

STATUTORY RESOLUTION APPROVING PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER ARTICLE 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION IN RELATION TO THE STATE OF PUNJAB.

SHRI CHINTAMANJ PANIGRAHI:
 Madam Deputy Chairman, I beg to move the following Resolution:—

“That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 11th May, 1987, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Punjab.”

The question was proposed.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Punjab situation is worrying the whole country and it is connected with the question of the national unity and integrity and that is why, not only the ruling party but also the Opposition parties, are trying their level best for a long time to arrive at a settlement. There was some understanding and discussion and a process was started a few month before. We were hopeful that the process would be further strengthened but all of a sudden, we came to know yesterday from the newspapers that something is being hatched to impose President's rule in Punjab. Yesterday, the issue was raised in Lok Sabha as well as in our House also. The leaders of the Opposition met the Chairman and wanted a debate but suddenly, this morning, we came to know that already there is a proclamation for imposition of President's rule. Why? Why such a hurry and why this proclamation? The daily newspapers have correctly reacted that it is only to influence the Haryana election because Congress(I) is feeling very much shaky now regarding the outcome of the Haryana election and that is why, sacrificing the interest of national unity and in-

tegrity, this step has been taken which is not only a partisan step but a sectarian and an opportunist step which will completely reverse the process which we started collectively in Punjab. It is very much interesting that only on the opening day of the Budget Session, what our President, in his speech, has said about Punjab Government—I am reading it out.

“In Punjab the forces of democracy, unity, progress and secularism continue to be engaged in the struggle to isolate and wipe out the anti-national elements which are guided and controlled by foreign sources.”

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri H. Hanumanthappa) in the Chair]

This collective attempt of all the secular, democratic and progressive forces to intervene in the situation of Punjab is a process to intervene not only in the situation of Punjab, it is a process to intervene in the situation of the entire country as well where communal forces are very much on the offensive, are rising. You now completely sidetrack that whole process. This is a most irrational decision, irresponsible decision, most unwise decision, taken for a narrow interest, for influencing the Haryana election. Whom are you helping by this? Are you helping the secular forces, the forces which took the initiative to start the process of fighting the secessionists, fighting the communal elements, rousing the secular forces, democratic forces, for intervention on a national scale? Are you helping them? By taking this action you are helping those forces which wanted immediate removal of this Barnala Government who wanted that that process should be immediately stopped. This is a direct help to the secessionist forces. You talked about foreign forces interested in destabilising us. Everybody knows what the ramifications are of these Khalistan elements, these extremists, not only inside the country but outside. What is the justification behind this pro-

* clamation? Law and order is now broken. The second argument I saw was that a parallel centre has been started by these extremist forces. Is it a new fact today? Their centres are there not only inside the country; their centres are there in America, in Canada, in London. You are fighting on the plea that a parallel centre has been started. You threw out those who came forward for mobilising the entire secular forces. What is the characterisation of Barnala Government by the President in his speech? I tell you, you have done a very big disservice by this proclamation. The entire process has been completely reversed. Secondly, under the leadership of Chief Minister S. S. Barnala, the State Government and the people of Punjab have shown exemplary courage in upholding the values of a secular democracy. There is no appreciation for that now. What does this proclamation mean? Appreciation was expressed in the speech of the Rashtrapati. You are now denouncing it though the proclamation has also been issued by the same President who had expressed his appreciation of the same Government. This is anti-climax. This is opportunism and this opportunism the ruling party is following not today but from the very start, particularly in relation to Punjab. I was associated in the earlier process when all the Opposition parties usually met in order to find some solution for the Punjab situation. A time came when in June 1983 the agreement was only awaiting signatures. But at that time we suddenly came to know that the Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi retreated. Then we came to know the reason behind it—Haryana...

श्री सुरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : (पंजाब) :
 मेरा प्वाइंट आफ़ ऑर्डर है। अभी आपने कहा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर रिट्रीट कर गये; एग्जीमेंट नहीं हो सका तो आपके पास क्या सबूत है इसका।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Let me explain I was a participant in

those joint meetings with Opposition leaders, with the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, with the Akali Dal leaders—Mr. Advani was also there—and all the Opposition leaders and we held a series of meetings and we all tried to come to some solution in the case of Punjab. So, we had a greater responsibility in solving this problem of Punjab. I am not speaking simply as a Member of Parliament or as a person representing a particular party, but I am speaking because all along we were trying our level best to see how a solution could be found. But our main point was that a solution should not be found through administrative measures and through military methods, but it should be found by political methods and political methods means that the people must be roused and the extremists and the secessionists should be totally isolated from them so that the people can come forward and intervene; otherwise, there was no solution. This was our argument. We repeatedly talked with the leaders also and I think that Mr. Darbara Singh will remember that we had similar talks also and all of them agreed, including Shrimati Indira Gandhi—she herself agreed—that this was to be the solution by which we should intervene and bring about a solution, a real solution. But now, suddenly, the Proclamation is issued on the basis of the assumption that the law and order situation is out of control. What is the new situation which has developed which requires this Proclamation? Nothing new. Only sixteen people have been killed the previous day... (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Only sixteen? (Interruptions).

SHRI DIPEN GOSH (West Bengal): How many people were killed during the earlier President's Rule? Give me the account. (Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Let there be no cross talks because this is a very serious situation and we want

*Approving Proclamation
issued by the President*

*of the Constitution
to the State of Punjab*

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

to debate it very seriously. We want to debate it very seriously because we want that some way must be found to solve this problem. We are not scoring points here. That is why I am very much angry against this decision and it is because we ourselves are involved in all these matters. This new process started in consultation with us. But in this reversal of the process, where is our position? Not only did you ignore Parliament totally, but also you ignored the entire Opposition. How can we believe in your words that you would consult the Opposition? This is such a measure you have taken and you have reversed the entire process. Now, who is going to gain and who will gain out of these measures? It is only the extremists.

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

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Your saying, "No, no." will produce no results at all. What the Prime Minister told in this House is this: We "want to separate politics from religion." Where is that stand now? Repeatedly he has said and emphasised that politics and religion should be separated because, otherwise, in a secular country, we cannot isolate the communalists, we cannot isolate the secessionists and, we cannot isolate the divisive forces. We see now that those elements who wanted to remove the Barnala Government have now been strengthened.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Have been...?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Have been strengthened. Now they have been strengthened and this compliment given to the Barnala Government proves that you accepted the boldness and the courage they showed to fight these secessionists. Mr. Barnala himself was declared a Tank-haiya and the entire religious commands were used against him. Despite that, when the chief priest issued the religious mandate that they should

resign, they refused. That is why, ultimately, the Government of India decided to give full support to the Barnala Government. Only on the 14th of April there was a big rally, a joint rally, in Amritsar where Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, on behalf of the Government of India, made a public declaration that they would extend full support to the Barnala Government and he made this declaration before the huge masses. But now what prompted you immediately to think of imposition of this President's rule—except Haryana? Your immediate interest is in winning the elections. That is why the main casualty is your credibility. That you cannot understand now. In course of time, you will have to pay the price. Nobody will believe you. You don't follow any principles. Congress is not guided by any principle. We are guided by the principle of secularism. You know Mr. Barnala has been in the hit list. You know our party people are being murdered. CPI fellows are being murdered.

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR (Punjab): What about the Congress people?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Yes, Congress and Akali people are also being murdered. Whoever is opposing them they have been targets. Taking all these risks, we have set up a process, and we wanted that it should be developed throughout India so that in the future all democratic, secular forces can be mobilised to fight these secessionists and other such forces. Repeatedly I have told that there is the American imperialism behind them. But never the Congress (I) had shown the courage to mention America. In their documents they just say 'foreign hands'. Only this much. Even when the White Paper was published on Punjab issue, before that personally I was called by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi on the 6th of April 1984. She was leaving for Libya. Repeatedly she called me to her house. I was there for more than half-an-hour

to discuss the Punjab situation. I repeatedly told her that without political intervention you cannot bring about a change in Punjab, you bring out a White Paper, expose all the activities of the secessionists and all the ramifications, how they are getting money from foreign countries and how imperialists are helping them. That will isolate them from the common masses. People should realise that they are acting as the agents of foreign imperialists. You have passed a Resolution in the Working Committee on the 18th of April that the foreign imperialists are trying to destabilise India, so we must unite against destabilisation. You know they are linked with Khalistanis. You know they are linked with the extremists and secessionists. So they want that the Barnala Government should go. And you are helping them by the imposition of President's rule, by this method! So, is it the method of fighting the destabilising forces and foreign imperialism? You think it over very seriously, otherwise the situation will go out of hand. Now, what will be the repercussions? They have sacrificed their sons and daughters—these Akalis who are fighting these secessionists. Even Barnala has become a 'tankhiya'. And they have mobilised the people. They have sent the police in the Golden Temple, taking all risks. Now, what did we see? We saw that Sunil Dutt, leading a procession, ultimately went to discuss with the Chief Priest. Why? Without the consent of the Central leaders this cannot take place. What the Chief Priest wanted? The Chief Priest is acting as the agent of these secessionist forces; it is known to everybody. So, when Sunil Dutt met him, it means you are giving credibility to these forces. Then, the Jain Muni. And we saw in the Press that the CRP was withdrawn when Jain Muni went to see the Chief Priest, Prof. Darshan Singh. Then Barnala said: "I don't know anything." Then our Home Minister was asked as to why they withdrew the CRPF from the Golden Temple. He said: "I don't know". Then it was said that it

was with the consent of the Prime Minister that this Jain Muni had gone to meet the Head Priest. I would like to know whether it is a fact or not. You cannot deny it.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Who told you that the Prime Minister gave his consent? From where did you get this information?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: It is a fact that the Chief Minister did not know why the CRPF was withdrawn.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: That was the unfortunate thing. The Chief Minister knew nothing about what was happening there. That is why we are in this position. It is because of the incompetence of the Chief Minister to control his own ministers.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You wanted to impose President's rule because you wanted to win the elections in Haryana.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I am talking about the far-reaching implications and the impact of all this. These are the people who are using religion for political purposes, using religion to overthrow the Barnala Government which is the elected Government, which is the Government which you are committed to support. Jain Muni is allowed to meet that man. Why?

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR: On his own.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Jain Muni's statement is that he went with the consent and permission of the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR: It is totally wrong that the Jain Muni was sent by the Prime Minister.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: These are facts. I am simply explaining as to what are the implica-

tions of these facts. The implications are far-reaching. It shows that the Congress Government, the Centre, our Prime Minister is not interested in fighting the secessionists and to isolate them politically from the masses. Their policy is to compromise with all the secessionist forces. They have done that earlier also. The whole history of the Congress Party is like that. Our Prime Minister talks of secularism. But in Kerala the Congress was running the coalition Government with the help of fundamentalists or with the help of communal parties. (Interruptions) That is why their practice and profession are so different. You are opportunists. We have told you repeatedly earlier also on the floor of this House and the other House. Even in individual talks we have repeatedly told them that by compromising with the communal forces or by compromising with the secessionist forces, you cannot isolate them from the masses. In this way, you give them credibility and their influence is bound to grow. This is what is happening. You had a clear example of this in the Shah Bano case. Can you deny that, once the Supreme Court judgment was defended and vindicated by the Central Government? But when the fundamentalists threatened that if they supported the Supreme Court judgment, no Muslim vote would be available in the elections. Immediately after that threat our Prime Minister surrendered to the communalists. A Bill was brought which was passed. One Minister who defended the Supreme Court judgment had to resign. Another spokesman was brought to defend this Bill. It is a surrender to the communalist forces. These are the wide implications. That is why, the people don't believe in you. They don't believe that the unity and integrity of India is safe in your hands. You can go to any length for winning the elections. You can compromise with any elements. You can destroy the forces which are sacrificing their lives with courage and conviction for

the unity and integrity of the country and fighting against the secessionists. You have completely let them down. The result is that those who are defending Indian unity, defending secularism, you are throwing them into the hands of these communalists and secessionists. That is the consequence now which will be very much dangerous in the coming days for the unity and integrity of the country.

Here, the whole speech of the President gives the outlook, and your Proclamation is just the reverse of that entire outlook. It is said here:

"The people of Punjab have always been in the forefront to defend the unity and integrity of India. They played a historic role in the freedom struggle which has left the imperishable imprint of secularism and democracy on their mind and spirit. It is, therefore, not surprising that they have stood up to be blatantly unconstitutional effort to subvert the democratic process through a sinister exploitation of religious sentiments."

You are surrendering to these religious sentiments. Again:

"In flagrant violation of the sacred tenets and traditions of the great religion founded by Guru Nanak, a small section has turned religious functionaries and holy shrines into instruments of terror and subversion."

The Barnala Government was fighting against this.

"Today this is the central issue in Punjab. Government will not allow the enemies of India's unity and integrity to abuse and misuse religion for their nefarious ends..."

All these brave words are there. But the practice is just the opposite. That is why you have created a

serious situation by this Proclamation and thrown those who are fighting the secessionists for national integrity into the hands of these secessionists and extremists. You claim that are fighting against the destabilisers, the American imperialists and others. You are providing handle to them to more favourably do the work of destabilisation. Your decision is so counter-productive that it will recoil on you also in future and the situation in Punjab will further worsen. That is our greatest fear. That is why we totally oppose this Proclamation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Shri Darbara Singh.

श्री दरबारा सिंह (पंजाब) : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं इस समस्या की पृष्ठभूमि के बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। हमारे पुराने दोस्त बहुत बजुर्ग और एक्सपीरियेंस्ड दोस्त ने काफी बातें कही हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे सारी पृष्ठभूमि को भूल गये हैं। मैं आपको याद कराना चाहता हूँ कि जब पंजाब में हालात खराब हुए थे इनको दुरुस्त करने के लिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने एक अर्काई किया था और उस अर्काई को सब लोगों ने हेल किया, कहा कि बिलकुल ठीक बात हुई है। हर पार्टी ने कहा, सब लोगों ने कहा, पंजाब में भी सब लोगों ने कहा, उसको माना। अब तक उसको किस ने लागू होने नहीं दिया, मैं उसके बारे में अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक पानी का सवाल है हरियाणा को कितना चाहिए, पंजाब को कितना चाहिए, उसका फैसला इराडी कमीशन करेगा। जब दोनों पार्टियों ने माना कि जो फैसला इराडी कमीशन करेगा वह हम को मान्य होगा तथा वह फैसला फाइनल और डिसाइसिव होगा। यह सब लिख कर के दिया गया है। इसके साथ-साथ चन्डीगढ़ का मामला आया। वह भी एक कमीशन को दिया गया। कमीशन ने आखिरी तौर पर कहा कि चन्डीगढ़ पंजाब को जाएगा। अब यह

कहा गया, बार-बार यह कहा गया कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट नहीं लागू होने दे रही, मैं यह कहता हूँ कि दोनों चीजें आपके सामने रखी हुई हैं, आइये, मानिये इसको, कौन नहीं मानता है? हमने यह कहा कि कल चन्डीगढ़ पंजाब को दिया जा सकता है प्रोवाइडेड यह फैसला मंजूर करें और जमीन वापिस करें। कभी यह सुना है चीफ मिनिस्टर ने यह कहा जो पढ़ा-लिखा और वकील है यह कहे कि 45 हजार एकड़ तो अभी ले लो, फिर जब फैसला होगा कहीं जाकर फिर देखा जाएगा। 25 हजार एकड़ फिर ले लेना। यह फैसला जो अदालत का हो, वह एकदम माना जाता है या कि इन्स्टालमेंट में माना जाता है? तो यह सारी चीजें इसलिए मैंने कहीं, आज इसकी डिसेडकेशन नहीं है। लेकिन मैंने इसलिए कहा है यह आम तौर पर कहा गया कि जो कमीशन की रिपोर्ट्स हैं, वह यहां लागू नहीं होती, बल्कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया इस बात के लिए तैयार है और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बार-बार कहा है, इस हाउस में कहा है, उस हाउस में भी कहा है, बाहर कहा है अपने ब्यान में भी कहा कि इसका कौन नहीं चलने देता।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: In the Accord there is no question of 70,000 acres; only the later Commission recommended it. The Accord was a time-bound Accord.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: Let me explain it.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: And It is the responsibility of the Central Government to see that it was implemented. You set up commission after commission. That was not in the Accord. It was a time-bound Accord saying that by a specified date, Chandigarh will be transferred.

