

MOTION RE. WHITE PAPER ON PUNJAB AGITATION—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now further discussion on the Motion regarding White Paper on Punjab. One thing I will like to say. All had agreed that today we would dispense with lunch and conclude the debate, say, by 2 o'clock and the Home Minister may be called upon to reply at about 1.30, shall we say?

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE): Between 1.15 and 1.30.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right between 1.15 and 1.30. So I will request the hon. Member to be very brief and to take, say, ten minutes each and not more than that. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. Not here. Shri H. S. Hanspal.

श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल (पंजाब) :
उपसभापति महोदय, व्हाइट पेपर के डिस्कशन के दौरान कल बहुत कुछ कहा सुना गया। मैं इसके बारे में इतना कुछ कहना चाहूंगा कि that it is a very useful, important and complete document.

यहां कल यह कहा गया, आडवानी जी ने खाम तौर से कहा कि इस डाक्यूमेंट में बहुत कमियां हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतनी बात कहूंगा कि यह व्हाइट पेपर 170 पेजेज का डाक्यूमेंट है, जिसके साथ कुछ फोटोग्राफ भी हैं।

अगर इस डाक्यूमेंट को 1700 पेज का भी कर दिया जाता तब भी उसमें कमियां बताई जातीं। इसलिये जैसा कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी कहा, फॉक्ट्स इसमें मेंशन किये गये हैं। जहां तक मैंने इसमें देखा, बहुत ही यूजफूल और कंसी-ल्विडेड मैटर इसमें अवैलेबल है। नये फॉक्ट्स यह रिवील करता है। 9 सीक्रेट मोर्टिंग्स हुईं जिनका इसमें उल्लेख है। इसके अलावा मेरी जानकारी के अनुसार और मोर्टिंग हुईं चाहे वह आफिशियल मोर्टिंग नहीं थीं जिनका इसमें

जिक्र नहीं किया गया या किया जा सकता है। अगर यह कहा जाये कि सैकड़ों की तादाद में मोर्टिंग हुईं, मुझे भी कई मोर्टिंगों में बैठने का मौका मिलता, लेकिन उनकी प्राबल्य यह है कि वह किसी एक बात पर स्थिर नहीं रह पाते। इसलिये वह मोर्टिंग बार-बार होने के बावजूद भी फेल हो गयी। मैं व्हाइट पेपर में से ही एक चीज कोट कर रहा हूं। इसमें लिखा है :—

"The Akali Dal leadership allowed the initiative and control over the agitation to pass out of their hands."

मैं इस बात से पूरी तरह से सहमत नहीं हूं कि अकाली दल ने अलाऊ किया तो लीडरशिप उनके हाथ से चली जाती। शायद इसका मतलब यह है कि मोडरेट के हाथ से निकलकर एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट्स के हाथ में चली गयी। मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि उन्होंने अलाऊ नहीं किया, बल्कि एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट्स ने उनके हाथों से छीन ली, जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि ये सब बातें हुईं। व्हाइट पेपर के पेज 2 के ऊपर लिखा हुआ है :—

"The tactics employed by the secessionist and terrorist groups were systematic campaign to create bitterness and hatred between Sikhs and Hindus;...use of terrorism against specific targets in the police and the administration of Punjab; preparation of 'hit lists' of those who disagreed and organising their murders....All this they did by lodging themselves within the holy precincts of the Golden Temple and other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab."

सबसे अनफॉर्च्युनेट बात यह हुई कि एजिटेशन को एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट्स ने अपने हाथ में ले लिया।

अब मैं सिख धर्म के बारे में थोड़ी सी चर्चा जरूर करना चाहूंगा। गुरुद्वारा-

[श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल]

मन्दिर, मसजिद, गिरजाघर, ये सब धर्म-स्थान हैं। इसका मतलब यह है कि इन जगहों में जाकर धार्मिक कार्यवाहियां, धरम-करम का नियम हो। लेकिन जैसा मैंने अभी पढ़ा, यह हिट लिस्ट गोल्डन टेम्पल में बनी। तो मुझे यह कहने में अघ हिचकिचाहट नहीं कि वहां धर्म के अलावा कोई दूसरी चीज चलती थी और दूसरी चीज थी सियासत, राजनीति या पोलिटिक्स, कह लीजिए। सिख धर्म में राजनीति के लिए कोई मनसूता नहीं है कि कोई राजनीतिक नेता नहीं बन सकता, लेकिन इस बात का ख्याल गुरुनानक देव के समय से आज तक रखा गया है कि सियासत धर्म के ऊपर हावी न हो। धर्म ऊपर रहे, सियासत नीचे रहे। लेकिन जब-जब भी इस किस्म के इन्सी-डेन्ट्स हुए हैं, तो सियासत ऊपर आ गई या धर्म नीचे चला गया या यों कह लीजिए कि गुरुद्वारे में से धर्म को निकाल कर बाहर फेंक दिया गया। धर्म कर्म की कोई बात वहां नहीं होता। गोल्डन टेम्पल को मैं खासतौर से कोट कर सकता हूं कि वहां पर कोई भी आदमी जो एस० जी० पी० सी० के तहत महेरेदार खड़ा रहता था, अभी भी खड़ा रहता है, वैपन्स तो दूर की बात है, गांव से दूर-दूर से दर्शन के लिये जो लोग आते थे, अगर उनके हाथ में लाठी भी होती थी, डंडा भी होता था तो वह बाहर रखवा लिया जाता था। अब वहां क्या पोजिशन है इस डिस्ट्रिक्ट में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता। आप सब भली प्रकार इस बात को जानते हैं। लेकिन जैसा मैं कह रहा था कि वहां धर्म को बाहर निकाल दिया और दूसरी चीजें वहां प्रमुख हो गईं। इसका नतीजा जो हुआ वह हम आज मूगूत रहे हैं। सिख धर्म में होली ग्रंथ

जिसको गुरुबानी भी कहते हैं, गुरु ग्रंथ साहब भी कहते हैं, कोई भी गुरुनानक नाम लेना इस संसार में इस वक्त है, चाहे वह हिन्दू हो, चाहे सिख हो या किसी और म्यूनिटी का हो, वह गुरुनानक को अपना गुरु मानता है और गुरुनानक के आगे शीश नवाता है, वह उस होली ग्रंथ को सबसे सर्वोच्च मानता है, उसके आगे अपना सिर नवाता है। उसमें लिखी हुई हर बात को वह मानता है। अब हुआ क्या कि उसमें लिखा हुआ है कि बोलिये सब धर्म, झूठ न बोलिये। यह गुरुबानी है कि सच बोलना धर्म है, झूठ न बोला जाए। लेकिन जब सियासत ऊपर आ जाती है तो फिर क्या होता है वह हम सब जानते हैं। सियासत में हमें झूठ और सच का ध्यान रखने की जरूरत नहीं होती। फिर इसमें लिखा है: "कबीर मबते हम बुरे हम तज भलो सब कोये। सच बोलि हम सब कोई।" क्या हम सियासत में ऐसा हो कहते हैं। क्या यह ओपोजिशन वाले हमारे ऊपर इस किस्म की बातें नहीं करते? इसके उलट क्या हमारी तरफ से नहीं कहा जाता? मैं इससे अपने आपको अलग नहीं करता। लेकिन यह धर्म की बातें नहीं हैं। यह भी लिखा है "मंदा किसे न आखिये।" मंझो साहब एक जगह हैं-विद-इन द गोल्डन टेम्पल, कम्प्लेक्स की बात नहीं है। गोल्डन टेम्पल के अंदर पालिटिक्स की बातें होती थी। बहुत लम्बो-चोड़ी बातें होती थी।

SHRI DARBARA SINGH (Punjab):
It is outside the Parikarma. It is not a part of the Golden Temple.

श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : जो कम्प्लेक्स है वह तो म्यूनिसिपैलिटी की रोड है। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि मंझो साहब से रोज बिला नागा बगैर किसी रुकावट के इस किस्म की बातें होती थी। भारी पालिटिक्स की बातें वहां होती थीं।

यहां पवित्रता भंग करने की बात तो बहुत दूर की है। हर किसी को बातें, हिट लिस्ट की बात यहां पर होती थी। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि सिख धर्म में जब छोटी-छोटी इस किस्म की कमियां आईं उसका हम को नुकसान हुआ। आज सबसे बड़ा नुकसान यह है, जो सिख पंजाब में है उनका तो नुकसान है ही लेकिन जो पंजाब में बाहर रहते हैं उनको भी शक की निगाह से देखा जाता है। मुझे पुरानी बात याद आ रही है। अंग्रेजी राज की बात याद आ रही है। अन्दर मीटिंग हो रही थी जिसमें 60-70 लोग मीटिंग में हिस्सा ले रहे थे। उनको यह मालूम हुआ कि अगर हम बाहर नहीं गये तो उस वक़्त अंग्रेजी राज के लोग और उनकी पुलिस अंदर आ जायेगी और हम को पकड़ कर ले जायेगी। उन लोगों ने वहां से बाहर निकल कर अपने आपको पेश कर दिया। उन्होंने कहा मैं हाज़िर हूँ, आपको अंदर जाने की ज़रूरत नहीं है। जब कि आज की हालत बिल्कुल उलटो है। उन्हा किस तरह से हुआ कि इन लोगों को उन्होंने बार-बार कहा कि आप लोग बाहर आ जाइये लेकिन वह बाहर नहीं आए। बाद में उनको यह एक्शन लेना पड़ा। इसके अलावा लीडरशिप की कमी अकालियों में खासतौर पर रही। सबसे अनफावुनेट बात यह है कि इसमें बदनामी सिखों की होती है। यह कहा जाता है और इस बात को बार-बार कहा जाता है कि हमारे साथ बात नहीं की गई या हमारी बात नहीं मानी गई। लीडरशिप वहां पर इस किस्म की थी, अगर यह कह दिया जाये कि तीन ही आदमी इस किस्म के थे जो आपस में फैसला करने थे तो यह गलत नहीं होगा। अगर ये लोग सही रास्ते पर चलते तो आज जो वहां पर हालत हुई है वह हालत न होती। ये तीन थे—संत लोंगोवाल, तोहड़ा साहब और भिन्डगंवाला। ये लोग

आपस में सही फैसला करते तो यह हालत नहीं होती। एक चीज़ यहां पर बार-बार कोट की जाती है, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह जी की बात कही जाती है—

चूं कार अज हता होलते दर गुजशन
हमम अग्न बुरदन व शमशोर दस्त।।

सरदार रण सिंह जी ने भी इन चीज़ की यहां पर कोट किया था। जफरनामा गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह जी ने औरंगज़ेब को लिखा था। उसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि जुल्मों की हद हो गई है, इसलिए अब तलवार उठानी पड़ेगी। जुल्मों की अगर हद हो जाये तो तलवार उठाने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है। आज इनमें गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह कौन है, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि हम लोग तो उनके, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह जी के पैरों जैस भी नहीं है। अगर लीडरशिप एक आदमी के हाथ में होती तो ऐसी हालत पैदा नहीं होती जो आज हमारे सामने है। अगर कोई फैसला संत लोंगोवाल करते हैं तो उसको भिन्डगंवाले नहीं मानते थे। जैसा पहले कोट किया गया है—

They had to decide certain things while guns were at their back.

