District Magistrate would be the immediate boss of the Police Chief of the district. In other words, he would be writing his annual confidential reports. Madam, situations like this have arisen in the past and we know what sort of a demeaning rivalry went on between the two. I suppose at this critical juncture, when the Administration, the police, is engaged in a grim battle against the secessionist and terrorists, no action of the Government should be such which leads to some sort of cold war between the two. It is with a seriousness that it deserves that I made this reference, because I do not wish to see that our officers who have till this day been concentrating all their energies on fighting the secessionists and terrorists, fight amongst themselves.

Madam, I would agree with the belief or with the viewpoint that the Punjab problem calls for a political solution. The Congress during its regime has always advocated that. But the Congress was firm in its belief that there has to be no negotiations with those whose creed is violence and whose aim is the breaking up of the country. Today what we see is that there is a failure on the part of the Government to reiterate that and to take the country into confidence as to what its policy on Punjab is. The Government, permit me to say, —Madam, is groping in the dark.

The Government is keeping the country also in a state as to what it is up to. There cannot be no better example for this submission of mine than to refer to what the hon. Minister

for Finance just said when there was an objection raised to the Vote on Accounts that he seeks for the first six months of the financial year. The point was very eloquently driven home by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. P. Shiv Shanker. I would not like to reiterate it and take the time of this hon. House. But, Madam, I do want to say that in his reply the hon. Finance Minister missed the basic point. The basic point is that as the constitutional provision stands today, the Government has no right to do any act, whether it is legislative or of passing any order which goes beyond that period. And not going to be pedantically legalistic in my approach. I want to come to the political aspect of it. It is only two months that are left for the President's rule to expire. It is not that there is a provision enabling the Government to move a Resolution and seek the approval of the Parliament for extending it for another six months. The higher limit prescribed in the Constitution comes to an end on 11th May, 1990. As to what the Government is going to do has got to be made known to the people today. If the Government decides to ask for an amendment to the Constitution, this is the time for the Government to take initiative, call an all party meeting and discuss the issue there. If the Government, after assessing the situation, is of the opinion that it will hold elections before 11th May, then the process has to start immediately. In any case, if the new Government has to come into office before 11th May, the election process has to begin in the first week of April. It is only ten days from now and the hon. Minister says that they will take the decision at the appropriate time. Madam, this is the policy or lack of policy that I am referring to with some dismay that the present Government seems to be following on Punjab. If this is the seriousness with which the Government is approaching the Punjab issue, then God save the country.

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

Madam, an all-party meeting was called by the Government some time back. At that time, and as I do now, we raised certain basic questions. We wanted the Government to spell out its policy on Punjab. We wanted the Government to tell us whether it considers the Rajiv Gandhi-Longowal Accord as the basis for proceeding further in the State.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN
(West Bengal) : Do you remember it?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Yes, I do. Just ask the Chair to give me more time and I would like to answer you in detail.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN :
The Congress Party has forgotten it.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : The Congress Party never forgot it. The Congress Party stood by it and stands by it. It was the filibustering attitude of the people who are now in the ruling party which led us to this situation and which led Punjab into the morass that it finds itself in today. Madam, Mr. Sukomal Sen's statement does provoke me to say that friends who now sit in the Treasury Benches spared no effort to say that the Congress Government at that time was prolonging the spell of the President's rule for personal gains. Madam, we ceased to be in the Government in December, 1989. It is the National Front Government supported by Mr. Sukomal Sen's party which now controls the reins of the Central Government. The first action, again a thoughtless one I would say and more of a populous measures, was to repeal the 59th Amendment. We supported that measure because we did not want to come in the way of the Government in devising any means, any strategy, to bring peace to the State. Today they don't know what they have to do. They don't know whe-

ther they have to proceed further for an amendment of the Constitution or not. That is the dilemma which the ruling party is facing and the country is facing as a result of their thoughtlessness. I wish the Government would consider this seriously and take the country into confidence in answering some of the very basic questions which pertain to Punjab.

I wish the hon. Home Minister was here. He said in the morning that he would be intervening in the debate. But since Mr. Madhu Dandvate is also on the panel that the Prime Minister has formed for Punjab, I would like to raise two or three basic questions and want to elicit the opinion of the Government on these. I would like to know...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I may incidentally tell you that while in the Opposition, I had initiated six debates on Punjab. So, I will intervene even in that capacity.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Knowing that and knowing the concern that you have always shown for the welfare of Punjab, I am sure that you would be able to influence your Prime Minister to get out of the control that various other forces wield on him from outside, and really act in the interest of Punjab and the country, Sir.

Madam, I would like to know specificity from the Government as to what is its reaction, what is its position on the renewed demand of Khalistan, on the re-assertion of the separatist elements in the Anandpur Sahib Resolution, on the role played by certain agencies in Pakistan. And as I said, what is its perception on the Rajiv Gandhi Longowal Accord? And as my friend Mr. Hanspal put in the morning, what is the Government's view on the overdue elections to the Shiromani Akhand Kirtikarn Committee? And what steps does the Government propose to take to

ensure the safety of the people of Punjab?

With these questions, Madam, seeing some restlessness on your face, I would like to proceed...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

No, no. The restlessness was because the Members wanted to know whether we are adjourning for lunch or not. And I said, when you finish the speech I will adjourn the House because I did not want to interrupt you.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Madam, I do want to take up after lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

You want to finish now?

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Madam, I will have to continue for some time. I have to come to the Budget part. I will cut short my submission on the political aspect and I will come to the Budget.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

You can resume your speech after lunch. Now the House Stands adjourned till 2.30 for lunch.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-three minutes past one of the clock.

BUDGET (PUNJAB), 1990-91
PUNJAB APPROPRIATION
VOTE, ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1990
AND
PUNJAB APPROPRIATION
BILL, 1990—Contd.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-five minutes past two of the clock, The VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. G. Vijay Mohan IReddy) in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY) :
Mr. Bansal to continue his speech,

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir Punjab today is highly inflammable made more so by the intransigent and extremist postures adopted by the Akali leadership of different hue from time to time.

Sir, I do not want to use this occasion to apportion blame. But I do earnestly say that if our friends on the other side, who have been the allies of the Akalis in the past, had prevailed over them to bring about some sobriety in their attitude and if the Akalis had risen to the responsibility that time had placed on them, I feel things would have been different today. I do not want to dwell at length on this. But I want to reiterate that being highly inflammable, as I said, the situation brooks no loose shunting.

The Punjab problem is a national problem. It calls for a national endeavour. May be, we have been faltering with the nity-gritty of the problem or in regard to working out the modalities of different things. But today, if the constituents of the Government put their heads together, I do hope, a solution can be arrived at.

The river water and the territorial disputes may have been relegated to the background today. But there is no denying the fact that these issues were the starting points for the Punjab problem which, ultimately, degenerated into something different as we find today because of various other vested interests including foreign forces having jumped in.

Sir, the Rajiv-Longowal Accord was arrived at. It was our sincere endeavour to bring peace to this strife-torn State and the accord was entered into with the fervent hope that irrespective of which party wins or loses the elections, what was absolutely essential for the country was that the flame of democracy