SHRI DARBARA SINGH: I am explaining my position. These people themselves said that there should be a commission. Who denies it. Mr. Barnala and others accepted that there should be a Commission which

[Shri Darbara Singh]

should finally decide the matter. You are saying it now. It is on the records. The records show that they accepted that a commission should be formed and the decision of the commission will be final.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: It was said that the area to be transferred should be contiguous, and that area was not found... (Interruptions).

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY (West Bengal): Chief Minister of West Bengal has been accused of swindling one crore of rupees. His Secretary has been accused of swindling Rs. one crore from the treasury of West Bengal. And he is talking all these things here.

श्री दरबारा सिंह : मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि हर चीज रिकॉर्ड पर है, यह तो नहीं कि मैं जबानी बात कर रहा हूँ। इसमें लेट शामिल होने का यह मतलब नहीं कि आप पिछली बातों पर नजर न दीजिये कि क्या हुआ है। टाइमार्डिस्ट कन्फेस होती रही है, मैं भी उसके इन्टर्व्यू के तौर पर गया हूँ। मुझे पता चला कि हैं कितनी अकालियों की मदद होती रही हैं दूसरी पार्टियों की तरफ से, और यह कहते रहे हैं कि सारी बात इनकी मानो। उसके बाद अर्काई हुआ है और अर्काई में सारी चीजे शामिल हैं और उसके लिए उन्होंने माना है। सब कुछ होने के बावजूद हम पर इल्जाम यह लगा रहे हैं कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट नहीं मानती है। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट हर चीज करने के लिए तैयार है।

यह मैंने इसलिए कहा है कि यही बात नहीं है कि जिससे प्रेजिडेंट रूल प्रोक्लेम हुआ है, यह बात नहीं है। यहां पर यह कहा गया कि प्रेजिडेंट आफ इंडिया ने यहां भाषण दिया है, उसमें कहा है—अच्छा कोई आदमी काम करते-करते अगर गलती कर जाए और जिसमें देश का नुकसान होता हो, तो गवर्नमेंट को हर

अपनी पूरी तैयारी करे कि वह उस गलती को दूर करे, जो भी हुआ है। यह आखिर में है उसमें कि देश को इन्टेग्रेटी, इसका सैक्यूलरिज्म बचाने के लिए पूरी गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की जिम्मेदारी है। यह भी उसमें कहा गया है।

तो इसलिए कंट्राडिक्ट्री बात करने से क्या फायदा है। बात सिर्फ यह है कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की जिम्मेदारी है कि जहां ला एंड आर्डर बिल्कुल खत्म हो गया हो, और जहां गवर्नर ने यह रिपोर्ट की हो कि करप्शन की इतना हो गई है और ला एंड आर्डर नहीं रहा है और यह सारी बातें कि आज उनके मिनिस्टर लूट रहे हैं दोनों हाथों से, यह जो सारी बातें इन्होंने कहीं हैं यहां कहा गया है, मुझे अफसोस है -

Only 15 have died. You should also remember how many innocent people have been killed there, how hundreds of them have been killed. This Government has shown patience; we have shown patience and thought that he will run the Government on proper lines. But that has not been so.

आज यह बात जो है, वह इसलिए है कि ला एंड आर्डर इस हद तक नीचे चला गया है कि उसके मिनिस्टर खुद कहते हैं, वयानवाजी करते हैं और पुलिस वालों के कपड़े फाड़ते हैं, उनको थप्पड़ मारते हैं और उनको कहते हैं कि फलों को छोड़ दो, टैरोरिस्टों को छुड़ाने के लिए कश्मिश की जाए, नहीं हुआ—हम उसका सबूत देंगे। यह कहना गलत बात है, यह कहना कि सिचुएशन बढ़िया है शायद आपकी नजर में होगी। हम लोग पंजाब के रहने वाले हैं हमें पता है, लोग नहीं चाहते कि टैरोरिज्म जारी रहे। लेकिन इसको खत्म करने का यह तरीका नहीं है कि रोज-रोज लोग मरते रहें और सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट चुप बैठी रहे। इसलिए हमें तो इस बात की खुशी है कि यह प्रेसीडेंट रूल लगाकर सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट कुछ कर रही है। इसकी पूरे तौर पर आगे ले जाने के लिए

हैं और सरदार बलदेव सिंह यहां मिनिस्टर रहे हैं, कभी मास्टर तारा सिंह का जमाना था, उस जमाने में उन्होंने कहा है, सरदार बलदेव सिंह के अपने अलफाज हैं कि ,

"We have to keep our places of worship above the turmoil and conflict of politics."

मैं इसे सारा नहीं पढ़ता यह फरवरी, 1949 में उन्होंने कहा था, जब वह डिफेंस मिनिस्टर थे, उस समय उन्होंने कहा था। यह बात चली आ रही है और लगातार कोई न कोई अकालियों का ग्रुप इस तरफ या उस तरफ जाकर करता है और हम इसको इतना लूज कर दें और इस बात पर छोड़ दें कि वे जो कुछ करते हैं वे करते जाएं और सारे देश के हालात को खराब करने की कोशिश करें, तो यह कैसे हो सकता है ? एक ही बात नहीं है, कितने लोगों का खून हुआ है, अगर आपकी पार्टी का हुआ है तो दूसरे लोगों का और सब का पार्टियों का हुआ है। इसके लिए हमने कोशिश की कि सब पार्टियों को साथ लेकर जाए और वहां गए भी तथा पब्लिक मीटिंग भी हुई। लेकिन उसका असर क्या हुआ और सब से ज्यादा दूसरे लोगों ने हिस्सेदारी ली, इन्होंने फिर भी हिस्सेदारी इतनी ज्यादा नहीं डाली अलबत्ता इसके खिलाफ उठते जा कर आप छुड़वाते रहे हैं उन लोगों को जो कि टैरोरिस्ट्स हैं, ऐसे पकड़े हुए आतंकवादियों को छोड़वाते रहे हैं कि इनको छोड़ दो। यह चीफ मिनिस्टर भी करते रहे हैं और उसके मिनिस्टर भी करते रहे हैं। तो हम कैसे चुप करके बैठे रहें कि वे जो कुछ मर्जी करते रहें वे क्या हम टैरोरिस्ट्स को खुली छुट्टी दें हिन्दुस्तान के सारे हालात को बिगाड़ने के लिए और पंजाब में वह सारी चीज चलती रहे ? आपको यह मालूम है कि पाकिस्तान की तरफ से इनको ट्रेनिंग, रुपया-पैसा और हथियार दिए जा रहे थे और इसके लिए मैं कहता रहा हूं, आज भी कहता हूं और कल भी कहूंगा, यू०एस०ए० इसमें इन्वाल्वड है। सारा रुपया पैसा पाकिस्तान को दिया जा रहा है, हथियार

भी दिए जा रहे हैं। श्रीलंका में क्या कुछ नहीं हो रहा है ? दीयागोसासिया में क्या कुछ नहीं हो रहा है ? हम सबको पता है, हम कहे या नहीं कहे। न कहने से आपका काम चलता है तो चलाएं। लेकिन मैं यह कहता हूं कि आप हिन्दुस्तान के हालात के बारे में भी देखिए कि किस हद तक यह बात बढ़ गई है। यह कहते हैं कि करप्शन, तो करप्शन की इतना हो गई है। ट्रांसफर में पैसा लिया जा रहा है। आप जरा पढ़ तो लें, जो राय ने बयान दिया है, तो आपको पता चलेगा और आप खुद भी महसूस करेंगे कि जो बातें हो रही हैं उसके लिए इसके बगैर कोई चारा नहीं था कि प्रेसीडेंट कल लागू किया जाए। इतने मर्डर हुए, बैंक डकैतियां हुई हैं। आतंकवादियों ने लुधियाना में बैंक को लूटा और सात करोड़ के करीब वह लूटा गया। उन आतंकवादियों में से अब कुछ पकड़े गए हैं और पकड़े जा रहे हैं तथा साथ मुकाबले में मारे भी जा रहे हैं। सब कुछ निकला है। आखिर किसी ने तो निकाला है। उस आदमी ने निकाला है। जिसको वह कहते हैं कि इसको निकाल दो, सी०आर०पी० को खत्म करो। तो फिर क्या वह खूद चलायेगा ? कौन चलायेगा ? मदद से सब कुछ किया जा रहा है। कौन सा काम नहीं किया गया है ? पैसा चाहा है तो पैसा दिया है, पुलिस मांगी है तो पुलिस भी दी है, उसकी इकोनॉमी को दुरुस्त करने के लिए इतना कुछ प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने किया है जो कि किसी और जगह पर नहीं किया गया ताकि हम सूबे की सारी हालत को दुरुस्त कर पाएं। लेकिन वह नहीं हुई। क्यों नहीं हुई, क्योंकि ये जो ताकतें लगी हुई हैं वे ताकतें नहीं चाहती कि हिन्दुस्तान स्थिर रहे, इसको अस्थिर करने की, डीस्टेबलाइज करने की कोशिश की जा रही है, इसके टुकड़े करने की कोशिश की जा रही है। यह भी कहा था कि यू०पी० के भी तीन चार टुकड़े हो जाएं। यह साबित करता है कि किस हद तक वे पहुंच गए हैं हिन्दुस्तान के टुकड़े होते रहें और हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है ? मैं यह इसलिए कहता हूं कि बहुत सीधे समझ

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

करके हमें बात करनी चाहिए। जो कहते हैं वे हिन्दुस्तान की इबादत के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान की इंटिग्रिटी के लिए सब मिल कर कोशिश करें। हमें मंजूर है कि हम इकट्ठे होकर इस बात का मुकाबला करें। लेकिन मुकाबला इस ढंग से नहीं होगा कि हम इन्हें छूट दे दें। जिस आदमी को यह आशय नहीं है कि पंजाब में किन लोगों को चुप कराना चाहिए, मैं यह कहता हूँ कि यहां कहा गया, बाहर कहते हैं कि अभी जगतार सिंह और उससे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। अगर ताल्लुक नहीं है, हमारे तीन कांग्रेस पी०सी०सी० के मेम्बर और उसके दो साथी—वहां कत्ल किए गए हैं, किसने कत्ल कराए हैं, किसने कहा है कि इसको छोड़ दो, यह रिकाई जो पुलिस का वहां सिखा हुआ है, उसको जाकर देखें तो पता चलेगा कि किन आदमियों ने उनको मारा है और पकड़े जाने पर किसने छुड़ाया है। अगर टेरारिज्म इस तरह रखना है तो वह ठीक है, जो उन्होंने कहा, उन्होंने बयान दिया है यह टेरारिज्म और बढ़ेगा। बढ़ेगा का मतलब यह है कि यह जो सरकार बढ़ाती है; और बढ़ेगा तो उसमें शामिल होंगे, शामिल होकर वह करना चाहते हैं। इसलिए हमें इस बात पर एतराज नहीं करना चाहिए। करप्शन हो, बेइमानी करते हो, उसमें लोगों को बगुनाह लोगों को मारते हों, चलते फिरते आदमी को मारते हैं, दुकान पर बैठे को मारते हैं, घर में जाकर उसकी बटूक खींचने के लिए उसको मारते हैं, तो क्या चुप करके घर में बैठे रहे, इसको नहीं देखे। कहने को तो सिर्फ 15 ही आदमी मारे गए हैं एक दिन में, हम समझते हैं कि आखिर वह भी इंसान है और हमारे जैसे इंसान है, जिनका खून पिया जा रहा है। तो उनके बचाने के लिए आप सब मिलकर कोशिश न करें। क्यों न करें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रोक्लमेशन किया गया है, यह इसलिए किया गया है ताकि वहां के हालात को दुरुस्त किया जा सके। आपकी कुछ भी राय हो, हमें एतराज नहीं है, आप अपनी राय रखें, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह ध्यान आपका

गलत है कि यह हरियाणा के लिए किया जा रहा है। किसने आपको बताया, हरियाणा के चुनाव ड्यू हैं, इलेक्शन होंगे, उसमें आप भी तो हिस्सा ले रहे हैं, आप भी पोलिटिकल पार्टियों से मिल रहे हैं, जो इस देश के टुकड़े करना चाहते हैं और आप उनके साथ मिलकर काम रहे हैं जो कम्युनल हैं, पयुडल हैं, आपने उनके साथ हिस्सेदारी डाली है। हमें सब कुछ पता है, आप सब मिलकर क्या कर रहे हैं। तो हम पर बात मत छोड़िये कि हमने लोग से समझौता किया है केरल में, आपने किया था या नहीं किया था? पहले किसने की थी, यह मुझे बता दें। यह क्या सी०पी०एम० ने पहले की थी। हम पर यह सारा मत डालिए। हां, हम इसके खिलाफ हैं, इसकी बात को कुछ हद तक इससे वे लोग कट-आफ करके कम्युनिज्म को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, हम आपके साथ हैं इस कम्युनिज्म को खतम करना चाहिए। ऐसे हालात पदा करना चाहिये कि हमारे इलाइम्स किसी से न हों। मेरी जाती यह राय है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, जैसा आपने कहा अपरचूनिज्म आपने किया है, आपने नहीं किया, तो मुझे बता दीजिए।

इसलिए मैं, श्रीमन्, कहता हूँ कि दूसरों पर आरोप लगाने से या बदनामी करने से यह यहां एतबार रहेगा, सरकार को किसी पर एतबार नहीं रहेगा, तो यह बात गलत है। आप हालात पंजाब के जाकर खुद देखिए कि वहां क्या हो रहा है, लूटा जा रहा है, बाजार में खड़े होकर लोगों से कहा जा रहा है लाओ, आपके पास कितना पैसा है, आपकी सिगरेट की दुकान है, उसको आग लगा दो, सामान बाहर फेंक दिया और फिर उसको कहा कि तेरे पास कितने पैसे हैं, पैसे ले जायं और जाते हुए उसको गोली लगा जायं और इसके साथ साथ आपको दाढ़ी नहीं मुड़वानी, आपको दाढ़ी रखनी है, केश रखने हैं, कितना प्रचार जहरीला वहां हो रहा है, कितना कितना पैसा लूटा जा रहा है लोगों के घर-घर