ऐसी हालत में सिख धर्म की बदनामी होती है, सिखों की बदनामी होती है। इस सब की जिम्मेवारी सिखों के लीडरशिप पर आती है। एक बात इस बारे में कहना चाहूंगा। गुरु नानक जी ने गुरुवाणों में और गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह जी ने भी सिखों को यह हिदायत दी है कि सारा का सारा जगत, सारे इंसान सब एक ही खुदा के बन्दे हैं —

[श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल]

अबल अल्ला नूर उपाया कुदरत के सब
बन्दे,

एक नूर ने सब जग उपजया
कौन भले को मन्दे ।

दशम ग्रन्थ मे गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी
ने कहा है कि चाहे कोई सूफी हो,
चाहे कोई इमाम हो, कोई हिन्दू हो, कोई
तुर्क हो, ये सब एक ही इंसान हैं ।

कोऊ भइयो मुन्डीया सयासी कोऊ
जोगो भइयो ।

कोऊ ब्रह्मचारी कोई जतीअन मानबो ।
हिन्दू तुर्क कोऊ राफत्री इमाम साफी,
मानस की जात सब एके पहचानबो ।

अन्त में एक बात कहकर मैं अपनी
बात खतम करता हूँ । आज सबसे ज्यादा
जरूरत इस बात की है कि जैसा पी० एम०
ने अपने रेडियो भाषण के लास्ट में कहा
कि आज बून्डस को हील करने की
जरूरत है । मैं उनको कोट करता
हूँ —

"Let us join together to heal the
wounds. The best memorial to those
who have lost their lives is to res-
tore normalcy and harmony in the
Punjab which they loved and serv-
ed. To all sections of Punjabies I
appeal don't shed blood, shed hat-
red."

आज सबसे बड़ी जिम्मेदारी सिखों
पर आती है । गुरुवाणी में कहा गया है कि
एक पिता एकस के हम बारिक । हमारा
एक पिता है और हम सब उनके बच्चे
हैं । चाहे कोई हिन्दू हो, चाहे मुसलमान
चाहे ईसाई हो, चाहे पारसी हो, सब एक
ही पिता की संतान हैं । आज सबसे ज्यादा
जरूरत इस बात की है कि जो गलती
हो चुकी है उसको न दोहराया जाये और
जल्दी से जल्दी बून्डस को हील होकर
सब भाईचारे से रह सके, इसके लिए
कोशिश की जाये । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA

(Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chair-
man, Sir, let me at the outset express
my utter disappointment at the trend
of discussion in this House since yes-
terday. None of us, either the Gov-
ernment or the Akalis or the rest of
the Opposition, has come out with any
honour or with any flying colours in
this sordid drama. Every one of us
has proved unequal to the task and
as an Indian and as a nationalist, I feel
ashamed and I hang my head in
shame at what has happened in Pun-
jab recently, particularly in June.
There is no point in the Opposition
showing any glee at the discomfiture
of the Government or in the Govern-
ment claiming any credit for the won-
derful success of the Blue Star opera-
tion because I must say that in prais-
ing the operations or in claiming cred-
it for the success, all of us, whether
it is the Government or it is the rest
of us are admitting the failure of the
political leadership to solve a political
problem which has been turned into
a law and order problem. And ulti-
mately, for the first time in India's
history, the army had to be sent to a
religious institution. Whatever may
be the reasons to the justification for
the same, it is a shameful thing and
none of us should be happy over such
a development. I, therefore, expected
the Government to be more factual,
to be more comprehensive in present-
ing this White Paper. But, unfortu-
nately, the Government has tried to
justify its action, to throw the blame
on the Akali Dal squarely and to
escape responsibility for its actions
and inaction during the last two or
three years. This White Paper is an
attempt to cover up the Government's
failure in many respects. It is an in-
complete document as we have been
repeatedly saying. It is only a narra-
tion of events but it conceals many
points. It leaves many questions un-
answered. I would like to point out
a few things that the White Paper has
failed to explain. One is about the
Gurmat training camps for terrorists
which the Government and other

leaders have been talking about very frequently. And they have accused the previous Government of Dr. Farooq Abdullah of encouraging these camps in Jammu and Kashmir. Similarly there were accusations that similar camps were held in Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh also. I do not know why the Government could not controly these camps or stop these activities when they had advance information about these camps.

Similarly, on pages 2, 3 and 57 of the White Paper, the Government has repeatedly referred to the involvement of some foreign powers and to covert and overt support from external sources. And the Prime Minister also mentioned yesterday in her speech that some foreign powers are involved in this. I do not know why the Government was reticent in mentioning these foreign powers which are behind these activities. Similarly, there was no explanation as to why the talks suddenly broke down between the Akali Dal and the Government on November 17, 1982 when both sides had come to a settlement and a draft agreement had almost been reached. In fact, there is a feeling in some quarters that the Government had gone back on this agreement because they did not want to give credit to the Akali Dal for the settlement. That point also remains unanswered.

Similarly, there is no explanation for the sudden resignation of the previous Governor, Mr. Pande and the Director-General of Police, Mr. Bhinder. In fact, it shows the admission on the part of the Government that these two functionaries had failed in their duty in controlling the situation. That should have been mentioned expressly.

Similarly there is only a casual mention of the failure of intelligence at the ground level on pages 56 and 57. It is not a small omission or a small failure on the part of the intelligence network because they themselves admit that the "Kar Seva" trucks were not checked before. Who prevented

them from checking them, because the SGPC did not come into the picture at that time? When these trucks came from outside, the police should have checked these trucks. In fact, the Government has admitted in the White Paper that a complete factory was operating in the Golden Temple complex for the manufacture of hand-grenades.

And if such a thing was operating in the Golden Temple Complex why the police could not prevent its establishment or its operation, we do not know. Similarly, there is no explanation, as our friends pointed out yesterday, why Sant Bhindranwale was let off after his arrest on September 20, 1981 when he was arrested in connection with the murder of Lala Jagat Narain. Similarly, there is no mention of the origin of the India-made weapons in the Temple, because it is stated that self-loading rifles of 7.62 mm calibre and 41 light machine guns and semi-medium machine guns were also found. All of them are used by the Indian Army in its Infantry Division. How they found their way into the Golden Temple, the Government has failed to explain in the White Paper. These are some of the prominent omissions in the White Paper. It shows that the Government has tried to escape responsibility for its inaction and inefficiency and it has tried to throw the full responsibility on the Akali Dal and other extremists for the holocaust which happened in Punjab.

All said and done, June 5 will certainly remain a sad day in our history, as I pointed out, whatever may be the justification. To quell 12000 or so extremists, if 70,000-strong army had to be sent to Punjab or into the Golden Temple, it does not show the maturity of our political leadership or the statesmanship which we displayed earlier. Today we find the absence of a leader like Sardar Patel who solved the States' problem in such a peaceful manner. We today find the absence of Jawaharlal Nehru who prevented a holocaust in several parts of the country and the world

[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

through his statesmanship and leadership. Such a leadership is lacking today. The Government has admitted by sending the army into Punjab that it lacks political leadership and statesmanship. Some of the friends have pointed out that it was unavoidable. I do not know whether it was unavoidable or avoidable. One thing we find is that the Government had not given advance notice of its severe action either to the extremists or to any of the Sikh leaders. I feel that had the Government taken some of the independent Sikh leaders into confidence and told them that this was the decision we have taken and the Government was going to take this action, and if they had intervened and made at least a last minute effort with the extremists, probably—I do not know—some results could have come and extremists could have been persuaded to come out of the Golden Temple. But that effort also was not made.

And I find that the Prime Minister herself admitted yesterday that it was a very painful decision. I do not mince words in saying that it does not require the calibre of or leaders-like Mrs. Indira Gandhi, noted throughout the world as a wise statesman, to send the army. Anyone of us could have done that, given the authority. But that does not give us any scope to take credit for such action. Similarly, I also feel that the Akali Dal is equally, if not more, responsible for this development in Punjab because they changed their stand very often. They prevented the agreement being signed at the last minute and they allowed misuse of the Golden Temple and the gurdwaras for accumulation of arms. They sheltered murderers and criminals and allowed them to make detailed preparation for subversion and insurgency. Bhindranwale was allowed to shift his headquarters from Chowk Mehta to Guru Nanak Niwas and then to Akal Takht itself. Akali Dal did not condemn the murders and violence perpetrated by the ex-

tremists and it appears that Akali Dal had lost control of the situation and surrendered to the extremists. Therefore, I feel that the Punjab crisis shows in unmistakable terms the failure of all of us, on both sides of the House, and it is unfortunate that an entire community has been alienated in the process. Nearly 15 million people today feel aggrieved over the action taken. They admit—some of them may not be talking openly but wherever we spoke to any Sikh—we found that fire is burning in his heart and he is very much aggrieved over the Government's action and this feeling of the Sikhs is aggravated more by this Kar Seva which has been forced in the Golden Temple.

I do not think that the Government should have rushed there. It could have waited for a few days more because this is now being treated as an attempt to drive a wedge between the Sikhs themselves. I do not know if they will destroy whatever is being built today. Then that will be another unfortunate development. I also feel that the Army should be withdrawn from the Golden Temple complex and the temple should be handed over to the SGPC with some conditions that they should not allow any such activities in future. The Akali leaders should be released forthwith and negotiations should be resumed.

Sir, it is a very serious matter. I, therefore, plead that the Government should not stand on false prestige. They should call the Akali leaders and also some independent Sikh leaders for fresh negotiations and a settlement should be arrived at as quickly as possible.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I speak with my eye on the clock and will be grateful if you keep your hand off the bell. I promise that I will not take more time scheduled for my party.

We have had six hours of debate during which we heard learned discourses on Punjab politics and Akali

factionalism and there has also been much recrimination between parties, each trying to blame the other. I think most people will agree that in the entire debate there has been total lack of a sense of gravity of the situation which is facing our country today. We are virtually on the brink of an abyss. There has been total absence of any realisation that the country is practically breaking up. And there has been total absence of any viable suggestion on what we are to do in this situation.

I hope the Members will bear with me when I speak because I may have some very unpalatable truths to tell. I am aware of the fact that I am a nominated Member who, as things go in this House, is the lowest of the lower caste. But since I relinquished my Padam Bhushan in a state of emotion—I admit it because I felt deeply hurt—I was suddenly pichforked into the eye of the storm and whether I liked it or not, without my seeking or relishing it, I found myself made into a kind of spokesman for the Sikhs. It is very ironical that I, though an agnostic, should have been suddenly become relevant to the Sikh community and my three Sikh colleagues on the other side who claim themselves to be pucca Sikhs should have become totally irrelevant when it comes to Sikh public opinion. Whether you like it or not, I now echo the sentiments of fourteen million people. So, take note of what I have to say.