किया जा रहा है, पेरेलल गवर्नमेंट की ज रही है। उसको दबाने के लिए नालायक साबित हुआ है हमारा यह चाँफ मिनिस्टर। यह हमने किया है लोगों में कांफीडेंस लाने के लिए ताकि वहाँ लोगों में कांफीडेंस आए और आगे बढ़ पायें तथा वहाँ पर शांति और अमन हो। क्या आप चाहेंगे कि लूट का बाजार ऐसा ही गरम बना रहे, क्या आप चाहेंगे कि लोगों के घरों में घुस कर उसके मां-बाप, बहनों को मारा जाय और उनकी बेइज्जती की जाय, क्या आप चाहते हैं कि छोटे-छोटे बच्चों को उनके मां-बाप से अलग किया जाय, मां-बाप सबको बल्ल किया जाय, खानदान के खानदान उड़ा दिए जाए? और इनके सिर पर जू न रेंगे। वहाँ का फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर बयान क्या देता है कि अब हमारे कटोल में है, 15 आदमी हमारे पड़े हैं, जिनको बुरी तरह मारा गया है गोलियों से और आप कहते हैं कि वहाँ नार्मल सा है, गार्मल हालात देख रहे हैं क्योंकि अपने पैर पर चोट न पड़े। अगर उन पर अपने पैर पर चोट पड़ेगी तो पता चलेगा, सिर्फ यह दूसरों का तमाशा देखने वाले लोग हैं। लेकिन उनका सेण्टीमेंट हम समझते हैं, वह भले कुछ न समझें कि 15 मरे या 50 मरे। हम यह समझते हैं कि पंजाब के हालात ठीक करने हैं। यह ठीक है, मुकाबला करते हैं जंगों में, यह बहादुर है, लेकिन वहाँ जो टेरोरिज्म आया है, उसको खत्म करने के लिए कुछ करना है। इसलिए देश में डिस्टेम्पलाइजेशन दूर करने के लिए, उसकी पूरी साजिश दबाने के लिए यह जरूरी था कि ऐसा मजबूत स्टैप उठाया जाय, जिससे यह टेरोरिज्म खत्म कर पायें और यह हमने सस्पेंडेड एनीमेशन रखा है हमने डेमोक्रेटिक राइट रखा है। जो इस

4 P.M. चीज को कहते हैं कि हम मेन स्ट्रीम में चलकर हिन्दुस्तान को समझें, वे अपने आप को आगे बढ़ाएँ। इसके साथ साथ लोग यह भी कहेंगे कि हम खालिस्तान और दूसरे लोगों के खिलाफ हैं। रिलीजन और पोलिटिक्स को हम कहते हैं कि

अलहदा करना चाहिए, लेकिन क्या यह हुआ है? आपने जिन लोगों का नाम लिया है और कहा है कि विश्वास के साथ कि जैन मुनि को प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने भेजा उनके पास समझौता करने के लिए, तो यह कितनी गलत बात है। अपने तीर पर सब लोग वहाँ जा रहे हैं, जाते रहे हैं। कोई वहाँ मर्या टेकने जाता है तो 20 दफा जाए, लेकिन प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने जिसको नहीं भेजा वहाँ टेरोरिस्टों के साथ समझौता करने के लिए। यह बात गलत है। वे क्या बयान देते हैं हमें उससे कोई वास्ता नहीं है। बयान देने के लिए मान, अपनी इज्जत और मर्यादा ठीक करने के लिए वे देते रहें, लेकिन प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने किसी को नहीं भेजा। हम रिलीज्यूस तीर पर किसी से बात नहीं करते तो क्या रिलीजन वाले को भेजा कोई फैसला करने के लिए? इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि जो आज वहाँ गुरुद्वारे के अन्दर हो रहा है और जो बाहर हो रहा है, टेरोरिस्ट ऐक्टिविटीज बढ़ता जा रहा है और उसमें किसी ने रुकवट डालने का कोशिश नहीं की। जितने भी मिनिस्टर हैं उनका कर्त्तवा चिट्ठा देख लो तो आपको पता चलेगा। वे कहते हैं कि पुलिस को वहाँ से भगा दो। सार, चार्ज आपके सामने आ गई है, उनको बार-बार दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि फैसला जो आज लिया गया है वह बहुत सोच समझकर लिया गया है ताकि हम उस हद तक तो इस चीज को रोकें जिससे टेरोरिज्म भी कम हो और पंजाब के हालात दुरुस्त हो, ताकि आने वाला हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत हो, ताकि कोई भी आपको तरफ आँख उठाकर भी न देखे। सार, चार्ज मैंने इसलिए जाहिर की है ताकि आप समझ सकें कि ये जो अटक रहे हैं और लोगों को जानें जा रहे हैं वे एक सक्ते हैं। लेकिन आज वहाँ झगड़ा क्या है? झगड़ा यह है कि वे कहते हैं कि फ़लों आफिसर को हटाओ क्योंकि उसने नंगा कर दिया है उनके मिनिस्टर को। उसने फ़लों आफिसर को टेलीफोन करके कहा

[श्री दरबारा सिंह]

है कि उस आदमी को छोड़ दो, जिसने कत्ल किए हैं, जिसने लूट की है जिसने गरीबों को मारा है, ऐसे आदमी को छोड़ दो? आज भी वह लूट बाजार में शामिल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि रोबेरो, डॉ० जॉ० पॉ० को जितनी प्रशंसा को जाए वह कम है। कितना साफ सुथरा आदमी है, निहायत शरॉफ आदमी है। काम करने वाला आदमी है, डिटरमिनेशन से काम कर रहा है, हम सबको उसको तारोफ करने चाहिए ताकि हम बता सकें कि गवर्नमेंट उसके पीछे है। गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि हम किसी रिलीजन और पोलिटिक्स को सपोर्ट नहीं करते हैं। यह किसी ने नहीं कहा कि रिलीजन और पोलिटिक्स को मिलाना चाहिए। हम कहते हैं कि रिलीजन और पोलिटिक्स को अलग करना चाहिए। उसको आज तक किसी ने नहीं माना। आहिस्ता आहिस्ता फंडामेंटलिज्म और कम्युनलिज्म फैलता जा रहा है और उसको जो तिहा है, उसका जितनी देर तक मुकाबला नहीं करेंगे उतना ही गलत होगा। इसका मुकाबला करने के लिए लोगों में विश्वास पैदा करना होगा और उसके लिए आप आगे आएँ ताकि बूनाँ को न मारा जा सके। जो लोग प्रेसिडेंट रूल के खिलाफ यहाँ या बाहर बोल रहे हैं उनको मैं कहता हूँ कि वे इसको सारियसनेस को समझें। इसके बगैर कोई चारा नहीं था कि प्रेसिडेंट ल लागू किया जाए और ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को दुरुस्त किया जा और दुरुस्त लाइन पर चलाकर पंजाब में सिएशन को अपने काबू में लेकर वहाँ पर नार्मलसी लाई जाए।

इत अल्फाब के सा मैं आपका शक्रिया अदा करता हूँ।

SHEJI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY
 (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman,
 Sir, I have no particular brief for Baranala; I have not to defend him. I want to understand the situation in Punjab as it is. I tried to understand the reasons behind the President's rule imposed by the Centre. I

want to know the logic, the rationale behind the President's Proclamation.

My colleague who started the debate, quoted the President's speech which he delivered in the joint session of Parliament. At the beginning of this session, Sir, Barnala was a brave man in the eyes of the Government; he was a secular man, he was a democrat and he was a nationalist who was straining himself and his Government to wage war against extremist and obscurantist forces in Punjab. For the first time in the history of Parliament, the Chief Minister of a State was praised. Now, at the end of this session, there has been complete denunciation of this same person by the party in power — within three months. There was unadulterated praise and flattery of Barnala by the Centre, but at the end of the session there has been total denunciation. The situation that obtained at the beginning of the session is not materially different from the situation that obtains today. Notwithstanding that, we see the contradictory positions taken by the Centre.

In the beginning of the session, Sir, the Prime Minister wanted consensus on Punjab. Rightly so. He did consult us—the Opposition — about the course to be followed by the Centre in respect of Punjab. There were meetings, there were exchanges of views and our counsel was taken by the Prime Minister in formulating his approach on Punjab. But, at the end of the session, no talk with the Opposition and the Opposition leaders, not even information to the leaders of the Opposition regarding the so-called deterioration in the situation in Punjab. If the situation in Punjab had deteriorated and it was, according to them, beyond repair, that should have provided the compelling reason for the Prime Minister to consult us all the more. The politics of consensus which was started in Punjab at the

beginning of the session, was not followed up. By the end of the session it evaporated. No consultation, no communication between the Prime Minister and the leaders of the Opposition, no talk. Why?, I ask him. Was he afraid of our advice? Did we, at any time, mislead him whenever we talked to him? Never. We had our differences with him. But on Punjab, on this issue, there was an effort made by all political parties to reach a correct understanding, to reach a common approach. That is why there was an understanding that all political parties should unite for the purpose of bringing about peace and tranquillity, normalcy in Punjab. But within a short time this was given up.

Thirdly, we supported the Prime Minister when he signed the Accord though we never fully agreed with him. We had our own differences. In spite of this, we supported the Prime Minister in signing the Accord. But, even this Accord which was not very satisfactory, was not implemented by the Prime Minister and his Government. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he wanted a settlement in Punjab, peace and tranquillity in Punjab, elimination of terrorism and terrorists by not implementing the Accord. The Accord was meant to bring about a settlement in Punjab. It was meant to eliminate the terrorism and the terrorists there. It was a political move, a political approach. But the Accord was never implemented. Does he believe that without implementing even this limited Accord, he would be able to bring about normalcy in Punjab? Have we not been telling him that Punjab is not merely a law-and-order problem, it is essentially, basically a political issue? The Punjab Accord is a part of this political move. By not implementing the Accord, the Government has created a situation, a more explosive situation in Punjab.

Today they blame Mr. Barnala for all the ills, all the omissions and commissions, and all atrocities in Punjab.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY
 (Andhra Pradesh): Even corruption.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:
 Now I hear the argument of corruption also coming in. Mr. Darbara Singh was praising Mr. Barnala the other day. Now he is denouncing him. Why are these blatantly contradictory positions being taken? Punjab has been made a pawn on the chess board of politics by Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and his Government.

SHRI MAHENDRA MOHAN
 MISHRA (Bihar): No.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:
 I charge you. You have made it a pawn on the chess board of politics. You are not interested in setting the Punjab issue. You are not. You want to keep Punjab at a boiling point all the time for deriving partisan advantages, advantages for your own party. My colleague was right when he charged you that you imposed President's rule for a mala-fide purpose to influence the elections in favour of your party in Haryana. Everyone knows it. If Baranala has failed, I would have gone with you to support you in imposing President's rule. At what time are you imposing President's Rule? At a time when Haryana election is there, at a time when Barnala for the first time has got majority in the Assembly; on his own he has got majority yesterday. Without your support he would have continued in power. At this juncture you imposed the President's rule and kept the Assembly in suspended animation. Why? What for? You could have dissolved the Assembly. You are playing a game and are indulging in political skulduggery Nothing beyond that... (Interruptions)

147 Statutory Resolution [RAJYA SABHA] Under Article 356 148
 Approving Proclamation
 issued by the President
 of the Constitution
 to the State of Punjab

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

I told you I am not holding any brief for Barnala. If Barnala has failed, then you impose President's Rule. If he has failed now, he had failed earlier too. If he has failed now, he had failed at the beginning of the session also when you were praising him. He had been failing all along. At no time there was a respite in terrorism in Punjab. When massacre of bus passengers took place it was ghastlier than what it was yesterday. You did not introduce President's Rule at that time. All of us condemned it. There were graver occasions than the occasions in the recent times, when you could have imposed President's Rule in Punjab. Why has this occasion been used by you? My colleague referred to sushil Jain Muni who went to see Darshan Singh Ragi. I ask you to answer this question. There is no bar to meet anybody in the country. You can meet anybody. You can meet the Prime Minister also. When Jain Muni went to meet Darshan Singh Ragi, the police force was withdrawn. I would like to know under whose order was it withdrawn. They cannot do it on their own. Somebody must have given the order. Either the State Government must have given the order or the Union Home Minister must have given the order. I want to know that. Did Sushil Muni have the permission or encouragement by the Prime Minister and the Government to go and meet Darshan Singh at the Golden Temple? There is nothing wrong in meeting, let me tell you, but I would like to understand the situation. I want to know whether the Government of India is employing middlemen here to bring about a settlement, because this Government cannot live without middlemen. That is the tragedy.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Without kickbacks also.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:

My friend, Mr. Upendra says that Government cannot live without kickbacks even here... (*Interruptions*).

Sir, I do not know how to describe the policy and approach of the Government of India. I am reminded of a phrase... (*Interruptions*). I think you are a novice in politics. Please keep quite. I am reminded of a phrase which I read long back as a student. Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan* has said, "the life of man in the State of Nature was, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". The Government of India's policy in respect of Punjab also is poor, nasty, brutish and short, devoid of all sense and reason. The proclamation issued by the President at the very end of this Session exposes their utter foolishness in the matter of handling a very grave situation. We all of us are concerned, including you, with the unity and integrity of India. We cherish it most but by your policy, by your destabilising policy and approach the contradictor positions that you take, you undermine the very process you set in. You want consensus. Now you do not want consensus. You want the accord. Now you do not want the accord. You want all parties to agree and come together. Now you do not want all parties to agree and come together. You do not want politics to be imported into important issues, national issues. But you import politics into it. This kind of blatant ad-hocism is not only striking you but the country. You are the greatest destabiliser and you are saying foreign hand is everywhere. Only one hand that I see, that is, your hand, that is, destabilisation. Not the foreign hand but your hand is destabilising the country. It is destabilising your party also... (*Interruptions*). It is destabilising your party.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your party?

Approving Proclamation
of the Constitution
issued by the President
to the State of Punjab

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY:

You think of your party first. Please save your party from your own mistakes, from your own blunders, from your own foolishness. I totally disapprove the ways and the methods employed by you. I think the whole exercise looks to me ridiculous on the very face of it. I feel that this kind of ad-hocism, this kind of recklessness, this kind of recklessness, this kind of selfish politics and this kind of politics of piracy which you are pursuing will not help either your party or the country. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL:

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is with a heavy heart but with absolutely no streak of regret or hesitation whatsoever that I rise to support the proclamation issued under Article 356 of the Constitution of India, bringing the State of Punjab under the President's rule. (Interruption).

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West

Bengal): You demanded this.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL:

I don't deny that. I justify my demand.... (Interruption). The demand was also made with a heavy heart. We do feel that the democratic process as such, should continue in the State but when it harms the national interest, we demand a change with a heavy heart.