My heart is very full. I shall try to be as unemotional as I can. I will say very little about the action that the Army has taken except that I maintain this was a tragic error of judgement, a grievous mistake and a gross miscalculation which will cover many black pages in the history of India, the history of Punjab and the history of the Sikhs. I will say more on what not to do to retrieve the situation. I think the best way of seeing this problem is to see back-

wards, to see what the situation is today and take it back to the army action and decide whether the action that the Government took was justified or not.

The situation today is this that the religious susceptibility of every single Sikh has been deeply wounded. Ninety-nine per cent of these Sikhs had nothing whatsoever to do either with Bhindranwale or with Akalis, or with the Government or with politics of any kind. That should be borne in mind. What this action has done is to humiliate the pride of a very proud people and you know that a proud people do not forget, nor forget very easily. It is a wounded community in a vengeful mood. We have to do something to prevent it from exploding. What is more, it has widened the gulf between the Hindus and the Sikhs. The wedge was undoubtedly driven in by the Akalis, it was widened by this evil man, Bhindranwale. This army action has made it so wide as to make it appear to be unbridgeable. It is unfortunate that the Sikhs who prided themselves as the first class citizens of this country are now regarded as something worse than third class citizens. As my friend, Shri Mohunta, pointed out the other day, the discrimination has not stopped. You have to go to any airport or travel by road or rail in Northern India to see how a Sikh is treated. You will know what the discrimination is. You are constantly questioned. Even at the Srinagar airport this morning only the Sikh passengers were photographed when they were coming. Search is carried out and their cars are checked at the entry points. This discrimination is undoubtedly restricted to the bearded Sikh. Is it really not wrong of them now to ask, "do Indians still regard us as fellow Indians?" In this situation, I have only two questions to ask:

Could any action that alienated 14 million citizens of this country, who

(Shri Khushwant Singh)

are the backbone of its defence services, who provide more than half of the food for this country and who live on the most sensitive borders that divide us from Pakistan be justify it?

Is it really true, as the White Paper maintains, that there was no other alternative? And as the Government and some Members of the Opposition have also said *ad nauseam* that there was no other way? My answer to both these questions, is an absolute "No". I will try to spell out my views with reference to what the White Paper says. It says that two years of negotiations with the Akalis were negated by their intransigence. They kept on shifting their stand, they kept on adding to their demands and they kept on resiling from their demands under pressure of extremists. The accusation was repeated yesterday by the Prime Minister herself. Is it true that the Government did not shift from its stand, did not change its stance did not resile from its stand? If you want any evidence of it, read the record of my former colleague, Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet's speeches here in the discussions. He mentioned many instances when a settlement had almost been arrived at and it was the Government that changed its mind. Everytime the talks broke down, the one statement that the Prime Minister made in reply to that was that some demands of the Akalis had been granted, and with regard to those that affected the neighbouring States, the neighbouring States had to be consulted. For two years we have been told that the neighbouring States have to be consulted. What happened in those consultations? Does it take that long to contact them in Chandigarh or Simla to find out what their reactions were? The White Paper also maintains that it was the Akali agitation which led to terrorism in the country. The Prime Minister herself repeated, "I know from experience that these civil disobedience movements often

degenerate into some kind of a violence." It so happens that this is chronologically inaccurate. Terrorism preceded the Akali morcha. You may recall that first violence took place between Bhindranwale and the Nirankaris as early as April 1978. Thereafter, there were fake encounters between the police under Sardar Darbara Singh who was the Chief Minister of Punjab and so called extremists which gave further filip to those terrorist activities. The murders of the Nirankari Baba and Lala Jagat Narain took place before the morcha was launched. So, this inference that the pacifist movement led to terrorism is historically and chronologically inaccurate. It has been repeated from both sides of the House that the Government had no choice but to move the army into the Golden Temple. I had sought assurances and been given the assurance—I from here and the then Home Minister from there—that the army would not be moved in because the results could be horrendous. Did the Government ever consider two alternative possibilities? No. 1, a commando action by people in plain clothes who would have gone and tried to overpower Bhindranwale and his men? There would have been a certain amount of loss of life; I have no doubt. But hundreds of innocent lives, including those of women and children, would have been spared. Did you ever consider the possibility of putting a cordon round the Golden Temple and the city of Amritsar, occupying the Guru ka Langar, cutting off food and rations and starving those people to come out? The results would have been quite different. No. The White Paper does not mention these alternatives. All we know is that to face about 300 to 500 armed desperados—and no more—you sent in six divisions led by three full Generals, tanks, armed carriers, mountain guns and all the weapons at your command to blast these people out, and instead of taking two hours that you anticipated it took you more than two days to do it.

Mr. Home Minister—new Home Minister—and Mr. Deputy Chairman, I visited Amritsar a month after the action took place. I interviewed many people who were there, who were eye witnesses to the sad episode. Let me tell you that the figure of the death toll is considerably higher than what the White Paper mentions. I know the Akalis are producing their own White Paper. Perhaps it will be vastly exaggerated. But it is quite evident that the death toll was considerably higher than what you are admitting. And women and children and innocent pilgrims were also there. Even more, the damage to property is also extensive. However much you try to patch up it will not be patched up. The Akal Takht is in total shambles, including all the relics, that were inside. You have maintained that no damage was done to Harmandir. But I have seen it with my own eyes. There are over 200 fresh bullet marks in Harmandir.... (Interruptions) You can still see this if you go there. (Interruptions) Please bear with me. You can contradict me (Interruptions) One Amrik Singh was inside.... (Interruptions).

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): What do you mean by fresh bullet marks? Did you see?

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: Yes. There have been earlier actions and the bullet marks were seen by those people at that time. They are new—through windows, coming from one side, going to the other. The archives of the Golden Temple along side the Prakrma, which housed over 1000 hand-written manuscript copies of the Granth, the Hukmnamas (Ordinances) bearing Gurus' signatures, have gone up in flames. And this was not during the action; it was after the action that this thing took place. (Interruptions).

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra): The archives were used as a place of defence by the extremists. They had put in gun

positions. They were using all the weapons. As a result, it was destroyed. (Interruptions)

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: He has a great advantage. He has not been there. He is only using the White Paper.

Now, I come to a very tricky thing.... (Interruptions).

SHRI LAXMI NARAIN (Delhi): The Rashtrapati also visited the place. He has not seen anything what he is telling now.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish these Members would hold their patience. I am now treading on a very sensitive ground but I think it should be recorded. And that is the role of the Army. We have treated the Army as a sacred cow. What has been done in Amritsar should go on record. I first draw your attention to this report in the Times of London dated 14th June based on Associated Press account which mentions that a number of Sikhs who were taken prisoner with their hands tied behind and shot in the head in cold blood. I have not heard a single word of... (Interruptions) Let the Government contradict it. This is the most serious allegation made. There are other equally painful things from people living in Amritsar.... (Interruptions).

श्रीमती मोनिका दास (कर्णाटक) : पूरा देश जला दिया आपने और अब बात कर रहे हैं.... बिल्कुल जला दिया आप लोगों ने अब यह बात कर रहे हैं... (व्यवधान) ... आप लोग पहले चलिए पार्टी को । देश के लिए कुछ नहीं सोचा आपने (व्यवधान)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: On a point of order...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I am on a point of order (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish his speech. Please sit down.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Please hear me. I am on a point of order. There is a procedural point. Mr. Khushwant Singh is speaking as an honourable Member of this House. The Member there cannot say *इस नीकरी दिया है*

Simply because he is a nominated Member, it does not mean that he is sold out. It is derogatory to the prestige of the House and the honourable Member. You must please expunge it from the record. He cannot cast aspersions on the Member. You have to expunge....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: But you please expunge it because it is a reflection on the honourable Members of this House. He cannot say that he is sold out... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How can I hear anything when so many Members speak at a time? (Several interruptions) I request honourable Members to please cooperate with the chair. Please sit down. Let him complete his speech.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: But you must expunge his observation from the record. You cannot allow an aspersion against a Member to go on record. That has to be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am trying to control the House. If all the Members stand up and start shouting, how can I hear anything?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You should have objected to that remark. It is an aspersion on the honourable Member. *हम नौ रो दिया है* What does it mean? (Interruptions).

SHRI HANSRAJ BHARDWAJ (Madhya Pradesh): I know; I am responsible for it. I maintain it.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You cannot shout him down

when he is telling the facts. The hon. Minister will reply and not you. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your seats. (Interruptions). These shoutings do not go on record (Interruptions) Please take your seats. Yes, Mr. Khushwant Singh.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I have made a reference to the role of the Army. I would also like and make a request to the new Home Minister to look into the charges that are now being levelled by the SGPC or whatever remains of it and the Akali Dal of the extensive looting that has been done in the neighbouring places.

Finally, we have been told how well the Army behaved. But it is with my own eyes on a wall along side the Akal Takht I saw a notice saying, "No smoking, no drinking allowed here." You can come to your own conclusions. These are two heinous offences in any place of worship to the Sikhs. Obviously, the troops have been doing that there and the notice was not up for them and was not taken off by the time I spotted it.

Now, I have said enough of the damage done. I think, it is far more important to turn to what possible can be the healing touch. We have been told what a healing touch should be....

कुमारी सरोज खापड़े (महाराष्ट्र) : मुझे इसके बारे में कुछ कहना है.. (व्यवधान) मुझे कहने से आप रोक नहीं सकते । खुशवंत सिंह ने जो बात कही है उसी बात को लेकर मैं कहना चाहती हूं । मैं गोलडेन टेम्पल गई हूं ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति : जब आप बोले तब अपनी बात कहिए । (व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़े : अन्दर दर्शन के लिए जो लोग जाते हैं ... (व्यवधान)

आर्मी के नाम से इस तरह के एलीगेशन लगा कर बदनाम करने का कारण क्या है?

श्री उरसभाषति : उनका आरोप है, सुन लीजिए ।

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: Let me talk now of your concept of the healing touch. The "place of honour"—and I put the words in inverted commas—goes to the Government—controlled media and the press subservient to the Government. I just give you a few instances where the same person holds the gun in one hand and the microphone in the other—total monopoly of the microphone this is the kind of "news" we can expect. We were told first that no woman had been killed. Then we were told, 13 women had been killed. Then we were told that it was one of Bhindranwale's grenades that killed the 13 women. We were told by the press, "from reliable sources," page 1, column 1, that Bindranwale has been killed by his own colleagues. On the third day it was said, Bhindranwale died in his own hand—on page 5, and finally it was said, no, he died fighting. We had the same kind of story about the discovery of heroin, of loose women—all taken up by this subservient press, and then they suddenly vanished or contradictions were published on page 3, bottom of column 8. This is the result of censorship. And this is not the healing touch.

I give you one instance of a fraud committed on the Sikh people. We are told that Guru bani Kirtan has been resumed from the Golden Temple early morning. I am an early riser and switch on my radio at 4-30 A.M. Mr. Home Minister, take it from me, Kirtan is not from the Golden Temple; they are the tapes from Jullundur station. I may tell you

why. Morning service consists of Asa Di Var, within which Ragis put in Shabads of their choice. These Ragis are clever people. They put in Shabads which have double meaning, talking about the wickedness of rulers. Obviously they were found unpalatable, because the Sikhs get different message from Asa Di Var. But for the last 4 days, including this morning, Ardas which comes at the end of the service, came in the middle because the poor man handling the tape did not know which comes first and which in the middle. So, we had a very charming situation of the alleged Bani coming from Harmandir Sahib, with Ardas coming in the middle. Please look into it. I will give you the dates also on which it has been going on; it was certainly this morning as well. Another healing touch.

Another example now. We know of the wide scale desertions of Sikh troops at different points. Why did they take place? Because of censorship, the poor fellows did not know what was going on. If you know the custom of army—some of my retired friends would know—it is that every Sikh soldier is first made to take an oath on the Granth about being true to his oath sticking to it and fighting for the honour of his country. Every-time Sikh soldiers go into battle, a Granthi goes with them with Granth Sahib carried on his head. Now, he was told, by gossip or rumour, that one of the Granth Sahib itself has been hit and the Golden Temple enshrining the Granth has been burnt. What are his reactions? It is one of anger, frustration. As a leaderless man, he walks out and says: I am going to Golden Temple to defend it myself. Now, we are told by a senior Army officer that the most condign punishment will be meted out to those people. It is upto you to give them condign punishment and see the result of that healing touch.

[Shri Khushwant Singh]

Now, [come to Kar Seva. It is quite obvious, you failed totally to get anyone with any credibility to take on this function and you hit up on this, if I cannot choose any kinder words... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not go on record. You need not name... (Interruptions).

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: All right; cancel those words. (Interruptions).

1 P.M.

(Interruptions).

AN. HON. MEMBER: He has withdrawn the word.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: Now, let us forget it. I am concluding, if they allow me to conclude.

SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANS-PAL: Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I have not finished. If they keep on interrupting... (Interruptions)

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर है। इन्होंने शुरू में यह कहा, सरदार खुशवंत सिंह जी ने, कि मैं सिखों के नुमाइंदे की शक्ल में यहां बोल रहा हूं। पहले तो यह है कि इनको सिखों का नुमाइंदा बनाया ?

श्री उपसभापति : यह बात छोड़िये।

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल : लाखों लोग इस किस्म के हैं। ये सिख नुमाइंदे हो सकते हैं अकाली दल के। एक सन्त के लिए जो इन्होंने बात कह दी ...

श्री उपसभापति : यह प्वाइंट आफ़

आर्डर नहीं है। This will not go on record. Mr. Khushwant Singh, please conclude.

*Not recorded.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I think, it is quite evident to everybody in this country that whatever this gentleman, let me call him gentleman, Baba Santa Singh, is doing, is against the wishes of the community. The community is not going to honour what he is doing. It will further exacerbate the feelings of the community. It is also evident now that despite what has happened, despite what you have done, you have not broken the back of terrorism. Terrorism continues. There is hijacking, breaching of canal banks, looting of banks and so on. It is evident from the fact of the enormous security precautions taken in this free country for our President and the Prime Minister. Despite these draconian measures to put down violence in the midst of fear. You also know that you cannot keep the Army in Punjab for ever. There is a limit to it. You cannot keep a people down with bayonets for two long. You should realise what the consequences will be, in regard to these people, inflamed as they are, if suddenly, this power, this control is taken away from them. I would like to place certain positive suggestions. I am a man who proposes grand gestures. I proposed at one time that the Prime Minister should go to the Golden Temple as a pilgrim. It was not taken seriously. I proposed later that the President should go to the Golden Temple. No notice was taken of either of my requests. They visited the Golden Temple after the damage has been done. (Interruptions) May I suggest now a grander gesture? Now, Sir, I would suggest that the leaders, of this country. Jagatgurus, Shankaracharyas and others, leaders of the Hindu parties like Advaniji, Vajpayeeji and others... (Interruptions) should join us in this Kar Seva. This is one of the ways in which we can heal the wounds. Lastly, we have a great day coming, the 12th of August. Raksha Bandhan. Let every Hindu tie a rakhi on the hands of a Sikh, which we shall reciprocate. These are the only ways in which you can

repair the damage which you have done.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, before I begin my observations, I would like to reply to a few of the things that Mr. Khushwant Singh has said. He mentioned about the searches and photographs taken of the Sikh passengers at Srinagar airport. I would like to ask him; after the recent hijacking of an Indian Airlines aircraft by the so-called Sikh passengers, what other security precautions do you expect the Government to take? Do you not expect the Government to take reasonable precautions? Earlier the kirpans were banned from the flights because kirpans were used for the hijacking of a plane. That is why, kirpans were banned from the flights.

Similarly, Sardar Khushwant Singh has mentioned various rumours, which he heard in Amritsar, of women and children being killed. He has quoted various people whom he met. But he has not mentioned their names. I would like to mention that I have heard even worse rumours than this. If you want me to name, I can name hundreds of things. But when we come to the basics of these things, if you ask who were the persons killed, where did they come from, no facts are forthcoming. Sardar Khushwant Singh has mentioned that the killings were far higher than mentioned in the White Paper. I would like to know the names, I would like to know the addresses and I would like to know the parentages of these people. I am sure there is no such thing forthcoming. (Interruptions)

Sardar Khushwant Singh mentioned about the destruction of archives. I would like to quote from the White Paper, page 48, paragraph 23:

"Troops effected entry into the area around the Sarovar through the northern door and the southern library building. In the latter area, the terrorists were firing from a number of machine gun positions in the library building and were hurling country-made grenades, lighting them with match-sticks. A fire was noticed at this stage in the library.

Troop fire-fighting parties were repeatedly rushed to put out the fire, but these attempts were foiled by the heavy machine-gun fire from the terrorists. By the time the terrorist positions could be overcome, the library had been gutted."

Sardar Khushwant Singh also quoted the *Times of London* as an authoritative source and said that the *Times of London* had said that people were killed by the troops in Amritsar. I would like to refer Sardar Khushwant Singh to a book written by an editor of the *Times*, Harold Evans, "Good Times, Bad Times". This entire book is an indictment of the way the *Times* newspaper is run. He mentions how news is manipulated, how various editors are sacked, how proprietors want certain news to be put in falsely, etc. etc. I would just like to quote a small portion from this book. He speaks about the owner of the newspaper, Rupert Murdoch. I quote:

"He guaranteed that the editors would have control of the political policy of their newspapers; that they would have freedom within fixed annual budget; that the editors would not be subject to instructions from either the proprietor or management on the selection and balance of news and opinion... In my year as editor of the *Times* Murdoch broke all these guarantees. He put his point of view very simply to the home editor of The *Times*, Fred Emery, when he summoned him from holiday on 4 March to his office shortly before

[Shri Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh] asking for my resignation: 'I give instructions to my editors all round the world, why shouldn't I in London?' He was reminded of the undertakings to the Secretary of State. "They're not worth the paper they're written on," Murdoch replied.

Furthermore, he mentions the episode of Hitler's diaries also published by the *Times Group* of newspapers. He says:

"My point is that in no sense does Rupert Murdoch appreciate this. When he was told that the diaries were fake, he reassured the worried editorial men at *Times Newspapers* who feared for their credibility: 'After all,' said Murdoch, 'we are in the entertainment business'."

(Interruptions)

SHRI GULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Point of order. Is there any collusion between Mr. Khushwant Singh and Mr. Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh? How did he know that Mr. Khushwant Singh would quote from *The Times* and that is why he brought this book? (Interruptions).

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: On the contrary, Sardar Khushwant Singh had showed me the *Times* newspaper yesterday. That is why I brought this book today I did not ask him for it. He told me himself (Interruptions). It has been alleged by the hon'ble Shri Advani that the White Paper has nothing new to say apart from very few portions. I agree with him that it has nothing new to say. Why has it nothing new to say? Because we live in an open society, because we have an open government, because we have a free press. Every single portion of the negotiations which took place was in public, every time an emissary went to Amritsar, every time anything was discussed it was exhaustively reported with the newspapers. As a result of that the White Paper can only be a compilation of

those things and can only mention a few of the things which were not revealed to the public and were kept secret. That is about all. And that is why those nine secret meetings have been mentioned.

About the talks, various Members have given the impression that the Akalis originally had 45 demands and trying to be reasonable, trying to be accommodating with the Government, they reduced these demands from 45 to 15. This is supposed to have been a very good gesture by the Akalis. I would like to clarify this position and explain that when the original 45 demands were put in, there were various demands which were completely frivolous, which had no bearing at all upon anything and when these were pointed out to the Akali leaders who themselves did not understand and had not understood the gravity of what they were actually discussing, they removed those demands. If you like I can quote from the White Paper, but I do not think I will be given enough time: So I would like to go on to other portions.

As regards Shri Advaniji's charge that details of the talks were not given, the Akalis themselves insisted that no recording should be taken no minutes should be taken. They said that the talks must be held in an informal atmosphere. This is well known to the Opposition and I do not know why Advaniji has asked for this. Therefore, there are no records. If we turn round today and say that this was what was said or that was what was said, it can always be a matter of dispute; that is why all this was not gone into. He also asked why Sardar Swaran Singh, Shri Harkishan Surjeet and various other people's efforts were not included in this White Paper. I would like to say that their mediatory efforts were not official, were not on behalf of the Government of India. Only those meetings which were officially sanctioned, which were officially recorded are mentioned. No other meet-

ings are mentioned. Various other contacts were made. I contacted various Akali leaders. I know about all the names of the various people were to be included, it would have run into hundreds of pages, thousands of pages with all sorts of things coming in, like "will you come to Delhi? Will you do this? How will you come? Will you come by train or do I send a car to fetch you?" You want all these details in the White Paper?

In my opinion the White Paper is most important in its one major aspect. It puts across the area of difference between the stand of the Government and the stand of the Akalis very clearly on each and every issue. It enunciates each issue in detail, goes into its ramifications and makes clear that the Government had taken a particular view point and the Akalis had taken a particular viewpoint and where were the points of divergence and what were the points of convergence. The genesis of the Akali agitation—I am not talking about the terrorist activities; I am talking about the Akali agitation because it had a bearing on the terrorist activities at a later stage — was the split within their own party, the split between the Talwandi group and the Badal-Longowal-Tohra group which later had its own differences within its own factions. The SGPC was used to further this faction fight. The SGPC, because it was controlled by the Akali Dal, was eventually used as a forum in trying to prove their strength. All this went against the *Rehat Maryada* which is the code of conduct for all Sikhs as Sardar Khushwant Singh is very well aware. It lays down what can and cannot be done within a Gurudwara. It says, "no book should be given the same reverence as the *Adi Granth* in the Gurudwara"—this is most important; "no secular event should be held there; the Gurudwara may be used for any gathering whose purpose is the encouragement of religion," not politics. This is from the *Rehat Maryada*

itself, as enunciated by the SGPC. They themselves went against this *Rehat Maryada* when they allowed hostile forces to enter into the Golden Temple, forces which were totally opposed to all the tenets of Sikhism. As Sardar Khushwant Singh has been very violent in his denunciation of those forces, I need not go into all that. But I am trying to say that this was all done at the behest of the SGPC itself which was at the back of it. They could have stopped it at any given moment of time. It is provided in the Act, it is provided in the *Rahat Maryada*. But they did not do it.