Sir, this was not an easy decision but there was no alternative left with the Central Government when it was abundantly demonstrated that the Barnala Government had failed miserably to discharge its primary duty of maintaining law and order in the State and to instil a sense of confidence and security in the minds of the people. Sir, I am flabbergasted at the allegations levelled by some Opposition leaders. It was said that the step has been taken with the narrow interest to influence Haryana elections. I simply fail to understand it. (Interruptions). Sir, the Haryana elections have not been

fixed all of a sudden. The whole country knew that Haryana Assembly elections were due in the month of May or June and if the Government ever had an intention to bring about a certain situation which could tilt the balance in favour of the Government, in favour of the Congress, there was no need for us to refer in the Presidential Address Shri Barnala by name. Senior colleagues here have referred to that. I would be coming to that point a little later but I do want to add here that every effort was made to strengthen the hands of Barnala Government and that reference was a part of it. Unfortunately, Shri Barnala has failed to come to the expectations of the people of the State and the country. He perhaps got complacent when an effort was made to strengthen his hands to fight the menace of terrorism. We tried to strengthen him but when we ultimately saw that all efforts have proved futile, we felt that we must really rise to the occasion and think of an alternative strategy and measures. Sir, some two years back, when the Rajiv-Longowal Accord was signed, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, demonstrating proven qualities of statesmanship had proclaimed that what matters is not as to which party wins the elections but what matters is that our motherland triumphs and that the sacred flame of our democracy, unity and integrity continues to emit light for the nation's welfare. If I am permitted to refer to the accord, I would quote the concluding part of it. I quote:

"The settlement brings to an end a period of confrontation and ushers in an era of amity, goodwill and cooperation which will promote and strengthen the unity and integrity of India."

This was the spirit of the accord and it generated hope that the new Akali Government would religiously devote itself to the task of restoring peace and amity, so vital for the development and prosperity of the State. To

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

our utter dismay, we found that the Barnala Government only paid lip-service to the sentiments of Sant Harchand Singh Longowal and did not rise to the occasion to pull out the State from the quagmire of violence. It rather adopted an ambivalent attitude towards the terrorists who, taking advantage of this, once again regrouped themselves and stepped up violence in the State. Though the State Government fought shy of meeting the challenge squarely, and, instead, missed no opportunity to blame the Centre for their failures, yet, the Centre, committed to honour the verdict of the people, extended every possible support to the Barnala Government. This the Centre did even when a number of their own legislators withdrew support to the Government there. It was the Congress which prevented the downfall of Barnala Government on more than one occasion. Every effort was made to strengthen him and rightly all political parties joined in this endeavour. For the first time in history, as it was said, the Chief Minister's name was mentioned in the Presidential Address. This, I reiterate, was done in a sincere endeavour to provide every possible support to Barnala Government so that the internal fight within the Akali Dal itself did not weaken him to fight the fissiparous and secessionist forces. However, the situation has been fast deteriorating in the State. Of late there has been no semblance of any authority of the Government there. The terrorists ruled the roost and ran a parallel Government intimidating the people and resorting to various measures such as reckless killings, loot and arson. While the panic-stricken people were fleeing the State, the Barnala Government took no concrete steps to contain violence. It failed to utilise the efforts of the all-party conventions to fight terrorism. Here with all the humility at

my command I do wish to add that though a number of all-party conventions were held in the State, it was primarily the Congress and the two Communist Parties who mustered...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: No.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: You did not? I said you did...

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Not the Congress.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: ...who mustered the support, who mustered the presence of the people at such conventions, but unfortunately some of the Opposition leaders took advantage of the situation and, in fact, made use of the platform provided to them to hurl all sorts of accusations against the Centre and an effort was consistently made to denigrate the Centre. I say again with humility, it was alleged not with all the honesty that the Centre had failed to implement the Accord. I only wish my learned friends had cared to have a look at the various stipulations of the Accord and the developments during the last two years. I do hope that the learned Members from the Opposition do know that most of the stipulations of the Punjab Accord, signed between Shri Rajiv Gandhi and Sant Longowal, have been fulfilled as far as the Central Government is concerned. And if you permit me, Sir, I will very briefly refer to those.

Clause (2), regarding army recruitment: It has been made abundantly clear by the Government that all able-bodied persons who are eligible to be enrolled, continue to be enrolled irrespective of any other consideration whatever. Clause 3 of the Accord stipulated an inquiry into the November incidents. I think that the honourable Members know that the inquiry has been completed and the Report laid on the Table of the House.

Regarding those discharged from the army, if my information is cor-

rect, a. preponderant majority of those discharged from the army have been provided alternative employment.

Regarding the All-India Gurdwara Act, suggestions from all the Chief Ministers have been sought and what had to be done by the Central Government was done, to begin with, immediately after the Accord was signed.

Clause 6 stipulated the disposal of pending cases and the withdrawal of the notifications regarding the application of the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act to Punjab. This I just want to mention for the sake of emphasising the point that the Central Government has not been wanting in its duty to implement the Accord—was done long back.

The most contentious issue was that of the territorial claims. We all know as to what has been transpiring and as to what have been the deterring factors and as to what has been the dithering attitude of the Akali Government which have led us into the situation that we find ourselves in today. My senior colleague, Shri Darbara Singh, has referred to that point in detail. It was the backing out by the Akali Government from time to time, asking for or suggesting one solution and then backing out of it again, that has delayed the transfer of Chandigarh. The Central Government had made it abundantly clear that Chandigarh had to go to Punjab, that it would go to Punjab. But the clause or the stipulation in the Accord did not end there. There was a further stipulation calling for the simultaneous transfer of some land in lieu of Chandigarh and for that, it was the Barnala Government only that had to do something and not the Central Government.

Sir, another clause related to the inter-State relations. We all know

the Sarkaria Commission and not even the Punjab Government ever raised any point that the Centre was backing out of its commitment.

Regarding sharing of the river waters, whatever step the Central Government had to take, including the amendment of the relevant law to refer the matter to a tribunal, has been taken. I here want to lay added emphasis on Clause 9.3 which postulated that the SYL shall be completed by the 15th of August, 1986... (*Time bell rings*)... and I think we all know, Sir, that the burden of carrying out this responsibility was not that of the Centre, but of the Punjab Government and still this has not been done.

Regarding the representation of minorities and the protection of their interests, the Central Government lost no time in instructing all the State Governments to ensure that due protection is given to the minorities in their States and we are proud to say that no untoward incident was ever allowed to occur in any of these States.

Promotion of the Punjabi language was another stipulation in the Accord and, to my own queries as well as those of other honourable Members, we have got enough information to the effect that the Central Government has done its best to promote the Punjabi language and has, of late, even given a grant to the tune of Rs. 79.6 lakhs to the State Government for the preparation and production of University-level textbooks in the Punjabi language.

Sir, much has been tried to be made out by accusing the Central Government of not fulfilling the conditions of the Punjab Accord. Some of the senior leaders from the Opposition even spoke in unison with the Barnala Government regarding various demands without really going into the merits in depth. If it were to be said that peace did not return to

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

Punjab because the Central Government failed to implement the Accord. I am sorry to say that it is taking too simplistic an attitude towards the issue. Sir, here we are faced with a situation where Punjab continued to reel under terrorist violence. Panic stricken people were fleeing the State. It was a reign of terror that ran across the length and breadth of the State. No right thinking citizen could gather the courage to stand and speak out. The terrorists, by their latest tactics, had in fact given the impression that it was not the writ of the Akali Government but that of the terrorists that ran the State. (Time Bell rings) It was, Sir, in these circumstances that this unhappy decision had to be taken to promulgate President's rule in the State. It was taken because the Akali Government had forfeited the confidence of the people and lost all moral authority to continue in office. Avarice and greed jaundiced their vision and afflicted their thought and action. The inaction of the State Government, rather the total lack of political will, to meet the situation made the Punjab tragedy a poignant one, though every tragedy has its own tale of woe, sorrow and suffering.

Sir, one has to make no effort to perceive the nightmare that every Punjabi was passing through. An environment had come to prevail where even petty criminals were emboldened to defy the rule of law with contempt and no right thinking person could challenge them. It was at this stage that when a wave of insecurity and fear swept the State and the State Government did little to contain it that the Centre had to decide to act. It could no longer be a mere spectator to the gory events that continued to rock Punjab and threaten to tear apart the State, a strategic border State. In such an extraordinary situation it was the duty of the Central Government to

to the State of Punjab

rise to the occasion and assure the people of Punjab that no conspiracy would succeed to strike at our polity. The Central Government has done well to give this hope to the people.

Sir, I would conclude by saying that this is not an end in itself. This is the beginning of a fresh endeavour to see that conditions are created that bring about normalcy to Punjab, that Punjab once again pursues its path of progress and prosperity, that no force whatever is permitted to play havoc with Punjab.

Incidentally, while referring to this commitment in the President's Address, one hon. Member from the Opposition said that the Central Government is going back on it. With all respect, I would submit that the Central Government is fulfilling its commitment to that effect. If there was an occasion when the country felt that there was need to strengthen the hands of Mr. Barnala the Central Government did it. But if we feel that such a situation has arisen where, basking in the reflected glory of the Centre, the State Government is not willing to do anything for the State and that Government ought to be dismissed, the Central Government has rightly taken that action.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I agree, and we do admit, that the situation in Punjab is grim, and sometimes it seems it is too grim for words. Sir, as a party we are one with this Government in its valient battle, to fight against terrorism. We are always extending our unqualified support to this Government in fighting the hydra-headed monster of terrorism. At least there is a justification that in violence there is a display of heroism and valour. But terrorism is a senseless violence, because there is only a display of cowardice. So, we are one with the Government in fighting out this strange situation that has arisen in Punjab. But I would like to observe

that the imposition of President's rule in Punjab at this point of time in this situation is an extreme step. It is an extreme step in the sense that the Members of the opposition parties have been saying that there is no abnormal situation that warrants the President's rule. Had you been wise enough, you would not have stepped into the shoes of the Akali Government. What you would have done was to place the terrorists on the one side. The practical wisdom tells me that in Punjab you should have strengthened the hands of Mr. Barnala and his Ministry. You should have made the Akalis and the extremists fight against each other. Instead of doing that, you have removed the Akalis and you have taken the place of Akalis. Now you are fighting with the extremists directly.

I would like to remind you that in the same deteriorating situation that exists in Punjab today, you have said earlier that you have been fighting terrorism through the instrument and authority of the Barnala Ministry. Now you have lost your faith in this instrument. Now you say that you are going to fight directly. You have created a difficult situation for yourself. I would like to say that this is going to be a losing battle for you. You are not going to win the battle. Instead of making these two factions, these two warring principalities fight it out amongst themselves, you have taken the position of the Akali Government. You have created a difficult situation not only for the Government but for the country. We say that there was no abnormal situation. Shri Samar Mukherjee has said that only 16 were killed. When he said that only 16 were killed, some Members from the ruling party took very strong exception to it and repeated 'only'. I would like to ask a very specific question. I am posing this question for clarification. Who are these 16 people who have been killed? Are they fundamenta-

lists? Are they men from the progressive forces? Are they political agents? Are they civilians? Who are they? I pose this specific question because every paper has said unanimously without even a single exception that all the 16 people who have been killed are terrorists or the people who have been harbouring terrorists. This is what they say. (Interruptions) If they are the terrorists or the people who have been harbouring terrorists, then instead of dismissing the Barnala Ministry, you should have supported him because he has done what is right. I would like to ask a very specific question. Who are these 16 people who have been killed? I would like to ask this very specific question. Again I say that we are one with this Government. If you take a sensible step to fight terrorism, we are with you. Even the other day, Members of your party were attending big rallies. The report was that lakhs of people came. There was a kind of unqualified support from the public. The Government says today that though there is no specific announcement about it, we find from newspapers that there was no support from the people. Barnala has not galvanised them. He has not utilised them properly. Now only the rallies have been conducted. Now only the people have been enthused. But this problem has been there in Punjab for the last two or three years or even much before that. This period of 25 months is not enough to tackle this problem. You do not think that you can solve this problem all of a sudden, within an hour. I am asking a very specific question. Though it looks apparently hypothetical, this is not a hypothetical question. Because you found fault with the Barnala Ministry and because you thought in your wisdom that the Barnala Ministry will not be capable of combating terrorism in Punjab, you have removed him. But, now, I am asking you because you have taken the reins of administration in Punjab,

[Shri Valampuri John]

Suppose from today there are increased number of murders and killings and increased terrorism, in another two months, in the next Session suppose we pose the same question to you, will you get yourself dismissed? How can you have two yardsticks? What is sacred to one man is sacred to all. Only on this reason that the Barnala Government is not capable of fighting terrorists, you have dismissed him. When you have taken the reins in your hands, suppose tomorrow—it is not a hypothetical question at all, it is not a hypothetical thing at all; it is going to happen, I tell you—suppose tomorrow you are not able to contain the situation, will you get yourself dismissed? Dismissal is not an answer. (Interruptions) Dismissal is not an answer. It is undemocratic. We are one with you, we will support all your positive steps. We are one with you in combating this kind of terrorism. Terrorism must be put down tooth and nail. I accept it. But it is an extreme step because as the other State parties, we will say that imposition of the President's Rule in any situation anywhere in this country is only a temporary liquidation of democracy. It is a death of democracy. I would like to submit that you can kill a snake, but you cannot set fire to a temple to kill the snake. Thank you.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this Government gets panicky and resorts to desperate measures whenever there is a crisis. The whole day it rakes up its brains, does not get a solution and at midnight it reaches a solution, rushes to the Rashtrapati Bhavan and resorts to this kind of a desperate measure. This imposition of the President Rule brings the whole Punjab situation to a full circle. Starting from October 6, 1983, when the seventh President Rule was imposed in the State, to this day so many things have happened in that State. And we have reached the same point once again. It is an admission of the

defeat of this Government because it has resorted to so many measures during the last four years, and ultimately it has to admit its failure. It is a culmination of all its blunders starting from the Bluestar Operation. Today they are reaping the consequences and they do not know what to do and, therefore, they repeat the same thing which they can find, the imposition of the President's Rule, as if that is the panacea for all the ills. They forget that it was during the last President's Rule itself that the Punjab problem took a bad turn. It was during that time that arms were smuggled into the Golden Temple. It was during that time Bhindranwale was built up to that stature. And what do you want to achieve by again imposing the President's Rule there? What do you want to do? What Mr. Parnala could not do with your support do you want to achieve now? You have not spelt out what you want to do now. You have put a DGP of your choice. You have put a Governor there who did not function as a mere Constitutional head there, but functioned as a Governor under the President's Rule. He took abnormal interest in the day-to-day law and order affairs. Nobody objected. Even the Opposition parties did not object, because the situation warranted that. You had put para military forces there; you deployed military there. You took all the powers. You passed a number of Acts in this Parliament, and you took several powers, special powers under Article 249 also much against the wishes of the majority of the parties on this side. It only reminds me of the desperate efforts of an impotent man trying for potency pills, and he does not know how to use them. This is the position of this Government. It does not know what to do with the powers it has already acquired; but it wants more powers. So far, they were keeping the guns on the shoulders of Mr. Barnala as a buffer. He was acting as a buffer, and they will face the music today. Tomorrow when they confront the extremists directly, it will be a fight

between the Central Government and the local people. I am warning you that such a situation will develop, and you are leading to that. We have warned you previously also in this House. "Don't, for God's sake, resort to this step. Whether Mr. Barnala is efficient or inefficient; we are not concerned. You cannot do better than that, and if you resort to that step, you are resorting to a dangerous step. You will go into direct confrontation with the extremists. It will be a fight between the Centre and the extremists, a sort of civil war". And you are encouraging that. You are going for that. You will repent for it in course of time. That is my feeling. We warn you and you are not listening to that. What can you do now which you could not do so far? You have not done a single thing to support Mr. Barnala politically. All along, you have treated it as a law and order problem. Have you done anything to strengthen his hands politically? You know he is a moderate. But you have done everything to weaken him instead of strengthening him.

Punjab Accord is a dead letter. You have not implemented even one aspect of Punjab Accord, and you divided the Akali Dal. Can you deny that? It was one of your Ministers, who is out of Cabinet now, who encouraged Capt. Amrinder Singh and Sukhjinder Singh to divide Akali Dal. Can you deny that? He is out of your Cabinet now... (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI AMARJIT KAUR: It is wrong.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You divided Akali Dal. You encouraged its division because you wanted it to depend on your support to survive. You wanted a puppet government and you divided Akali Dal, and you encouraged Barnala to ignore Badal group, and he is now reaping the consequences of his relying on your support. And that was a mistake committed by Mr. Barnala also. I am sure about that. You are responsible for division in the Akali Dal.

There is no doubt about it that you encouraged Capt. Amrinder Singh and Sukhjinder Singh... (Interruptions).

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: They might have disclosed it to you. I hope you don't make unsubstantiated charge.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We are completely against extremism, violence, fundamentalism and all that. But this is not the way to tackle the situation.

And I am surprised, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to read the Governor's report to the President. It is an atrocious report. I never expected a Governor like Mr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray, with all his legal acumen, would send a report like this. It is self-condemnation, and condemnation of a popularly elected government. Only yesterday we discussed the role of Governors. I will read two or three paragraphs and you will understand to what extent the Governor has gone to condemn a popularly elected government.

"what made matters worse was the deep involvement of some of the Ministers in the present Cabinet and their relations with the terrorists/ extremists and the unwarranted attempted interference with police activities particularly at the District and Thana levels by them and some of the leading members of the ruling party."

This is one charge. Then, it goes on:

"Corruption has also become rampant...."

as if there is no corruption in the Centre.

"....and money is being taken.."

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): There is no corruption only in Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

"....money is being taken for the passing of a number of orders including orders for transfers, postings, and employment of 5.00 P.M. people by some of the Ministers and their relations and or associates, as well as by certain Chairmen of important Government Corporations/undertakings.

It is quite clear that the ruling party and its Government have no political will to combat truly and seriously either the fundamentalist movement or the growing and unabated terrorism and extremism and have become quite incapable of even assuring effectively far less safeguarding the basic fundamental rights guaranteed under our Constitution.

"The State Government indeed stands today as a mute spectator when tens and thousands of people here cannot even carry on their ordinary avocations of life. There is total chaos and anarchy."

Sir, I want to challenge this Government to prove these charges because these are serious charges. You are charging the erstwhile Ministers with complicity with the extremists and you are also charging them with corruption. It is your duty to prove these charges and I demand that a Commission of Inquiry should be constituted by you to prove these charges. (Interruptions).

Then, Sir, there is another funny thing which I myself could not follow. I do not know how Mr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray could write such a thing. He says:

"All the fight that is being put up, for example, the killing of Jarnail Singh and another in an encounter this morning at Sarghur, in fact, is by certain sections of the police under the leadership of the Director-General of Police and not because of any leadership or assistance or encouragement from the Government."

In the case of one single instance where there is success, it is due to the leadership of the DGP and for all the failures, Barnala and his Ministers are responsible. If you want to attribute success or failure, attribute it to one individual. Either you blame the Government or you blame the DGP. In one instance, you give credit to the DGP. Of course, it may be due. He is an efficient officer. I am not disputing that. But for all failures, you are blaming the Government. Why don't you give credit to the Government also for this?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): What is wrong if it is mentioned in the report?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: This is the type of the report on the basis of which the Government has come to the conclusion that President's Rule is inevitable there.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: If there is corruption, the Legislature is there.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I think, you are now entering into a dangerous situation there. As I said already, there is going to be a serious situation developing there, because you have removed the moderate elements. You have thrown them among the extremists and whatever moderate influence which they were exercising on the people, on the extremists, will no longer be there. The situation is likely to turn worse and the Central Government has to take full responsibility for this. Therefore, you have to reconsider the whole matter. You have kept the Assembly in suspended animation. I hope, better sense will prevail and you will restore popular rule as early as possible. I hope, you will reconsider this when you foresee the dangers which are going to come to Punjab and the country. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Shri Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Nobody from that side.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): You are supporting it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to extend my party's support to this Proclamation, but with two very strong reservations. I have only to spell out these reservations. It would be the principal task before me in my speech. Of course, in addition, I would also like to deal with the issues raised by my colleagues in the opposition. Their views I greatly respect because they are views born out of an honest conviction; there is no expediency or opportunism about them. I differ with their evaluation of the situation. Sir, when they referred to the praise that was being showered on the Chief Minister, Mr. Barnala, only a couple of months back, they were very right. They quoted no less than the President's Address which is the most authentic document reflecting the Government views and that was the Government's evaluation about the Chief Minister at that point of time, just three months back. In fact, I have with me even the subsequent evaluation. It is in reply to the President's Address. And the Prime Minister says: "What we stood for the support that we have given to the Government of Punjab, today after a long time is bearing fruit when we see that forces of secularism for separating religion and politics are standing together against factional tendencies, against terrorism, against fundamentalism, against the forces which are out to destroy the country." This is Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi speaking on March 3, 1987.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: It was two and a half months back.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, yes. Therefore, I want someone to explain to me what has happened between this point of time and today.

So far as I am concerned, I have been of the view, at least since December, 1986 that in Punjab there are no soft options. I entirely agree that normally a democratically elected Government should not be dislodged. Normally, they should be allowed to rule as they are, with all their shortcomings, including corruption, indeed. Let me refer to the Governor's letter. Principally, the charges made against the Barnala Government are four.

The first one is on page 2. It says that "there was not only a parallel authority working in the State by the fundamentalists and/or the extremists in the temple and the gurdwaras as opposed to the Punjab Government Secretariat at Chandigarh but terror stalked the land and fear abided in almost every heart with the inevitable result that migration and the subsequent communal tension and bitterness commenced again." This is the charge number one. Of course at the beginning of this remark, perhaps, in order to justify and give Mr. Chidambaram a point to make in reply to my first query the Governor has said "from about the middle of April 1987." As if there was no terror earlier and it is only from about middle of April, 1987 that suddenly terror started stalking the land. I can give you instances after instances in the last one year, starting with Muktsar in July-August last, thereafter General Vaidya's *hatya*, thereafter attempt on the life of the Prime Minister and of Mr. Ribeiro, thereafter the bus carnage in Hoshiarpur. There are so many instances on the basis of which any Governor could have taken the same stand, terror stalking the land and about a parallel Government running there. What is contained in the Governor's letter or Governor's report has been the Governor's view since a long time. If today New Delhi has taken a decision it is not based upon the Governor's report, rather the Governor's

report is based upon New Delhi's decision. When New Delhi came to the conclusion that President's rule has to be imposed, his views have been penned down in the shape of this report.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is always like that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is not the Governor alone who has been holding these views. I have with me a debate held in this House. Before I refer to it, let me first bring out all the four charges. Number one, as I said, is the parallel Government, terror stalking the land. Secondly, the deep involvement of some of the Ministers in the present Cabinet and their relations with the terrorists/extremists and the unwarranted attempted interference with police activities, particularly at the district and thana levels by them and some of the leading members of the ruling party. The third charge is and which I think is the most crucial charge and the most important charge, which certainly justifies imposition of the President's rule which is that the ruling party and its Govt., meaning the Akali Party, have no political will to combat truly and seriously either the fundamentalist movement or the growing and unabated terrorism and extremism and have become quite incapable even of assuring effectively, far less safeguarding, the basic fundamental rights guaranteed under our Constitution" etc. etc. "It's writ has ceased to run in large areas of the State, particularly in almost all rural areas. The State Government indeed stands today as a mute spectator when tens of thousands of people here cannot carry on their ordinary avocation of life." The last charge is that of corruption. I endorse these charges. When I say that I endorse these charges, I find that in August, 1986 the first three

charges are contained in a speech made by no less a person than Mr. Buta Singh, the Home Minister of the Government of India. These very three charges—namely, that there is terror there, that a parallel government seems to exist there and that which I have described as the most crucial charge—that the present Barnala Government lacks the political will to deal with the situation

My colleagues this side should not be surprised that only two months back Government showered praise on Shri Barnala and today they are dismissing Shri Barnala and accusing him of being totally incompetent, of being the villain of the piece. I heard Shri Darbara Singh described him as totally incompetent. "He is a lawyer, even then he does not understand this," something of that kind he said. I could not follow his Urdu properly but I tried to understand from Virendraji. But this kind of conduct by the Government of India need not surprise my colleagues. In many circuses, some artistes specialise in somersaults. I believe that this Government and this party have an incredible capacity of doing political somersaults. They did it in Jammu and Kashmir. They have done it now in Punjab and they may do it again in Punjab. Something that happened in Kashmir could well be repeated in Punjab also.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That is the game.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: In the political arena, you should give them the capacity and admire them for that, they can stage somersaults of this kind. But the cost the country will have to bear because of the peculiar situation in Punjab is going to be immense, unless our perspective is clear.

I remember when I said way back in August, 1986 that despite the fact that in this opposition I am in a minority, I am going to support the Government's case for a security zone, all of my colleagues said, you are

doing a wrong thing; once you allow them to encroach into the field of State autonomy, they are going to do it everywhere. And they told me, perhaps you do not have a government of your own, therefore, you can afford to do it. I believe that State autonomy is important but far more important is the integrity and security of the country, and it is this that prompts me to support the Government on the security zone issue. This prompts me to support Shri Buta Singh when he tells me that this present Government lacks the will, it does not have the political will. I would like to quote my colleague, Mr. Jaswant Singh. He had spoken in that debate and he had listed a number of laws that Parliament had passed in order to meet the terrorists' threat. He listed fifteen different laws in all. And Mr. Buta Singh replied: "Shri Jaswant Singh brought out a list of 15 Acts through which we could deal with this kind of situation. Sir, laws are there; no denying it. But, Sir, that law in the statute book itself will not come to the rescue of the people. There has to be a political will, there has to be a determination and there has to be an adequate organisational set-up in the field itself which is committed, which is prepared to die for the security and integrity of the country. It is that thing which is lacking". Therefore, we supported this security zone proposal. Article 249 was invoked for the first time in the history of the Rajya Sabha, at least after 1950. Shri Buta Singh also said: Another Act was mentioned by Jaswant Singhji, and this was the Anti-Terrorist Act. This Anti-Terrorist Act can also be implemented only if there is a political will and if the authorities are allowed to operate without any hindrance, without any political interference. Sir, may I bring to the memory of this august House what happened when we tried to demolish the hide-outs of the terrorists in one of the most dangerous areas in Punjab cal-

led Mand? It was an accusation made then, that half of the Cabinet of the present State Government issued statements against this operation which was to protect the country from these dreaded terrorists. Sir, this operation was ridiculed. The Chief of the Police was himself ridiculed personally by no less a person than a Cabinet Minister.

Sir, why am I pointing out all this? What does this Governor's report contain apart from all the allegations that were made against the Barnala Government in August, 1986 by the Home Minister himself in this House and on the basis of which he sought this House's permission to pass a Resolution under article 249 and create a security zone? Till that point of time, my party had not demanded President's rule. It was only in the month of September that I started demanding it. You have taken from this House, I said sanction for the creation of a security zone. Where is that. What has happened? You accused the Barnala Government of being flat-footed, being weak, and lacking political will. My charge against the Central Government is: you lack the political will. If the Barnala Government is opposing it, let it go. But you have taken sanction from this House. Why have you developed cold feet? In September or October, for the first time I made the statement: if because of implementation of this House's Resolution for the creation of a security zone the Barnala Government wants to go, let it go. That was my phraseology. It was only in the month of December that my party for the first time came to the conclusion—seeing the continued murders, killings, day in and day out, of people who are opposed to terrorism, whether they are Sikhs or Hindus that President's Rule must be imposed. From my own party, from the Communist Party and from the Congress Party, we have lost valiant people—party workers. Many of our activities in

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

the field have been killed. In the month of December my party took a stand that in Punjab there were no soft options left. My assessment was that—Barnala was being continued only as a shock absorber. The Government's evaluation is no different from mine. My colleagues from the Opposition differed from me. Even today Mr. Gurupadaswamy has said that Punjab is a political problem. I disagree with him.

Punjab was a political problem till three or four years back. When we had those tripartite conferences, I was totally convinced that if the consensus that emerged from that tripartite conference had been implemented the law and order problem also would have been solved. It was a political problem till then. Today it is not a political problem—certainly not. The political ingredient of it is very small. It is not even a law and order problem. We have a very serious law and order problem, much more serious than that of Punjab, in Bihar, in Uttar Pradesh. This is much more than a law and order problem; this is a threat to the unity and integrity of the country. It is far more than a law and order problem. It is, therefore, that we departed from the normal approach—no encroachment in State autonomy, no dislodging of an elected Government. Also, we pointed out to the Government in December, 1986 that the Barnala Government did not have even a majority; it was continuing only because of the Congress(I), so that when you remove this Government you cannot be accused of removing a majority Government. Do you realise the irony that today when you have actually brought in the proclamation, you are removing a majority Government, which charge could not have been levelled against you in December last because it was being sustained only by you? At that point of time, I remember, I said, "You are not going to remove the Barnala Government today because

he serves as a shock-absorber. When a Hindu is killed by the terrorists, the Hindus feel angry against Barnala, not against Shri Rajiv Gandhi. When a terrorist is killed by the security forces, the Sikhs feel angry against Mr. Barnala, not against Shri Rajiv Gandhi. So, he acts as a buffer between the anger of the people and the Government of India." I also said at that time, "Because your assessment is no different from mine, you are also going to remove Mr. Barnala and you will impose President's rule, but you will do so shortly before the Haryana elections." This is exactly what you have done. I agree entirely with Bansalji, I think he is right, that after all it is not going to pay, and it could have been done a day later, and further more, people are not going to be deceived by this. That is true. But today the situation in the party and the Government is that....

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I did not say, "People are not going to be deceived by it." I said, "If we had Haryana elections in mind, such steps could have been taken at any time. we knew that the Haryana elections were taking place on such and such a date. Therefore, we would not have supported Mr. Barnala earlier." That is how I put it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Very good.

SHRI RAM AWADHESH SINGH (Bihar): You had no other option.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would only say, because of the manner in which you have done, the time at which you have done it, your motives have become suspect. Your bona fides will be questioned. It is because of this that I think that much harm is going to be done to the cause of national integrity—that you want to support.