There has been one failure by the Government. The major failure of the Government has been that the Government has not utilised the Gurudwara Act properly. It has not implemented it on the basis of its accounts. There is a complete chapter in the Act which is devoted to finance. It mentions, from section 106 to section 124 objects on which the funds of Gurudwaras may be spent, the utilisation of surplus income, formation of Gurudwara Boards, Research Fund Religious Fund, Research and Religious Funds to be governed by the Acts, funds held in trust by the Boards for specific purpose, General Trust Fund, Board to maintain accounts of all Trust Funds, audit of accounts, auditors' report; budget of Board etc.; etc. It also gives power to the State Government. It says, "The Board shall maintain regular accounts showing receipts on account of expenditure out of the General Board Fund and separate similar accounts for each Fund established under the provisions of section 112 and for the General Trust Funds". It later goes on to say "The accounts described in section 114 shall be audited and examined once in every year by such auditor as may from time to time, be appointed by the State Government." This has been the failure of the State Government and the only failure of the State Government—that it has not gone into the

[Shri Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh]

accounts of the Gurudwaras. This was mainly because the SGPC was considered, through tradition, a semi-autonomous body; nobody interfered in its affairs. That is one of the reasons why all this came to pass. (Time bell rings).

Sir, there are to very important points I would like to make but, if you want, I will skip one and go to the other... (Interruptions)... Can I complete the whole thing, Sir?... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

SHRI VISHWAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: I am being brief, but I have certain quotations which I would like to give.

The Jathedars were totally immobilised by the terrorists... (Interruptions) Yes, I am a Sikh; I am a practising Singh. You want to ask the question, Matto Saheb? But I am a practising Sikh in my house. I have a Gurudwara, I have the Guru Granth Saheb, I take the "VAAK" every morning, I do all the prayers. I may smoke and I may have my hair cut but I am a practising Sikh for all practical purposes. I am a Patit Sikh as they say in the *Rahat Maryada*, but I am a Sikh all right. (Interruptions). He is an agnostic but, I think, between us we both are one good Sikhs.

The Jathedars were totally immobilised by the terrorists. I would like to quote from the Act—why they were immobilised, what the reason was, why they could not act. In the SGPC Act it is mentioned in section 134:

"134. The committee may suspend or dismiss any office-holder, provided that it shall not dismiss a hereditary office-holder or a minister unless it finds that such office-holder or minister—

(a) makes persistent default in submission of budgets, accounts, reports or returns....."

It gives various reasons on account of which a man can be dismissed. And it says:

"(g) fails persistently to perform his duties in connection with the management or performance of any rituals and ceremonies in accordance with the teachings of Sri Guru Grant Sahib."

So, since the Jathedars were appointed by the SGPC, they were the captives of the SGPC. They could not issue any Hukamnama without their permission. And when they were ordered to issue Hukamnamas, they had to issue those Hukamnamas. In fact, there have been instances even during the Akali regime when they issued Hukamnamas against the *Rahat Maryada*.

There is a small note which I had made a few years ago. I would like to quote from it:

"The position of the Jathedar of the Akal Takht was further undermined when he was asked to issue edicts by the President of the SGPC regarding the internal conflicts within the Dal."

This is when the split took place between Talwandi and Badal.

"...The Akal Takht appointed a seven member committee to distribute tickets on behalf of the Akali Dal for the 1979 Lok Sabha elections. When both Talwandi and Umranangal defied the dictates of this committee they were summoned and punished—the only strange thing being that whereas Talwandi was asked to clean utensils Umranangal was only fined.

Umranangal belonged to the Badal group and the Badal group was in control of the SGPC.

"It was obvious that the Badal Group had prevailed upon the Jathedar. A vociferous section of the Sikhs who protested against this charged that a paid employee of the SGPC should not be the Jathedar of the Akal Takht. Even Sardar Kapur Singh, National Professor of Sikhism criticized the SGPC and the Jathedar."

This is from the 'Indian Express' of 13th January, 1980.

Now I would like to point out what a Hukamnama is. A Hukamnama is issued by a Jathedar. What are the various authorities? In Sikhism we have a triangle of authority.

"A triangle of authority was evolved by the Khalsa—the Sarbat Khalsa which elected and appointed the Jathedar who then acted according to the collective will of the Faithful—The Gurmatta. If necessary, a Hukamnama would be issued by the Jathedar to implement the Gurmatta. This assumes great importance because the Jathedar by himself was never competent to issue any Hukamnama without the authority of the Gurmatta, which could only be exercised by the complete congregation—the Sarbat Khalsa.

The importance of the Gurmatta cannot be denied by any authority since there is a plethora of historical evidence which shows its supremacy in the Sikh scheme of things. The first Gurmatta was enforced by the Khalsa at Chamkour against the will of the Tenth Guru when he was asked to leave the field of battle and save his life."

This has been quoted by various writers. So I need not go into it.

Now let us come to the various Takhts. We know that the various Takhts have an association with the Gurus. Sri Akal Takht was founded by the Sixth Guru in 1609, ninety years before the Khalsa was formed. Sri Patna Sahib Takht is holy because it was the residence of Guru Tegh Bahadur and the birth-place of Guru Gobind Singh. Takht of Nanded is important because it is the last.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Leave these things. Come to the last point.

SHRI J. K. JAIN (Madhya Pradesh): Let him say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot go into details so much.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: I may talk about the Damdama Takht. Damdama Sahib has been projected by the Akalis after 1962 as being a Takht of the Akalis and the Sikhs...of the sikhs. I would like to mention that Damdama Sahib is the place where the Adi Granth compiled under the direction of the Tenth Guru. It is not a Takht of the Sikhs. It has been declared so by the Akalis. It has not been ratified. In fact, if you read the S.G.P.C. Act which provides for the Head Priests of the various Gurudwaras to be the members of the Takhts. It says: "the Board shall consist of 132 elected Members. The Head Ministers of the Darbara Sahib, Amritsar and the following four Takhts namely: the Shri Akal Takht Sahib, Amritsar, Takht Kesgarh at Anandpur, Takht Patna Sahib, Patna, Takht Hazur Sahib, Nanded, Hyderabad Decan." It does not mention the Damdama Sahib Takht. This is the Act which has been amended upto date. The Act, therefore, says that the Jathedar or the Head Minister of the Takht Damdama Sahib is not even a Member of the S.G.P.C. Let alone anything else. Sir, I will refer to *Rehat Maryada* (a guide to the Sikh way of life). I am sorry, Sir, I will take little more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is limited time. Please finish your speech quickly.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Sir, I would request you to permit the hon Member more time as he is giving us some valuable information on the subject.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We will have a separate lecture also.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Sir, I am very sorry to point out that you have allowed more time to Shri Khushwant

Singh and why not Shri Vishvajit Prithvijit Singh also.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please come to the last point and conclude.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: Sir, I am coming to the last point. Sir, various hon. Members of this august House have criticised the commencement of Kar Seva at the Akal Takht. I would like to tell my hon. friend Shri Khushwant Singh in this House, I did not object to his language at that moment, whereas other hon. Members have objected to his language and therefore, he should not object to my speech. I would like just to mention one thing about the Nihangs. Nihang means crocodile. This word "Nihangs" was used by the Guru as a symbolic of a guerilla activity group. Nihangs occupy a special place in the sikh scheme of things. The Dal Khalsa which was formed by the sikhs and soon after the death of Guru Sahib that split into two sections. I would like to quote from a book entitled "Sikh Polity" by Dr. Bhagat Singh. He says "though the Sikhs had been outlawed by the Punjab Government, they secretly moved about in small groups. In 1734, Kapur Singh divided the disintegrated fabric of these sikhs into two Dals (groups). The word "Dal" is a Punjabi expression meaning a horde and suggests the notion of a group with a definite mission or objective before it. One group was named Budha Dal, the League of the Elders, which comprised men above the age forty and the other was named Taruna Dal, League of the Young, which consisted of the young Sikhs below that age. The Budha Dal was assigned the duty of looking after the Sikh holy places and the propagation of the Sikh faith. The Taruna Dal was to undertake the more difficult task of the defence of the community." It is that Budha Dal which headed by Baba Santa Singh.

SHRI J. K. JAIN: Mr. Khushwant Singh, it is a befitting reply to you.

SHRI VISHVAJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH: In fact, the Akali party took its name from Nihangs. They said we are a replacement for the Nihang who have been protecting you all these years. That is why they call themselves Akalis, to catch the popular imagination, "Akali" meaning he who worships the Formless One. In fact, Bhai Khan Singh, who has been one of the greatest scholars of Sikh history and Sikh literature, has mentioned in his "Mahan Kosh"—he quotes from the "Suraj Prakash" of Bhai Santokh Singh—that the Tenth Guru gave a blessing to Bhai Man Singh saying:

होवे प्रसन्न बर देवन जोवे,

पंथ खालसे में तब होवे.

तुझ सम बेख सुनाव बिसाली ।

नाम निहंग अनेक अकाली ।

—meaning thereby: कि तेरा निहंग पंथ चलेगा ।

He gave this *vardaan* and it is according to that, that the Nihangs have always acted. I would like to make just one last quotation from a book called "The Sikh Revolution" by Jagjit Singh, where he mentions the special role of the Nihangs. He says:

"Nihangs or Akalis, like the Shaheeds, were those volunteers who had dedicated their lives to the armed service of the Panth. Maybe, they were a part, or an offshoot of the shaheeds. They cut off for life all the worldly connections, spent their entire lives in the Jathas, remained always armed to the teeth and were ever ready to lay down their lives for the Panth. They were to the Sikhs what the Jannesears were to the Turks, with the difference that the Nihangs or Akalis were honorary volunteers and not organised or paid by the State. The Nihangs were a dedicated and inspired lot, highly conscious of the Sikh mission and its revolutionary ideals.

There was an armed commune and continues to be so to this day. In other words, they institutionalized the ideal of dedicating. Tan, Man, Dhan' to the Sikh revolutionary cause. It was for this reason that they were held in high esteem in the Panth. They were at one time its conscience keepers. When the movement entered its lean period and split up into different fighting corporations (Misals), one of the Misals was of the Shaheeds. They held no territory of their own, and were provided food and shelter by the Panth. The Shaheeds or Akalis provided the rallying point for the Misals to coordinate in order to meet a common danger to the Panth. At such a time, the resolution (Gurmatta) to meet such an eventuality (e.g. at the time of threatened danger from Abdali's invasion) would be sponsored by the Akalis. All the Misals would honour the resolution. Even Ranjit Singh respected them and was afraid of offending the Akalis. They were the dominating factor in the Khalsa army committees. Scott compares the Akalis with Cromwell's Ironsides. "The Akalis would represent the 'Fifth Monarchy Men', stern and uncompromising, firmly believing in the right-ness of their cause, insisting on the right to equality for all, guided by the decisions of the Panch, or Committee of five than by their nominal leaders, and watching those leaders with the jealous eyes last they should assume absolute power."

This has been the role of the Nihangs and this is the role of the Nihangs even today.