Sir, I would like to conclude. Let it be understood that if the imposition of the President's rule is the only thing in your mind and you think that in this way the Punjab problem is going to be solved, you are delu-

ding yourselves. In fact, I said the same thing the other day when some Ministers started speaking in very blowing terms about the all-party rallies that had been held in Punjab recently, in those all-party rallies, my party was in a minority of one when we said, "We are not going to support the Barnala Government. We are going to speak against the terrorism. These rallies are being held in order to convey to the people that so far as the terrorists are concerned, all political parties are united. Therefore, we are going to participate in it." All the others who used to support Mr. Barnala were saying, "Mr. Barnala is a valiant knight in shining armour as it were, fighting the fiends of fundamentalism." This was the trend and tenor of the speeches that were made. We were the only ones who were of the view that President's rule should be imposed. We did not support Mr. Barnala at any stage. Of course, we said, "To the extent Mr. Barnala had shown some little courage in standing against the high priests of the Akal Takht, we appreciate his stand. That is all."

But I would like to know from the Government, on this occasion, what else it has in mind, whether it has any thing else in mind apart from imposing President's rule. And I would suggest that the sanction that you took in August last from this House must be implemented without delay. A security zone all along the border must be created. After all, we cannot keep on shouting about Pakistan helping the terrorists, sending infiltrators into the country, but doing nothing about it. Now that you have taken this step, you have decided to go in for direct intervention, let this be done without delay. Now it is within your field.

Secondly, I have always been of the view that one of the basic flaws in our handling of Punjab has been that after 1984 when the State was under the President's rule, a very strict screening which should have been done, was not done. Cleansing

process of the administration, of the police set-up should have started then itself to ensure that we have a proper machinery. Now that is something that you have to do.

At the same time you have to remove some irritants. There are irritants. You cannot keep on saying over and over again that the question of the Jodhpur prisoners is going to be reviewed. You have to come out with categorical facts saying this is the position and undertake the review process immediately. I have always maintained that there should be three categories. Those of them, who are guilty, about which we have evidence, prosecute them. Those, who are innocent, release them. There is the third category may be of those, who, we suspect, are guilty, but we have no evidence. I think security lays are intended to deal with such people. But you cannot go on endlessly saying that the matter is being reviewed; we will do it soon etc. etc. So, also on the question of the 1984 riots, the people who are guilty have to be punished. If till this day not a single person has been punished, you cannot create confidence among the people

I am criticised and my party is criticised for suggesting the use of the army. I am unable to understand this inhibition about the deployment of army to assist the civil authorities in a situation like that in Punjab. We do it in much more ordinary cases in Ahmedabad, in Delhi or elsewhere, where there is law and order situation and which the local police is not able to deal with it, or which we are not able to deal with even with the assistance of para-military forces. Why should there be any inhibition about the use of Army in Punjab? Is it only because of 1984? If that is the inhibition, I think that has been a principal hurdle in dealing with the situation in Punjab. This inhibition must be shed.

The Deputy Chairman in the Chair
 ..Lastly, this vague repetition

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

the charge that the Punjab problem has been the result of Pakistan or America's intervention and that they are promoting terrorism in Punjab, assisting the terrorists, the extremists etc. should be abandoned. I demand that there should be a white paper on foreign intervention in Punjab. How foreign powers whosoever they be, have been trying to promote terrorist violence in Punjab or assisting the terrorists and extremists in Punjab. On that issue I demand a White paper.

With these words I once again support the President's proclamation, but with the strong reservations which I have voiced.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : (बिहार) :
 उपसभापति महोदया, ऐसा लगता है कि जब बन्दर फौज जाता है जाल में तो जितना हाथ-पांव चलाता है उतना ही और फँसता जाता है। (व्यवधान)

श्री विश्वजित पृथ्वीजित सिंह : (महाराष्ट्र) : आज आपने सत्य बोला है। (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं यह कह रहा था कि जब कोई बन्दर जाल में फँस जाता है तो जितना वह हाथ-पांव चलाता है उतना ही फँसता जाता है। यह भारत सरकार, यह राजीव गांधी की सरकार।

श्री विश्वजित पृथ्वीजित सिंह : भारत सरकार का जाल तो बहुत बड़ा है।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : वह जाल में फँस गयी है और जितने हाथ-पांव चलाता चाहता है निकलने के लिए उतना ही फँसता जाता है। शुरू से ही पंजाब समस्या पर जो कुछ चर्चा हुई, जो कुछ भारत सरकार ने हाथ-पांव मारे, उतनी बार यह उसमें फँसती गई है। प्रेजिडेंट रूल पहले भी वहाँ पर हुआ था, तब भी उसका समाधान नहीं हुआ। उसके बाद सरेन्डर करके समझौता हो गया लॉगोब्राल

से और इस तरह से एक रास्ता निकाला गया कि अलियों के हाथ में, अलाल दल के हाथ में हुकूमत दी जाय ताकि अलाल दल के लो वहाँ के अलियों से लड़कर आपस में निपट सकें। यह रास्ता, भारत सरकार ने निकाला। लेकिन फिर भी कोई समाधान नहीं निकाल सके। अब आप फिर प्रेजिडेंट रूल लागू करने जा रहे हैं। लेकिन प्रेजिडेंट रूल से कोई रास्ता नहीं निकल सकता है। सिनेमा का एक गाना है—वहीं पर निगाहें, वहीं पर निशाना। यह पुराना गाना है ... (व्यवधान) । आप लोग मुझे बोलने दायिये। निशाना है हरियाणा का चुनाव। आप समझते हैं कि पंजाब में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करके कुछ अच्छा रिजल्ट निकल सकता है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह होने वाला नहीं है। इस तरह से बन्दर अपने हाथ जाल में फँस गया है। ईराडी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आपके पास आ गई है। पाना के बँटवारे के सवाल पर हरियाणा में जो गुप्तमगुप्त्या ही रही है, हरियाणा को जनता पाना के बँटवारे के सवाल पर जिस प्रकार से खड़ी हो गई है, और जिस प्रकार से वह कांग्रेस को परास्त करने के लिए तैयार हो गई है उसी के लिए आपने पंजाब में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया है। बरनाला साहब शायद इस बात में न आ जाय, इसलिए आपने पंजाब में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया है। ईराडी कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आपके पास आ चुकी है। उसको सरकार ने पढ़ भी लिया है। मैं यह चार्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि कमीशन को डिस्टेंट किया गया है कि इस तरह की रिपोर्ट पाना के बँटवारे के संबंध में हरियाणा के पक्ष में दी जाय मुझे भारी डर है कि हरियाणा के पक्ष में पाना देने की रिपोर्ट ईराडी कमीशन में है और इस बात को जब बरनाला की पोपुलर गवर्नमेंट के सामने रखा जाएगा तो सरकार पर दबाव पड़ेगा इसलिए उस दबाव को कम करने के लिए यह राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया गया है। इसके अलावा इसका कोई दूसरा मकसद नहीं दिखाई देता है ... (व्यवधान) ।

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक (उत्तर प्रदेश) : क्या आप हरियाणा के खिलाफ बोल रहे हैं ?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं तो आपके खिलाफ बोल रहा हूँ। आपने पंजाब को पापुलर गवर्नमेंट को इसलिए भंग कर दिया कि ईराड बमोशन का जो रिपोर्ट आने वाला है, वह अभी आपके सामने है, हमारे सामने पेज नहीं कं गई है, उसमें जो पान के बंटवारे का सवाल है, उसको हरियाणा के पक्ष में बदनाम है और अगर पंजाब में बरनाला गवर्नमेंट रहे तो उसको जवाब देने में दिक्कत होगी।

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक : आप चाहते हैं कि हरियाणा को पान दिया जाय ... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : हम चाहते हैं कि हरियाणा को पान मिले। मेरा कहना यह है कि हरियाणा का जनता पान के लिए जो लड़ाई लड़ रहा है आप उस लड़ाई को मोड़ कर दूसरा दिशा देना चाहते हैं। बिना किसी कारण के तात्कालिक लाभ के लिए आपने कहा की पापुलर गवर्नमेंट को भंग किया है और उस पर तोहमत लगाई है जब कि दो महीने पहले आपने उसको बहादुरी का सर्टिफिकेट दे दिया था। आज तक हिन्दुस्तान के संसदीय जनतंत्र के इतिहास में कभी राष्ट्रपति के मुंह से किसी मुख्य मंत्री का नाम लिवाकर यह नहीं हुआ है, किसी सूबे की सरकार की प्रशंसा हो गई हो लेकिन बरनाला सरकार का नाम लेकर जो उसकी प्रशंसा की गई ऐसा कभी यहां के संसदीय इतिहास में नहीं हुआ जो किसी मुख्य मंत्री का नाम लेकर राष्ट्रपति द्वारा उसकी प्रशंसा की गई हो। दो महीने पहले ज्वइंट सेशन में आपने प्रेसीडेंट के मुंह से जबरिया कहलवाया और उसको कहलवाने के बाद आज कह रहे हैं कि ... (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : जबरिया का मतलब क्या है ?

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : जबरिया का मतलब है जबरदस्ती ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री देव प्रताप राय : प्रेसीडेंट के बारे में ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इन्होंने कहा है कि उनसे जबरदस्ती कहलवाया गया है ... (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi): Madam, I am on a point of order. Is this in order for an hon. Member to say that something can be done and forced on the President and a statement can be issued? Is this in order or not?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMEN: That is only his view and not a point of order.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : ये जो लिखते हैं प्रेसीडेंट उसको पढ़ता है, प्रेसीडेंट को पढ़ देना होता है यह तो एक कांस्टिट्यूशनल प्रावधान है इसमें क्या डिस्प्यूट है ? यह डिस्प्यूट का विषय नहीं है। आपने जबरिया प्रेसीडेंट के मुंह से पढ़ाया, लिखकर दिया। ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति : आप बार बार इसी बात को क्यों दोहरा रहे हैं। आप आगे बोलिये। ... (व्यवधान) ... आप चेयर की तरफ एड्रेस कजिये आप मैम्बर्स को एड्रेस मत कीजिए।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मेरा समय जितना इन लोगों ने ले लिया है उतना आप दे दीजिये। ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ... (व्यवधान) ... आप लोग धीरज तो रखें।

उपसभापति : आप लोग आपस में मत बोलिये।

ठाकुर जगतपाल सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप कौन से लोकदल में हैं।

उपसभापति : आप आपस में मत बोलिए, वक्त जाया हो रहा है। Please don't create any trouble.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ बहुत गंभीरता के साथ कि आपका बहुमत है । आप जो चाहते हैं यहां कर सकते हैं, पास करा सकते हैं, इसमें दो राय नहीं हैं । लेकिन जम्हूरियत में आप एक कन्वेंशन कायम करिए, एक अच्छा कन्वेंशन कायम करिए जिससे आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियों को रास्ता मिल सके । यह न हो कि आज आप बहुमत में हैं और जो मन में आये पास करा दें, किसी की प्रशंसा कर दीजिए और कभी उसी को माली दीजिए और इसको बहुमत के बल पर चले दें : ... (व्यवधान) ... लेकिन आप इस बात को याद रखें कि जो आप यहां कह रहे हैं, जो चीजें आप यहां कर रहे हैं वह रिकार्ड में जा रही हैं । और जो चीजें रिकार्ड में जा रही हैं, उनको आने वाली पीढ़ी पढ़ेगी, आने वाले लोग पढ़ेंगे, और जिस ढंग से आप एक ही बात को तोड़मरोड़ कर कह रहे हैं जो आप को सूट करता है वह कहते हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... तो महोदया मै, यह ...

उपसभापति : आप वही बात दोहराये नहीं । आप अपना भाषण जल्दी समाप्त करिए । 6 बजने वाले हैं ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब में जो राष्ट्रपति शासन इम्पोज किया गया है, मैं उसका जबर्दस्त विरोध करता हूँ । जिस ढंग से इम्पोज किया गया मैं उस की निन्दा करता हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस राष्ट्रपति शासन के खिलाफ देश की जनता सड़कों पर खड़ी हो और इन लोगों के खिलाफ जबर्दस्त जन-आन्दोलन खड़ा कर के हरियाणा की जनता इनकी चालाकी का जवाब देगी तथा इनको पूरी तरह से शिकस्त दे कर बता देगी कि यह चाल चलने वाली नहीं है ।

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to oppose the statutory motion which is being discussed in the House. This Session witnesses today

a very sad spectacle, a sad spectacle in the sense that this Session is going to end with a note altogether different from what it began with. At the beginning of the Session Parliament initiated a new process for a solution of the prolonged Punjab tangle. The policy frame was enunciated through the President's Speech to the Joint Session of Parliament and at the end of the Session that spirit, that process, is being buried and buried deep. By this I want to say that the process which was started at the beginning of the Session is being reversal at the conclusion of the Session. This is a paradox. This is a sad and tragic event in the history of India's Parliament.

Coming to the subject, to begin with I want to submit with all humility that the Governor of Punjab has levelled a certain charge against the Government of Punjab. As a matter of fact, that charge truly applies to them, the ruling party and the Government at the Centre. The charge I refer to is that the Governor, Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray, of Punjab has mentioned that the Akali Government has not got the political will and determination to combat, to fight terrorism and forces of secessionism. In fact, it is a charge that I hurl against them. The very fact that they have reversed the process for a solution of Punjab problem reveals that the Government of India, the ruling party, have got no determination, no political will, to combat the forces of fundamentalism, the forces of secessionism, the forces of communalism, the forces of separatism, the forces which are rearing their heads in the name of separate Khalistan. Therefore, the charge is truly applicable to the other side, not as has been mentioned in the case of Punjab Government. I also want to make it clear to this House and through this House, to the countrymen, that I do not agree with Mr. Advani's prescription or conclusion that the Punjab problem has ceased to be a political problem and

it has, of late, been completely transformed into merely a problem of law and order. I reiterate that the Punjab problem has remained a political problem, that the Punjab problem, even after imposition of the President's rule, continues to remain a political Problem, and Madam. If any step is taken only on the basis that it is a law and order problem, I think, that will only jeopardise the country's unity and integrity.

Now I have got a charge against the Government that the imposition of the President's rule in Punjab is the outcome of an extraneous consideration, not germane in any way to the situation prevailing in Punjab, either in the past or in the future. It is an extraneous consideration and this extraneous consideration relates to the electoral prospect of the Congress (I) Party in the ensuing Haryana elections. (Time Bell rings) And, Madam, for me it has been a very sad thing to observe that here is a ruling party whom we cannot replace because of certain political compulsions, places electoral mileage above everything else and considers it a more valuable thing than the unity and integrity of the country.

Again I charge that this Government is taking a position of compromise with the fundamentalists, communalists and secessionist and is taking a position against those very forces which are fighting against the forces of communalism, separatism and is unity in our country. In this respect, I think I shall be failing in my duty if do not mention the role of the Governor of Punjab. As has been mentioned earlier, the decision has been taken by the Centre and the report of the Governor of Punjab has been tailored to comply with the requirement of the Government at the Centre. Therefore, my conclu-

sion is that the decision precedes and the report follows. I do not say and I would not say that the Barnala Government is free from all weaknesses. There were weaknesses and there were weaknesses even yesterday. (Time bell rings). But the Government had a strategy of its own and the strategy was that the moderates in Punjab's Sixth politics have to be strengthened and they have to be strengthened in the interest of a solution to the Punjab problem. This very step of imposing the President's Rule must only be the beginning of the end of the role of the moderates in Punjab.

Madam, it is the Prime Minister of our country who initiated the process of all-party campaign. But it is a sad commentary that by this act of imposing the President's Rule that role has been negated and this will not help in healing the wounds in Punjab.