I have heard all sorts of things being said here for the last two days. As Mr. Khushwant Singh said that he spoke with pain in his voice, I also have pain in my voice. I would like to quote for the benefit of all my brethren, whether they belong to any caste or creed or community, those eternal words from the Japji

Sahib, the morning prayer of the Sikhs which is recited by every Sikh practically every day:

गुर ईश्वर, गुर गारख ब्रह्मा, गुर पारदत्ता माई,
सबनों जियों का इक दाता, सा मैं विसर न जाई।

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have listened to the speech of my hon. friend, Mr. Khushwant Singh, with a bit of anguish. Before I deal with some of the points that he has raised, I would like to remind this hon. House as to what Mr. Khushwant Singh said when he landed at Palam at the time when the operation was still under way. He said, this action had put the Sikhs out of the mainstream of Indianism. I should have expected expression of a little element of gratitude from Mr. Khushwant Singh today that it is this mainstream of Indianism which is flowing through the portals of this House which has given him the honour of standing on the floor of this honourable House and addressing the representatives of the Indian people. A few days later I read in the newspapers that Mr. Khushwant Singh has returned the Padma Bhushan. Till that time I did not know that he had been honoured with this particular award. But I was certainly reminded of one tremendous event in the history of India and that was when Rabindranath Tagore returned his knighthood in 1919. But what a vast difference! He returned his knighthood so that India should be free. Mr. Khushwant Singh returned his Padma Bhushan in support of those monstrous forces which had held the entire nation to ransom. I have also visited Amritsar. If there is any religious place whose sanctity and spirituality have been embedded deeply in my mind, it is the Harmandir Sahib because I have been visiting Harmandir Sahib right from my childhood. I am not a person who usually goes to temples. But whenever I have gone to Amritsar even, I have gone to Harmandir Sahib to pay

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

my obeisance I went to Amritsar this time in the month of June. Mr. Khushwant Singh has said a lot about the army action. I would like to bring to the notice of this honourable House and Mr. Khushwant Singh a very particular moving event. The first company of Indian soldiers was led by a young Sikh Captain. The moment they entered the Parikrama and were pushing on and travelled hardly ten or fifteen paces, they were faced with such intensive crossfire from all directions that they were completely immobilised and this young Sikh Captain was wounded. But he did not lose his courage. He rallied his men and he asked them to proceed and he went on leading them. Another few paces, he was wounded a second time. Yet he did not fall back. He rallied his men again and he called upon them, "This is your duty, let us proceed on". And when he proceeded on by a few more paces, he was wounded a third time and he fell. He became unconscious. He was removed to the hospital. In the hospital when he regained consciousness the first words which he uttered were, "I want to go back to my men". But he was too seriously wounded to join the armed battle again. I had the privilege to meet that young Sikh officer in the Jallandhar hospital and when I saw his battered and wounded body but with gleaming eyes, in his battered and wounded body in his gasping breath and in his gleaming eyes I saw that spirit of India which has lived on down the centuries through the turbulent history of India the spirit of Indian brotherhood, the spirit of unity and integrity of India, the spirit of triumph of secularism over narrow parochial religiosity. What Mr. Khushwant Singh has said today constitutes a grievous insult to this spirit of India symbolised by this young Sikh officer and given projection to in this particular White Paper in the last paragraph which is a befitting finale of this tragic episode, and that is paragraph 12:

"The action which the Government has had to take in Punjab was neither against the Sikhs nor the Sikh religion. It was against terrorism and insurgency. The Sikhs are a well-integrated part of the Indian nation. They were second to none in their contribution in achieving and defending the country's freedom and the building of the economic strength of free India. The Sikh community stands firm, along with the rest of the nation, in its resolve to preserve and strengthen the unity and integrity of the country."

Mr. Khushwant Singh has said a lot about the Army action. Sir, I would like to say one thing.

If there is one monstrous force which has bedevilled human civilisation down the centuries, it is when religion has not mixed up with political violence. It is this monstrous force which led hundreds of thousands of Europeans to leave their hearths and homes in the 17th and 18th centuries to build up their new homes in the hospitable climes of America. It is this monstrous force which rained death and destruction on one little country, that is, Ireland, for centuries. And what has happened in the 20th century? It is this monstrous force which has bedevilled the people of Palestine. It is this monstrous force which is raining ruin on the people of Lebanon. Sometimes this force overtakes State. Sometimes it becomes a challenge to the authority of the State. It is this monstrous force which is causing havoc in Iran today and in our sub-continent it was this particular monstrous force which disintegrated the country as it was known for centuries together. Now this monstrous force had gripped Punjab for the last four years and this monstrous force was aggravated by the fact that it was also motivated by the demand of secession. I respectfully submit that secession in itself contains all the elements of anarchy. In this regard I would just like to quote Abraham Lincoln. He said:

"Plainly, the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A constitutional majority is the true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy, or despotism."

If that be the challenge which was posed to the democratic values of secularism, unity and integrity of the country, what should have been the responsibility of the Government of the day? What was the constitutional duty of the Government of the day? I can do no better than quote the words of Abraham Lincoln again when he addressed the people of the South who were seeking to destroy the United States of America. He said:

"In your language my dissatisfied fellow country-men and not in mine is the momentous issue of civil war. Government will not assail you unless you first assailed. You can have no conflict without being yourself the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heavens to destroy the Government while I shall have the most solemn one of preserving and defending it. You can forebear assault upon it; I cannot shirk from the defence of it."

I would like to place on the record of this hon'ble House my tribute to the courage and fearless leadership of Mrs. Gandhi. She took up the challenge and met it in the words which were uttered by Abraham Lincoln to the people of the South. For generations to come, as long as India lives down the history there will always be a tribute paid to the leadership fearlessness and courage of Mrs. Gandhi for having given a new turn to the destiny of India.

I would like to make one more point. The Hon'ble Member, Mr. Advani, had said that he had nothing to say about what is contained in the White Paper. This is a remarkable statement coming from the leader of a political party which is aspiring to govern the destiny of the nation. I would respectfully submit that I want to draw the attention of this

honourable House to page 54 of the White Paper. Millions of people in this country are watching the proceedings of this House and the other House because they want to seek an answer to the question which have been posed by the White Paper on page 54. They are not interested in the political polemics of one political party or the other. In other agony and suffering, they want an answer from the representatives of the people to the questions which have been posed on page 54, and the questions are:

"Is it right for places of worship which are revered by millions to be used as arsenals? Is it right to transform such places into sanctuaries for criminals and subversive elements? And, above all, how do we prevent the secular foundations of our Republic from being eroded?" Mr. Advani has said that he has no comments to make on what is contained in the White Paper. It is a remarkable statement! He has nothing to say with regard to these particular questions the answer to which is being demanded by the people of India. And I am not surprised. In the last 35 years, the party to which he belongs has never had anything positive to say. Their only programme has been—and I have been aggrieved to see the proceedings of this honourable House—either to indulge in character assassination of the Nehru family or to propagate the poison of communalism in this country. I respectfully submit, Sir, that the honourable Prime Minister has replied with regard to the first two questions that the religious places will never be allowed to be used as arsenal of weapons. But, with regard to the third question as to what should be our role to preserve and strengthen the foundations of secularism in this country, I would like to make a submission and this is my last submission. This is a very important submission which I would like to bring to the notice of the honourable Home Minister. I would like to make six suggestions.

[Shri Madan Bhatia]

The first suggestion is that any political party which operates from a religious place or functions through religious idioms should be completely put out of the electoral processes of this country. (*Interruptions*). It is necessary that such a political party should become the political leper of India. It cannot be that one individual member appeals to the religious sentiments of his electorate and he is held to be guilty of corrupt practices while, if the whole political party functions in this particular manner, we call it democracy. It is preposterous, it is ridiculous, and it reminds me of what Bernard Shaw said that if you kill one man it is murder, but if you kill on a mass scale with the beats of drums as in the battle field, it is heroism. I would, therefore, respectfully submit that the time has come now when we must take this hard decision. Secondly, Sir, this is a poor developing country in which the process of industrialisation is going to take many many more years. In Europe and in the West, there were forces of religion and communalism. But they were ultimately defeated by the process of industrialisation. That will take a number of years in this country. Therefore, it is necessary that in order to fight communalism... (*Time bell rings*) we must give to the people a socio-economic-cum-political fighting ideology. And, Sir, what is that ideology? It is that ideology which was enshrined in the Preamble to the Constitution under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi, namely the Republic of India will be a socialist Republic. I, therefore, expect from the Congress Party under the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi that it would make socialism the battle cry of the people of India. I will just enumerate. Three, time has come that we must put an end to the donominational religious educational institutions. Article 30 must go. They have become the breeding ground of communalism in this country. It is preposterous that the funds of the public exchequer in this country are being

used to foster the places where communalism is being bred. Four, and this is my very serious suggestion, it is time, Sir, that we must face the question: To what extent the framework of democracy which we have adopted has fostered or retarded the forces of unity and integrity in this country? We adopted the framework of Britain, because intellectually and politically we had been nurtured on British political and other constitutional traditions. The problems of Britain cannot be identified with the problems of India. England is basically a small country and is basically a unified society. India is a vast country and a multiple society. The position of India has to be compared with the position of United States. And let us not forget while facing this particular question that a tremendous contribution has been made by the political framework of the United States in unifying the people of America into the mainstream of the United States of America. We have to face this question. If we do not face it today, we shall have to face it tomorrow.

With that, Sir, ultimately I would respectfully submit only this much. The hon. Prime Minister has said yesterday that it is time to consider that we shall build bridges; let not our thinking be deflected by the visions of the ballot boxes. The nation is in agony and the nation is suffering. The nation wants a national, unified approach to deal with monstrous forces which have bedevilled the unity, integrity and all the cherished values of the nation.

Thank you. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister made an emotional speech yesterday, bringing home the point that army action in Amritsar was inevitable. Sir, I do not think, like the Greek drama all the incidents led to the tragedy of an army action in Amritsar Golden Temple. Many people did not like the voice of Mr.

Chushwant Singh. Now he has become suddenly an anathema to them. But how two of the Members have resigned from the Congress Party? For example, Sir, Mr. Amrinder Singh ex-Prince of Patiala, has not only resigned from the Congress Party but he has also resigned from Parliament also, saying that his "feelings were grievously hurt." So also Mr. Devendra Singh Garcha, Member of Parliament belonging to the Congress Party, has resigned from the party. More than anything else there were desertions in the Army. Perhaps for the first time in the history of the country such extreme things, unprecedented things, have taken place. That is why many Sikhs are seething with indignation and anger about what happened in the Golden Temple. For them it is their Mecca. For them, such kind of things did not take place in the last 400 years of their history.

Sir, in this context comes their White Paper. I think it is totally a misnomer. We Members of Parliament here in this House and in the other House wanted the White Paper on the extremist activities in Punjab. Here what is given is a White Paper on the Punjab agitation. What is the agitation? Terrorist agitation is going on. Sir, I think it is totally a misnomer. So I would say after 'Operation Blue Star' here comes 'Operation Whitewash.' Sir we thought the White Paper would be a dispassionate study. But this is the official version and it is incomplete and distorted. It does not give an answer to many of the questions. For example, it does not explain the genesis of Bhindranwale phenomenon. It does not say why no serious attempts have been made to bring Bhindranwale to book for his terrorist activities or why he was beyond the reach of law for such a long time. We could not find an answer to this question in this White Paper.