Lastly, Madam, I want only to seek clarifications on three issues.

What is the latest attitude of this Government with regard to the high priests now in Amritsar? Is there any change in the attitude of the Government towards them and if so, kindly enunciate it.

What is the attitude of this Government, in the present context, after the imposition of the President's Rule, towards the United Akali Dal? Has there been any change and, if there is any change, what is the rationale behind it and what is the attitude of this Government towards the move of the Muni and others who, according to me, are pronouncing certain things which only help the high priests and the extremists? I want clarifications on these issues and I think the hon. Minister will clarify these points if he is so pleased. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now
 Mr. Hanspal.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंतापाल : मैडम डिप्टी चैरमन, यहाँ पर बहुत विचार आज पंजाब के प्रोक्लमेशन के ऊपर रखे गए, उसको तो मैं सपोर्ट करता हूँ, एक बात जो बार-बार कही गई वह यह थी प्रेसीडेंट एंड्रेस के अन्दर-प्रेसीडेंट सहव ने बरनाला सरकार की तारोफ की और यह ठीक है, क्योंकि उस वक्त उन्होंने कुछ ऐसे सोलिड स्टैप्स लिए थे वहाँ पर कंसेन्स करके जिससे यह महसूस हो रहा था कि अब वहाँ पर स्थिति को कंट्रोल कर सकेंगे। लेकिन विदिन श्री मन्थस ऐसी सिचुएशन डिवेलप हुई कि जो उस वक्त नहीं थी। अडवणो जी ने कहा कि पहले भी वहाँ पर पैरलल सरकार चल रही थी या पैरलल अलग से कोई चीज वहाँ पर ऐसी थी जहाँ से कि आर्डर पास किए जाते थे ऐसा नहीं था। पिछले तीन महीने के अन्दर कुछ फंडामेंटल सोशल रिफार्म्स के नाम पर ऐसे काम किए गए जिससे अब यह स्पष्ट जाहिर था कि वहाँ पर पैरलल गवर्नमेंट अब चल गई है। करीब तीन जिलों में या शायद चार में यह सिचुएशन थी इस वक्त की बरनाला सरकार या पंजाब सरकार की कोई बात कही हुई नहीं चलती थी, जितने जब चाहें वे रुपए ले आते थे, आर्म्स ले जाते थे और मार आते थे। आई एम टाकिंग आफ टैरोरिस्ट्स। दूसरी बात जो क्लीयर होकर सामने आई इन दिनों में वह यह थी मिक्सड अप आफ मिनिस्टर्स विद टैरोरिस्ट्स। यह बात ठीक है, इस बात को महसूस किया जा रहा था बहुत दिनों से, बहुत महीनों से, लेकिन अब तो यह हालत आ गई थी कि पंजाब सरकार ... (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : कितने महीने पहले ?

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंतापाल : दिस इज नाट रिलेवंट जो बात आप पूछ रहे हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : चूंकि दो महीने पहले आपने बनाई थी। यह कह रहे हैं कई महीनों से मालूम था, कितने महीनों से मालूम था ?

उप-भाषित : आप सुनिए। आप जरा बैठ जाइये।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप कंटा-डिक्डो बोल रहे हैं। तो आपको बहुत महीनों से मालूम था किये मिनिस्टर लाग मिलते थे। तो कितने महीनों से मिलते थे ?

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंतापाल : लेकिन अब सिचुएशन यह थी कि बरनाला सहव की सरकार के नम्बर दो मंत्री भी आतली उस बात में सथ हो गए और अडवणों में भी यह बात छप गई कि वे कितनी खास जिनका नाम दरबारा सिंह ने शुरू में लिया जगतार सिंह जो नोन टैरोरिस्ट्स थे उनको छुड़वाना चाहते थे। जब यह हालत हो जाये तो उसके बाद सरकार को कैसे कंट्रोल करने दिया जा सकता है ? तीसरी बात यह उभरकर सामने आई कि डायरेक्ट इंटरफीयरेंस विद पुलिस फोर्स, ला-कीपिंग फोर्स के साथ अब वहाँ के मिनिस्टर कर रहे थे। इसलिए यह बहुत जरूरी हो गया था कि वहाँ पर कोई चेंज आफ गवर्नमेंट लाई जाए that was the only solution under the Constitution to proclaim President's role.

एक बात और जो मैं हाउस के ध्यान में लाना चाहूंगा जिसका जिक्र शायद किसी ने नहीं किया, जब दो साल पहले या 21 महीने पहले पंजाब में इलैक्शन करवाए गए तो हमारी सरकार ने ही उस वक्त यह इलैक्शन करवाये। आलमोस्ट सारी आपोजिशन इस बात की मुखालफत कर रही थी कि इलैक्शन वहाँ पर अभी न कराए जाएं। तो यह चार्ज लगाना कि हमने ड्यूटी इलैक्टड गवर्नमेंट को नहीं चलने दिया या नहीं चलने देना चाहते थे यह बिल्कुल गलत है। (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : यह तो आप लोगों की चालाकी थी।

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंतापाल : जब आपको कोई बात समझ में नहीं आ सकती तो क्यों बोलते हैं और जो कि इतनी लोजिकल

बात है। इट इज ए मॅटर ऑफ रिकॉर्ड, यह रिकॉर्ड की बात है कि सारी अपोजिशन ने उस वक्त अपोजिज किया कि अभी इलैक्शन नहीं होने चाहिए। लेकिन यह हमारी सरकार थी कांग्रेस पार्टी की सरकार थी जो चाहती थी कि जल्दी से जल्दी वहाँ पर ड्यूली इलैक्टड सरकार बने और उस सरकार को बनवाया।

SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHA-KRISHNA (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of order. He says that all political parties had opposed the election. But Telugu Desam did not oppose it. We had supported the move for conducting the election.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : मैंने यह कहा कि आलमोस्ट सारी अपोजिशन मेरा ख्याल है आलमोस्ट का मतलब आप समझते हैं कि क्या है ? मैं अंत में मंत्री महोदय से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने वहाँ पर प्रेसीडेंट रूल लागू कर दिया, बहुत अच्छी बात है, लेकिन इस बात का जरूर ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि अब सारी की सारी जिम्मेदारी सेंट्रल सरकार के ऊपर आ गई है। आपको इमीडियेट और ड्रास्टिक स्टेप्स वहाँ पर लेने पड़ेंगे। अगर यह वहाँ पर नहीं लेगे और वहाँ पर किलिज को कटने नहीं कर सकेंगे... (व्यवधान) तो आपके ऊपर सारी जिम्मेदारी आयेगी। मैं सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि बहुत जल्दी इमीडियेट एक्शन ऐसे वहाँ पर लेने चाहिए। जो कि लोगों के अन्दर कांफिडेंस खो चुका है पिछले दो साल से, वह फिर से बने और जो लोग वहाँ से बाहर निकलना चाहते हैं, माइग्रेट करना चाहते हैं उसके अन्दर इतना कांफिडेंस आ जाय कि वह ऐसा सोचना बंद कर दें और जो थोड़े बहुत लोग बहार निकल आए हैं उनके अन्दर इतना कांफिडेंस आ जाय कि वह पंजाब वापस आ जाए। स्कूल प्राइमरी खुल जाय, जिसमें बच्चे बिना किसी डर के जा सकें, लोग अपना कारोबार कर सकें और यह चीजें हैं रात को बस बंद हो चुकी हैं या बगैर भय

के या बगैर डर के लोग घर से नहीं निकल सकते तो वह चीज रेस्टोर हो जाय ताकि एक नार्मल स्थिति पंजाब के अन्दर आ जाय और मैं पंजाब का रिप्रेजेंटेटिव होते हुए यह कहना चाहूंगा कि पंजाब वापस, वही पर आ जाय जहाँ पर पहले था, देश के पहले राज्य के रूप में। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

श्री हर्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति जी, सन् 1984 में जब लोक सभा के चुनाव हो रहे थे, उस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी के अध्यक्ष और तत्कालीन प्रधान मंत्री ने देश भर में घूम-घूम कर के यह कहा था कि शांति के लिए, देश की राष्ट्रीयता के लिए, देश की अखंडता के लिए और पंजाब में शांति के लिए कांग्रेस पार्टी को वोट देना चाहिए और देश की जनता ने कांग्रेस पार्टी को वोट दिया और दो-तिहाई मेजोरिटी में कांग्रेस पार्टी को जिताकर वहाँ भेजा। श्री राजीव गांधी दुबारा इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री बन गए। लेकिन कल जो राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपनी उद्घोषणा से राष्ट्रपति शासन पंजाब में चला दिया है, यह न केवल संवैधानिक धाराओं का दुरुपयोग है बल्कि इस देश की जनता के साथ, संविधान के साथ और लोकतंत्र के साथ एक बहुत बड़ा धोखा है क्योंकि जो कुछ पंजाब में हो रहा है, पिछले सवा दो साल में पंजाब में हुआ, अव्यवस्था बढ़ी है, चहे आतंकवाद बढ़ा है या बहुत से लोगों की जो हत्याएँ हुई हैं या लूटपाट हुई है, उसकी जिम्मेदारी से इस देश की कांग्रेस पार्टी, इस देश की सरकार और और इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री, अपने को बचा नहीं सकते हैं। मैं आपके माध्यम से उपसभापति जी, इस सदन का ध्यान संविधान के अनुच्छेद 355 की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, जिसमें इस बात की व्यवस्था है कि केन्द्र सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है कि देश को बाह्य आक्रमण से और आंतरिक गड़बड़ी से बचाए—

"Duty of the Union to protect States against external aggression and internal disturbance—it shall

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

be the duty of the Union to protect every State against external aggression and internal aggression"

तो पिछले सवा दो साल से पंजाब में यह आंतरिक गड़बड़ी हो रही थी, इण्टर्नल डिस्टर्बेन्स चल रही थी, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने कर्तव्य का पालन क्यों नहीं किया था ? केन्द्र सरकार क्या कर रही थी ? केन्द्र सरकार क्यों सो रही थी ? पंजाब में जो कुछ भी घटित हुआ है या पछले सवा दो साल से घटित हो रहा है, इस स्थिति से बचाने की सीधी-सीधी जिम्मेदारी केन्द्र सरकार की थी क्योंकि केन्द्र सरकार ने इस देश की जनता से वायदा किया था कि हम सत्ता में आयेँगे तो देश की खूबज्झटा बचायेंगे, इस देश में शांति स्थापित करेंगे और पंजाब की समस्या का समाधान करेंगे ।

माननीय उपसभापति जी, जो राज्यपाल महोदय ने राष्ट्रपति जी को पत्र लिखा है, उसमें कुछ कानून-व्यवस्था की भी चर्चा की है और उस और मैं अपना ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ, 11 मई, का राज्यपाल महोदय का यह पत्र है, जिसमें उन्होंने कहा है :—

"Lawlessness, lootings, snatchings, Bank Robberies, burning of shops, Kiosks, Khokas; the brutal maiming or murdering of innocents etc. commenced with a renewed vigour making not only many of the Fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution illusory but also even the most basic right under it — the right to life — non-existent.

माननीय उपसभापति जी, दिल्ली केन्द्र शासित प्रदेश है, केन्द्र शासित राज्य है । कोई भी दिन ऐसा नहीं जाता है जब दिल्ली में निर्दोष लोगों की हत्या न हो, कोई दिन भी ऐसा नहीं होता

है जब दिल्ली में बैंक न लुटता हो, कोई भी दिन ऐसा नहीं जाता है, जब दिल्ली में दुकानों और सबकों पर जो दुकानदार हैं, उनकी दुकानों को लूटा न जाता हो, तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि राज्यपाल महोदय ने जो इसमें इस बात की चर्चा की है, इसमें कौनसी नयी बात थी और क्या कारण नहीं है जिसके कारण केन्द्र की सरकार को भी बर्खास्त करना चाहिए या केन्द्र सरकार को स्वयं इस्तीफा देकर चला जाना चाहिए । जो सरकार अपने आश्वासन को पूरा नहीं करती, जो सरकार जनता से वोट मांगते समय दिए गए अपने आश्वासन को पूरा नहीं करती, मेरी अपनी राय है कि ऐसी सरकार को इस्तीफा देना चाहिए और फिर जनता के पास जाना चाहिए जनान्देश प्राप्त करने के लिए । सरकार को लोक सभा भंग करने की सिफारिश राष्ट्रपति

6.00 P.M. से करनी चाहिए जो भी आश्वासन लोगों को सरकार द्वारा दिया गया था,

उसकी पूर्ति नहीं हो पाई है, इसलिए लोक सभा को भंग कर चुनाव होना चाहिए पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री श्री बरनाला को जिम्मेदार ठहराना और स्वयं वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति शासन स्थापित करना, इससे बढ़कर इस देश की जनता के साथ कोई धोका नहीं हो सकता, इस देश के संविधान के साथ इसलिए मैं इस राष्ट्रपति शासन का घोर विरोध करता हूँ और कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी की आख लगी हुई है हरियाण के चुनाव में और जो इस समय इन्होंने चुना है राष्ट्रपति शासन को लागू करने का, यह दुर्भाग्य से प्रसिद्ध है । इसलिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the hon. Minister.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam Deputy Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the views expressed by the hon. Members on the Resolution that is now before this House.

Madam, I can recall two earlier occasions in the unfolding drama of Punjab where the Government of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi was required to take bold decisions. On each one of these occasions, we were criticised, taunted, heckled, opposed, and the voice of reason was drowned in the cacophony of dissent. The first occasion was in September, 1985 when barely two months after the Punjab Accord was signed, the Prime Minister took the bold decision to hold elections. Save a few parties, the Opposition opposed us. They said that the elections should not be held, they said that the people of Punjab were not ready for self-government. Nevertheless, we took that decision. And today, at least I have the satisfaction that a year and nine months afterwards there are some Opposition parties who see the wisdom of that decision, yet will not see the unwisdom of persisting in that democratic set-up after it has failed. The second occasion was in December, 1985, when the Akali Dal split. I need not mention the names of parties which wished and prayed that the Punjab Government will collapse or should collapse. The Congress Party which had fought the Akali Dal, which had lost the election only by less than half a per cent of the popular vote but yielded a large number of seats, thanks to our system of spotting the winner, took another courageous decision that we will support Chief Minister Barnala, we will support his Government, we will not allow that Government to collapse. That was a bold decision. Yet we were criticised. Today we stand on the threshold of another moment in history where we have to take a bold decision. This calls for courage, this calls for sacrifice, this calls for shouldering burdens, this calls for facing adversaries, even facing bullets. In a moment of truth, many Opposition leaders said that you are taking on a foe, you are taking on a burden which you under-estimate. Perhaps we do. But we take on this fully conscious that we are assuming unto ourselves a tremendous burden of bringing order to Punjab, restoring peace and harmony to Punjab, bringing back sanity to Punjab, because we believe that we owe a duty to the people

of Punjab and we owe a duty to the people of this country. We cannot run away in the face of this challenge.