Now, the dominant question that has to be answered is whether what hap-

pened on June 6, could have been avoided or not. I would say that this is the crux of the problem. My reply is that it could have been avoided. The Army action could have been avoided. On more than three occasions, the Government and the Akalis very nearly came to a solution. On November 2, 1982, an understanding was reached with the good offices of Mr. Swaran Singh. On November 3, the next day, a statement was read in Parliament by the then Home Minister. But the statement was different from the understanding. That was the first occasion. Here we should take note that the Akalis took a reasonable stand because of 7 other parties. On November 18, an aircraft was kept ready to go to Amritsar. Who went back on this agreement? Definitely the Government went back on this agreement. Again, on April 20, 1983, an agreement was arrived at in the tripartite conference. Only the modalities of implementation were to be worked out. Once again the Government went back. Again on June 30, 1983, the opposition parties worked out a consensus on territorial disputes. At all time, the Akalis were prepared to accept a package deal. In one Consultative Committee meeting of the Home Ministry, the then Home Minister, Mr. Sethi, said that the Congress Party would share power with the Akalis. The next day he went back. I do not want to go into all the details. I want to ask this question. Why did the Government allow to slip the opportunity of finding a political solution? Is it casual or intentional? The answer is very crucial. Sir, you allowed the situation to go from bad to worse. (Time bell rings) What is that?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You don't ring the bell when others speak. It is very unfair.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now. (Interruptions) There is no time. Please conclude.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: You allowed the situation to go from bad to worse. At that time you had no

[Shri Murasoli Maran]
political solution, but finally you found a military solution. There was a small wound. You have cured it. You allowed the gangrene to develop so that the leg is amputated. That is what has happened today. There is no use of criticising the Akalis. I would say that Akali Dal is one of the few parties in India that if they give a call to fill up the jails, one lakh people would court arrest which cannot be done by many of our national parties.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. (Interruptions) There is a limit to everything. Mr. Dhabe, please.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: All the irrelevant things have been allowed to be said.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): You won't hear the other point of view.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have heard all the points of view. There is a time limit. What can I do.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): He is entitled to take his party's time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: You have to give me some time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I cannot. Somebody will have to suffer.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I cannot suffer for somebody.

Sir, I should not be the casualty.

2 P.M.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, it is not fair... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, you finish within two minutes.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Please give me some more time.

Sir, the Akali Dal had the privilege of having nine secret meetings with the Government. So, I do not find fault with the Akalis. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that the agita-

tion went out of the control of the Akalis. That is true. At the same time it is also true that Bhindranwale also went out of the control of the Congress Party.

Sir, it is a sentimental question. The Prime Minister said that we should apply the healing touch. But, Sir, what is happening now? The healing touch is very much necessary. It should be given and administered by all of us. But what is happening? You have amended the National Security Act just to scuttle the habeas corpus petitions of Longowal and other Akali leaders in the Supreme Court. Is it a healing touch? Sir, you have extended the period of preventive detention for two years. Now you can put anybody behind the bars for two years without trial. Is it the healing touch? Sir, you have brought the Special Courts ordinance by which anybody found in the so-called terrorist affected area can be tried in camera by a Special Court without the presence of the press and the public. The Centre can decide which Judge can try which group. Sir, is it a healing touch? Now you have amended the Evidence Act also so that in the so-called disturbed area, if any person is arrested, he and not the public prosecutor should prove his innocence. Is it the healing touch? Sir, these sorts of laws are not to be found in any democratic country in the world. Probably, in the Northern Ireland called Ulster you may have this. They call the Special Courts as Kangaroo courts where there is no jury.

Sir, I would warn you, if you apply these draconian Acts in Punjab, if you institute Kangaroo courts in Punjab, then Punjab will become another Ulster of India. This is not the healing touch. The present Home Minister is a compassionate man. He is Raj Guru. The Prime Minister wants to build the bridges that have broken. I would request him not to use these draconian laws, not to apply these draconian laws in Punjab. It would not lead to recon-

ciliation. That is why, Sir, I request you to drop this idea.

Sir, the Army went there to flush out the terrorists from the Golden Temple. Their task is over. Why should they remain there? If you give the reason that they are still searching for the secret ammunitions, it would not hold water. That is why, Sir, it is not good to politicise the Army. They are like man-eaters. If they taste one drop of human blood, then it is dangerous. They will get ideas. Sir, Army is the one infrastructure of the State which has not been spoiled yet.

Sir, I demand that the Army should be withdrawn from the Golden Temple. The Akali leaders should be released, and tripartite talks should be conducted thereafter. Then only, Sir, we can really build a bridge.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I only want to raise two points in this connection—firstly, the total failure of the Intelligence of the Punjab Government, and secondly of the political leadership.

Sir, it has been stated in this White Paper at page 29 that the Akalis were not in a position to control the terrorists and that Shri Bhindranwale had taken possession of the Akal Takht and other things. And at page 33 it has been stated that terrorists were occupying some of the private houses near the Golden temple with a view to improving their tactical position and that they had their ammunitions there. And the greatest admission in this White Paper is at page 54. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what he has to say on this. I am reading it. "By about the middle of 1983, anti-national and terrorist groups had established complete control over the Golden Temple and converted it into the main base for their operations." Therefore, it is too late to say, they were not knowing about it. The paper itself

admits that by middle of 1983, terrorists had taken complete control. That means the terrorists had complete hand in this matter; they were armed; they had made it an arsenal and this information was available with the Government but the Government had always said in this House that there was no evidence and they want to talk it out and would not allow army to enter into the Temple and they will respect the sentiments of the Sikhs. Therefore, the first question that I would like to ask is whether it is a fact that they knew what was going in by the middle of 1983. Then a number of pictures are given here. I have numbered them. On the fifth picture, loophole of the pill-box of machine gun that had been constructed by cutting the marble walls of the Akal Takht, has been shown. That means, marble wall had already been cut, and they had made arrangements for firing from that position. But there is no mention when was it found. At what point of time was it noticed? How all these things went unnoticed when so many arrangements had been made? All these pictures are rather against the Government. These pictures show that preparations were going on for a long time. Why no action was taken? Secondly, the paper says that there is no dispute about the religious demands. The only dispute is about Chandigarh and sharing of waters. These are the demands which led to the dispute between the Akalis and the Government. This is not the demand of Akalis alone; it is the demand of the people, and it is a political failure of the Government. Total constitutional machinery has collapsed. First, Darbara Singh Ministry was shown favouritism and Central Government only suspended the Assembly, still keeping the MLAs in tact. What for? What was the reason? Why so much favouritism was shown to Punjab when you dismissed Sikkim and Jammu and Kashmir Governments even without an enquiry. The Prime Minister said yesterday about it. We know how they are doing in Punjab.

[Shri S. W. Dhabe]

in Rajasthan, in Himachal Pradesh, and how they took over in Haryana. People want elections in these States. But it is the fragmented ruling party which is responsible for the situation in Punjab. Why should they not be in a position to take a decision when the Prime Minister is so strong and she is so much applauded in the House but why they cannot take a decision within the party. They could not decide on the Chandigarh issue, nor on the sharing of waters issue. It is therefore the failure of the ruling party. I therefore finally say that I endorse what Shri Khushwant Singh has said. There is need to immediately withdraw the army and give a healing touch so that a solution could be found. Time has come when a political solution to the problem should not be delayed which will otherwise result in anarchy in the country.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Deputy Chairman, 16 hon. Members have spoken on this subject and I am grateful to them for whatever they said and in whatever manner they said it. There is hardly anything for me to comment on the manner because this I had thought to be an occasion for sober, dispassionate thinking and also some peep into the future. This document Sir, was not meant to be rhetorical. It has not claimed to give anything more than the bare facts that should be known to everyone. As one hon. Member said, even these facts, most of them, are known. But they have come to the notice of persons over a period of time and their total impact had to be brought out by some kind of a compilation and also volunteering some information which may or may not be available to the general public. So, as White Papers go, the format of the White Paper has been maintained and the style of the narrative is restrained. The fewest possible words have been used and, therefore on the format of the White Paper I would respectfully

submit that it is exactly what it should be. Nothing more. Nothing less. The only question which has been raised is whether it reveals something, or more than what it reveals, it conceals. I will come to that presently. Yesterday, the Prime Minister and Sardar Darbara Singh and other Members have dwelt upon many of the aspects contained in the White Paper and also the background that is necessary for understanding the White paper. I shall not repeat what all has been said already.

The main thrust has been given by the Prime Minister. What does Government stand for? What we do not want to do, what we would like to do, both the negative side and the positive side. On this, the final word has been said by the Prime Minister.

I would only like to go into the nitty gritty of the whole thing, because, through many speeches here, unfortunately, by taking recourse to what is called suggestion *falsi* and *suppressio veri*, a certain atmosphere seems to have been created, whereby, perhaps, a doubt that this problem could have been solved earlier and because of the Government, this has not been solved, has been created. This, I would like to submit is entirely wrong.

If the negotiations started in 1981, it is fantastic to say that someone was scheming to continue the negotiations until 1985 so that some political benefit could be gained by the party, by the Congress I Party. I cannot conceive anything more fantastic, more unthinkable, than this. This is sheer hindsight. We are in 1984, the latter part and, therefore these are being improvised. Nothing more than this. What is the nitty gritty? The first insinuation or suggestion, call it what you will is that there was a Resolution in 1983, 30th June. This resolution was passed by leaders of all the opposition parties and this was the blue print, this was the Magna Carta on the basis of which everything would have been quite easily done.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Not my party.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Okay, honourable exceptions. This is the burden of the song.

May I, Sir, with your permission, read out the crucial portion, the operative portion I quote: "During the tripartite talks between the Government and the Akali leaders and the opposition parties, differences on the issues involved were considerably narrowed down..." It is a question of how wide they were, how less wide they became before any one can claim that they were narrowed down and even if they were narrowed down, they were not reduced to nil let us face that... "The Union Government has already accepted the religious demands of the Sikhs and since the managing committees of all the seven historical Gurdwaras have adopted resolutions endorsing the demand for the enactment of an All-India Gurdwara Act, there should not be any difficulty now in accepting this demand..." How many gurdwaras were involved in the demand, whether the number was seven, whether it was ten, how it went up to 30, that is a story which has been given in the White Paper.

"As regards the other demands, a Commission has already been appointed to go into the question of restructuring Union-State relations..." That is the Sarkaria Commission. How the insistence was made by the Akali leaders that we should mention, the Government should mention the Anandpur Sahib Resolution while appointing the Sarkaria Commission, is also known history. Government did not agree to it but this was very much there. That is being ignored here.