I am grateful to Advaniji for supporting us. I only appeal to other Opposition parties to stand by us when we take on the gravest challenge that this country has faced since independence. We are willing to take on this challenge.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA:
 You have failed to meet the challenge.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Please be serious. Now they have said that we do this with an eye on elections. I cannot think of anything more ridiculous. Look at what happened in the last three months. I will not go beyond that. On the 23rd of February, the Government, speaking through the President, affirmed its support to the Government of Shri Barnala. Even on that day we knew that Haryana was going to elections in May or June. We could have prepared the ground. We could have added our voice of criticism. We could have joined the Opposition parties in running down the Government of Punjab. But we did not. We supported him sincerely, truthfully and in the hope that he will be able to deliver the goods.....
 (Interruptions).

श्री राम ब्रह्मेश सिंह : ठीक टाइम पर करना चाहिए (व्यवधान) ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If he speaks like this, you have to take action on that.....(Interruptions).

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY
 (Andhra Pradesh): Why do you say that?
 (Interruptions).

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: You have to take action on that; he is reducing it to a mockery.....(Interruptions).

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA:
 What is this action? (Interruptions).

191 Statutory Resolution [RAJYA SABHA] Under Article 356 192.
*Approving Proclamation
 issued by the President
 of the Constitution
 to the State of Punjab*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Are you supporting him? (Interruptions).

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Why do you say of action? (Interruptions).

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Are you supporting his heckling? Are't you ashamed of that? (Interruptions). Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy aren't you ashamed of that heckling when everybody is seriously listening? Don't join that cacophony. There must be some voices of reason here.... (Interruptions). I can appeal to the Chair.... (Interruptions).

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Why do you say of taking action? (Interruptions).

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: What is this action? (Interruption).

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Mr. Malaviya, you can never cow me down. I am appealing to her.... (Interruptions).

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: You also cannot cow me down.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I have every right to appeal to her.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. Please sit down.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I am not speaking to him. I have every right to appeal to the Chair. I am entitled to be heard without interruption, and I will not yield my right.... (Interruptions). And if you don't know the distinction between appeal and dictation, I am sorry for you.... (Interruptions). If the hon. Member does not know the difference between appeal and dictation, I am sorry for him. Madam, if he continues to do that, you will have to take action against him. That is my appeal to the Chair.... (Interruptions). Of course, I cannot speak his language, nor can he speak my language. We cannot communicate with each other. If he does not understand my language, I cannot help it. If he cannot understand the language I am speaking, I cannot help it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. There should not be any disturbance in the House when such a serious matter is being discussed. We are discussing a serious issue. Don't try to accuse each other.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Madam, my only appeal is, you should also control that side.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Don't try to paint yourself as a paragon of virtue now. (Interruption) Turn round and ask him, Mrs. Renuka.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I am on a point of order.

उपसभापति : मैं आपसे रिक्वेस्ट करूंगी कि आप शांत रहिये ।

श्रीमती रणुका चौधरी : मैं तो शांत हूँ ।

उपसभापति : आप मेरी परमिशन से नहीं बोल रही हैं । आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्रीमती रणुका चौधरी : आप कह दीजिए कि पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर उठाना बना है ?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Nothing has happened on which you can raise a point of order. Let the Minister speak.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I was saying that we are on the threshold of taking another bold decision and the Government has taken such a decision. I am grateful to Mr. Advani and his Party for supporting us. We face a grave crisis. We face tremendous odds. We face a very powerful adversary in Punjab. I am only appealing to the hon. Members to look at the events in the last three months and support the Government in this decision.

Madam, what has happened in the last three months? On the 26th of January, in response to a call given by the Damdami Taksal, the Panthic Committee and the

AISSF, there was a Sarbat Khalsa held in the Golden Temple. The Sarbat Khalsa endorsed the declaration of Khalistan made by the Panthic Committee on the 29th April, 1986. That was the day when the Panthic Committee practically usurped all the authority of the SGPC and the Akali Dal in Punjab. On the 3rd February, 1987, an edict was issued by the five High Priests directing the Presidents and Jathedars of the various Akali factions to submit their resignations by the evening of 5th February, 1987, as a prelude to forging Panthic unity. It was not an act for forging Panthic unity. It was the first act of destabilising the elected Government of Punjab. On the 5th February, 1987, two days later, the High Priests held Shri Barnala guilty of violating the directives of the High Priests and gave a call to the office-bearers of all factions, MLAs and MPs to give a call to the office-bearers of all factions, MLAs and MPs to give an undertaking, a written undertaking, to the Jathedar of Akal Takht accepting the new office-bearers of the reorganised Akali Party announced by the High Priests. And who was announced as the President? Shri Simaranjit Singh Mann was nominated as the President of the new Akali Dal. The five-member Presidium included Shri Prakash Singh Badal, Baba Joginder Singh, Thekedar Surjan Singh, Shri Jagdev Singh Talwandi and Shri Geja Singh. On the 14th February, 1987, five Akali Ministers including Shri Harbhajan Singh Sandhu handed over pledge letters to Prof. Darshan Singh Ragi. It was the beginning of a clear and open split in the Akali Government. Shri Prem Singh Chandumajra dedicated his services for the Akal Takht Sahib for strengthening Panthic unity. From the 14th to 16th March, 1987, a three-day long Hola Mohalla celebration was held at Anandpur Sahib. It was dominated by the AISSF Gurjit Singh faction and the Damdami Taksal. A number of resolutions were adopted at the celebrations. One resolution averred that no accord less than Khalistan would be acceptable to the Sikhs. Another resolution said that the AISSF recognised the five-member Panthic Committee and the five High Priests only, and no other leader or organisation. A third resolution said that the

struggle for achievement of Khalistan would continue. A fourth resolution appealed to the Khalistan Commando Force to take suitable action against those police officials who were killing Sikhs in allegedly false encounters. Resolution were passed warning police informers of dire consequences, warning Sikh preachers of violating Sikh principles and openly declaring that Shri Barlana, Shri Balwant Singh and Shri Racchpal Singh would meet the fate of Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

On 24th March, 1987, the SGPC held its budget session in Golden Temple Complex. Resolutions were adopted in the Session taking notice of the campaign launched by pro-Government, anti-Panthic and anti-religious parties against Shri Akal Takht Sahib and describing it as an attempt to undermine Sikh religion. They said that the political aim of the Khalsa Panth was enshrined in the concept of 'Raj Karega Khalsa' which was part of daily Ardas of the Sikhs, justifying oneness of religion and politics, and saying that the entire political power is concentrated in the Akal Takht Sahib and all organisations of Sikh Quom come under its command.

We know, Madam, that all this was done under the directions, rather the dictates of the Panthic Committee. The Panthic Committee is a clear usurper of political authority in Punjab today. It is the Panthic Committee which has set up a parallel Government to which the Governor refers in his letter. The Government's letter is a document which makes painful reading. He says that he had watched everything carefully and waited to see what shape things took finally. He points out that a parallel authority has been set up in Punjab by fundamentalists. He substantiates his charge that some Ministers of the Government were involved. And these are the Ministers who split the Punjab Cabinet, who split the Punjab Government. He documents the campaign of vilification that has been carried on by some Ministers of Punjab against the Director General of Police. May I say, Madam, if there is one man in Punjab today who stands bet-

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

ween a holocaust and peace, if there is one man in Punjab to whom the Sikhs and the Hindus who believe in peace and harmony look up to, it is the Director General, Shri Ribeiro?

Well, in the last two weeks a campaign of vilification was carried on against Shri Ribeiro. Finally, the Governor concludes and I quote:

"It is quite clear that the ruling party and its Government have no political will to combat truly and seriously either the fundamentalist movement or the growing and unabated terrorism and extremism and have become quite incapable of even assuring effectively, far less safeguarding, the basic fundamental rights guaranteed under our Constitution."

Madam, 2000 years ago a famous poet Thiruvalluvar said:

"A king who owns determination to act is said to own everything.

One without this Bill to act possesses nothing that he ought to possess."

The Government of Punjab today and the Chief Minister, Shri Barnala, have lost the will to fight the battle. We do not blame Shri Barnala in that sense. In fact, we are sorry for what has come to pass in the last three months. The Central Government sincerely wished that the Government of Punjab would take firm action in tackling the situation. It was with this objective in view that the Central Government made available every possible assistance to the Central Government. We remained in constant touch with them. However, the situation in Punjab continued to deteriorate.

Madam, I must say that I have every sympathy with Shri Barnala who had shown courage in upholding secular democracy and did not bow to the commands of the priests in the affair of the State. Shri Barnala is a well-intensed person. He perhaps wanted the situation in Punjab to improve. Unfortunately, his closest colleagues in the Cabinet, some of them, let him down and he became different in giving positive direction to

the administration. The people have lost faith in the capability of the State Government to protect their life and property and to bring about conditions in which they should live in harmony. It is this total lack of political will which has compelled the Governor to submit his report to the President and the Government, acting upon his report, has now imposed President's rule in Punjab.

Madam, I do not want to burden my speech with figures, but even according to the figures furnished by the Punjab Government, during the period 1st October, 1985 to April 7, 1987, in 2744 incidents 728 people have lost their lives. A reference was made to a number of laws that were placed at the disposal of the Punjab Government. What is the record? In the period from 1st October, 1985 to 28th February 1987, 2218 cases were registered, 1296 cases were investigated and investigations were completed, but 11 cases ended in acquittal and not one case has ended in conviction. In Punjab not one case has ended in conviction.

Madam, I can do no better than quote the opening words of the famous novel to describe the last four months; "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us." In the last four months we have tried through the Government of Punjab. The Government of Punjab had failed the people of Punjab, has failed the people of India. Today the Government of India assumes this onerous responsibility. We take this responsibility upon us in a spirit of humility, but no trepidation. We take it upon us not quite knowing what shape things will take in the future and what forces will be ranged against us. But we do so with courage. We do so in the fullest confidence that the people of India will support us. Madam, I commend this Resolution to this august House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will now put the Statutory Resolution to vote. The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 11th May, 1987, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Punjab."

The House divided.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

AYES : 82.

NOES : 16.

AYES—82

Advani, Shri Lal K.
Ahluwalia, Shri S. S.
Amarjit Kaur, Shrimati
Ansari, Shri Hayat. Ulla
Ashwani Kumar, Shri
Bagrodia, Shri Santosh
Bansal, Shri Pawan Kumar
Bekal Utsahi, Shri
Bhardwaj, Shri Hansraj
Bhim Raj, Shri
Chatterjee, Prof. (Mrs.) Asima
Desai, Shri Jagesh
Faguni Ram, Dr.
Fotedar, Shri Makhan Lal
Ganeshwar Kusum, Shri
Gupta, Shri Vishwa Bandhu
Hanspal, Shri Harvendra Singh
Hanumanthappa, Shri H.
Heptulla, Dr. (Shrimati) Najma
Jacob, Shri M. M.
Jaswant Singh Shri
Jogi, Shri Ajit P. K.
John, Shri Valampuri
Joshi, Shri Krishna Nand
Joshi, Shrimati Sudha Vijay
Kadharsha, Shri M.
Kalita, Shri Bhubaneswar
Kaushik, Shri M. P.
Khatun, Kumari Sayeeda
Kullur, Shri M. L.
Kushnoor, Shri Veershetty Mogalappa
Mahendra Prasad, Shri
Mahto, Shri Bandhu

Malviya, Shri Radhakishan
Malik, Shri Mukhtiar Singh
Malik, Shri Satya Pal
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram
Masodkar, Shri Bhaskar Annaji
Mehta, Shri Chimanbhai
Mishra, Shri Kailash Pati
Mishra, Shri Mahendra Mohan
Mohapatra, Shri Basudev
Moopanar, Shri G. K.
Naik, Shri G. Swamy
Nalwa, Shri Hari Singh
Natarajan, Shrimati Jayanthi
Pahadia, Shrimati Shanti
Palaniyandi, Shri M.
Pandey, Dr. Ratnakar
Panicker, Shri K. Vasudeva
Patel, Shri Vithalbhai Motiram
Patil, Shri Dinkarrao Govindrao
Rajagopal, Shri M.
Rao, Prof. B. Ramachandra
Rao, Shri R. Sambasiva
Ray, Shri Deba Prasad
Rayka, Shri Sagar
Reddy, Shri T. Chandrasekhar
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Sahu, Shri Rajni Ranjan
Sahu, Shri Santosh Kumar
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Sharma, Shri Chandan
Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Shiv Shanker, Shri P.
Shukla, Shri Keshavprasad
Singh, Shri Bir Bhadra Pratap
Singh, Thakur Kamakhya Prasad
Singh, Shrimati Pratibha
Singh, Dr. Rudra Pratap
Singh, Shri Vishvijit Prithvijit
Sukul, Shri P. N.
Surender Singh, Shri
Thakur, Jagatpal Singh
Thakur, Shri Rameshwar
Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
Tripathi Shri Chandrika Prasad
Vaduthala, Shri T. K. C.
Valiullah, Shri Raoof
Verma, Shri Kapil
Verma, Shrimati Veena

Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra

Noes 16

Bhattacharjee, Shri Nepaldev

Chatterjee, Shri Nirmal

Chowdhury, Shrimati Renuka

Ghosh, Shri Dipen

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.

Kar, Shri Narayan

Malaviya, Shri Satya Prakash

Mukherjee, Shri Samar

Poddar, Dr. R. K.

Quasem, Shri Mostafa Bin

Radhakrishna, Shri Puttapaga

Reddy, Shri B. Satnarayan

Reddy, Dr. G. Vijaya Mohan

Sen, Shri Sukomal

Singh, Shri Ram Awadhesh

Verma, Shri Virendra

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, if the House permits, we can go ahead with the Prevention of Corruption Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. In the next session.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Jacob did have a talk with us and unanimously we said that we will have it in the next session.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It was already sorted out.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Postpone the prevention of corruption.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Actually, on this Prevention of Corruption Bill we had a discussion on one day and the Bill is half way through. If the Members cooperate, we can conclude that Bill today.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: One more opportunity.

SHRI P. N. SUKUL: You don't want to stop corruption? ... (Interruption)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Let the incidence of corruption in high places increase in the meantime ... (Interruption)... We can discuss it later on.

VALEDICTORY REMARKS ON THE CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, today, this Session of Rajya Sabha, which in common parlance, is called the second part of the Budget Session of Parliament, is coming to a close. Before, I adjourn the House *sine die*, I would like to thank all Members on behalf of the Vice-Chairman and on my personal behalf for the kind co-operation extended by them in conducting the proceedings of the House.

This Session of the House began on a stormy note, and the minds of the Members were very much exercised over several controversial issues, such as Fairfax, commission agents in Defence deals and purchase of Bofors guns from Sweden. Thereafter, Members got down to normal business of the House, and we discussed, as per our practice, the working of the Ministries of External Affairs, Human Resource Development and Defence. The Members have had opportunity to draw the attention of the Government to several difficulties and grievances of the general public through 104 special mentions. Through Call Attentions, three matters of urgent public importance, namely, the Fairfax issue, the working of the Government-owned media and the situation in Sri Lanka, were discussed. Apart from this the House devoted time to Government Legislative Business by passing 13 Bills. These include the Appropriation and the Finance Bills giving effect to the Budget proposals of the Government and last, but not the least, the Constitution (Amendment) Bill and the Goa Bill granting Goa the full Statehood today. Generally, this part of the Budget Session lasts for three