"On the river waters dispute also a broad understanding was reached with the help of the opposition parties during the tripartite talks to refer the dispute to a Tribunal under the Inter-State Water Dispute Act..." What is to be referred, that is not

referred to here in the resolution. It is 'the dispute' only. What are the ingredients of the dispute, what was agreed to be referred? Was there anything on which there was no agreement or was there complete agreement on what was to be referred? This is not given in this. "...Then the only issue that remains to be settled now is that of Chandigarh and other territorial disputes between the two States of Punjab and Haryana. The meeting felt that a reasonable settlement of this problem can be found. The meeting is of the opinion that as broadly agreed in the tripartite committee meeting Chandigarh should go to the Punjab and in a spirit of give and take certain areas of Punjab be transferred to Haryana..." Sir this is absolutely vedantic"...Certain areas from Punjab should be transferred to Haryana. Haryana has to be given adequate financial compensation of building its capitals all the other claims and counter-claims in regard to territories can be referred to a Tribunal..." Sir, can any one, any hon. Member, seriously suggest or claim, that on the basis of this resolution a solution can be arrived at, or that this resolution really spells out a solution? I would like to know. (*Interruptions*). Please listen to me. And what happened to this resolution? What happened to this resolution even as it is? The very next day press reports on the proceedings of the meeting of the opposition conclave held in New Delhi on 30th June, 1983, said that the Lok Dal representatives had reservations on the resolution to the extent that they felt any solution of the territorial issue should be made in consultation with Haryana. Now we started consultation with Haryana. And what is the result? The result is that it has not been possible for the two States to agree on what areas should come from Punjab to Haryana in lieu of the fact that Chandigarh would go to Punjab. This is the crux of the whole matter. And this is what Prime Minister said in her broadcast speech. And the

(Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao)

hon. Member says: "What were you doing for one year? I said so on the 30th of June, 1983 and the same thing is said by the Prime Minister in 1984". So the conclusion of the hon. Member is that we woke up to their "great resolution" after one year. Now this is not correct. What the Prime Minister said was the right answer to it because after all these efforts, she said, it has not been possible to agree on any of the details, how much territory should go, how many villages should go.

Again, Sir, the *Hindustan Times* of 2nd July had a news item under the heading "No unanimity on Formula". This news item gives interpretation of leaders of Akali Dal, Janata Party and Shri Charan Singh on the formula which was arrived at in the conclave meeting. Then again the *Times of India* reported the same. In the course of the debate on the adjournment motion regarding the situation in Punjab on July 26th, Shri Charan Singh, who had attended the conclave meeting on the 30th of June, 1983, said—I will just read out what he stated:

"अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि शाह कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर अमल होना चाहिए और चंडीगढ़ हरियाणा के पास रहना चाहिए और खरड़ तहसील भी हरियाणा को दी जानी चाहिए तो मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि कौन सी गलती करता हूँ या हरियाणा वाले यह डिमांड करें तो कौन सी गलती करेंगे।"

This is the resolution: This is what you call the finale of the resolution! And you take this as containing a solution! I am surprised, I am amazed, I am astonished that this should come from any Member with any kind of seriousness: "what were we doing all the time?" We were doing exactly what this resolution suggested that should be done. Only, it just did not fructify.

Coming to the water dispute, you say a tribunal should be appointed. Yesterday the Prime Minister explained under what circumstances the case was withdrawn from the Supreme Court and an Award was given, an arrangement was arrived at, then the Akali Dal said that they would not stand by it. Sir, I have some personal experience about it. I happen to be one of those who were talking with the Akali leaders. Let me first say that all our talks were conducted in an atmosphere of utmost cordiality at the personal level. The very first meeting in 1981 I had two meetings with the leaders—there was absolutely no personal rancour of any kind. They had their own point of view. They said: "You see, it is not a question of whether we are getting more or less. It is a question of principle. Why should you pull the case out of the Supreme Court? Even if we get less, it does not matter. But it should go back to Supreme Court. Or else we are not going to agree to this Award". What approach is this? It is evidently a political approach. It is evidently a party approach. If it had not been a political approach, if it had not been a party approach, they would make their own calculations privately with the help of engineers; they would ask us: "Look could we have got anything more than this if we had proceeded in the Supreme Court?". If the experts had said that they would not have got more than this, they would still protest and make some noise, but finally would say: "All right, now that the Prime Minister has given this Award, let us agree", and put the Prime Minister under some obligation. That is what I would have done if I were in their position? But no, this was a party approach, this was a political approach, "come what may, I shall not, my party shall not agree to any award given by the Prime Minister of India".

This is the approach. Now, what do they want? Is it only Ravi-Beas? It is not Ravi-Beas alone. I am sure

Advaniji would know that. It is not Ravi-Beas--please understand. I am just addressing this to the hon. Members who thought this is QED—quite easily done. It is not Ravi-Beas. What they wanted was the reopening of the 1955 arrangement, what they wanted was the inclusion of the Jamuna waters--and that is where it broke. Can any honourable Member in this House seriously say that the 1955 thing as demanded by the Akali Dal should be reopened? Can he say that the Jamuna waters also should form part of this? Now that we are going to refer it to the Tribunal—we have agreed to refer it to the Tribunal—but refer what? That is the question. And that is where the difference came. Any one honourable Member could tell me how the Akali Dal's request in this respect is justifiable. So, how do you expect any solution to come? The solution could apparently come only when I accept in toto what the Akali Dal wants me to do.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On this point they were forced to withdraw from this tripartite conference. Later on they went back but in that conference...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMA RAO: That is why they did not want a tripartite conference any longer.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: But the fact is, they had to withdraw.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMA RAO: This is one of the things, Advaniji. Later on they did not return to the tripartite conference at all.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Once again.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMA RAO: Once again. You know that. They came. Perhaps they found that they could not put as much pressure in a conference than could put on me or the former Home Minister. So they thought that it is always

good to talk to the Government. They said, "we will talk to Government; we will not come back to the tripartite table."

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): This would amount to unsettling settled things.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMA RAO: Akalis not to take part in further tripartite talks." This is what they said on 18th or 19th of February. And what is the alternative left to us? Does the Government simply abandon everything? We went to them again. We said all right; if you are so much against coming back to the tripartite table, would you like to talk to us? They said, "yes; but we would like to talk to you only subject to certain conditions." And I won't blame them because for them those conditions were important. They also considered it important to talk to the Government. But if the people knew and, particularly, those who were holding the rifles in their hands came to know that the Akali leaders were having talks, then we would not have had the second round of talks. Between the first and second round something would have happened. That is why the Akalis wanted secret talks.

What is the great secret about it? "Secret" means that it should not be known to those who do not want these talks to take place. That is all. The secrecy is only in that. If others come to know, it does not matter, but it was very very important, extremely important that those who did not want the talks to take place or to fructify should not come to know that talks are taking place. And then they said, "No records, no minutes." So how you expect me to maintain minutes, how do you expect me to place anything on the Table of the House? And, in fact, why should I have really included these nine meetings, even the mention of these nine meetings, in the White Paper?

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

They were secret meetings, yes. I would not have mentioned them but for the fact that today, if they had not been have mentioned, everyone in this House, all sections of the House, would have said, "You have been sleeping over the matter. What did you do after the tripartite talks broke down? That would have been the first unanimous question hurled at me by every Member in this House irrespective of party. And when people came and asked me, I talloed it. Many important journalists came and asked me, many reporters came and asked me: "Are you having secret talks?

कुछ सुन रहे हैं, राव साहब कुछ तो बताइये न, मैं लिखूंगा नहीं, लेकिन बताइये न ।

just for my background information

मैंने कहा हम तो सैकड़ों लोगों से बात करेंगे, अब इसमें किसके बारे में बताऊं किसके बारे में न बताऊं । और या सुनकर भी क्या करोगे तुम को तो लिखना नहीं है ।

This is how I parried questions. But our friend Badal said, "We are not having any at all talks." While I, parried the questions, from the other side comes a total denial. Where do I stand? Where does the Government stand? This was my predicament. That was the reason why we brought these things in. After a lot of deliberation, we had to take this course of bringing out the details about the talks in the White Paper.

Now I come to the second point. I am only trying to reduce the entire debate to a few issues. That would always be more convenient and we could save time. Yesterday, the Prime Minister replied to the question about Bhindranwale being a bosom friend of the Congress. This was one of the things that has been floated very freely. In addition to what she said—I am not going to repeat what she said—I would like

to say that if he had been such a bosom friend of the Congress as early as 1981, how did it happen that the first demand of the Akali Dal was the unconditional release of Bhindranwale—not today but in 1981, when their demands from 45 were reduced to 15 (the short-listed demands, mind you, not the 45 demands), how is it that the pride of place first is given to this demand? (Interruptions) It is for anyone to draw inference.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We are not supporting the Akalis. But you cannot escape your portion of responsibility.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The most important point on which everyone seems to have spoken is the foreign forces. I never expected, Sir, that after four and a half years of answering this question as Foreign Minister, I would have to answer the same as Home Minister. Particularly our friends from CPI, CPI(M) are always at me they have been at me: Why don't you name a particular country? As if, that is going to make a world of difference. The Prime Minister said quite clearly that you cannot prove a matter like this in a court of law, you cannot get the same kind of probative force to whatever information you have, which is insisted upon in the Evidence Act. Now I will tell you some straws in the wind. It is for anyone to draw conclusions. Instead of trying to draw the right conclusions, instead of taking this in the right spirit, instead of interpreting the restraint shown in this, which even the countries concerned have appreciated that their names has not come in the White Paper. Instead of doing all this what are we doing? Do you want me to dig up this and place it before the House and the nation? Is it possible? Is it desirable? Is it possible for me to say that so and so has done it? For instance, it is true that a few persons belonging to some

other country were among those killed in action. Whom did I blame for that? **Whom should I name** for that? It is clear and clearly, borne out by inspection **and by facts** that arms bearing marks of certain countries were found here. Whom did I blame for that? Do I blame the Head of the State or the Head of the Government or the Prime Minister or the Defence Minister? **Whom do I blame?** What is the point in asking me to name someone? Clearly naming is not possible. **What we** have to conclude is that arms have come from certain quarters; **and** persons have come from certain countries, and beware of that. **This is all** that can be said. **This is all** that can be done. **Nothing more.** Not only today—not even after this, I tell you we can be more specific. It will not be proper, **it will not be** possible to say that so and so is behind this. What all we can say is foreign forces or foreign hand. I cannot say such and such foreign person. **What does hand mean?** Hand means a force. Where I should not identify the person. I say it is a foreign hand. **What is wrong about it?**

What more needs to be explained in that? I do not see anything more, So, I would respectfully submit to the House that enough has been said. If something needed to be said in the White Paper which was advisedly not said, it was **supplemented in the** debate in this House. So, I do not think it is possible for me to say anything more than this. In fact, no one in this House, no one in this country has any doubt about the identity of the foreign hand. No one. It is only a little pinprick at the Government just to embarrass me and try to press me to say something which I should not say. This is all that is happening. Otherwise there is no illusion. There is no mistake. **There is no doubt in anybody's**

mind. Sir, why did the arms come into the Golden Temple complex. This is something like watching Ramayana the whole night and in the morning saying:

“राम और सोता का रिश्ता क्या था ?”

This is about all. The arms coming into the Golden Temple, Government for whatever reason not being able to intercept them—this is the gist of the whole thing. If we had intercepted the arms then the White Paper would not have become necessary. This debate would not have become necessary. We were asked what were we doing? Why did we not stop them? Why did we not stop arms coming into the Golden Temple? The Government is saying that for certain reasons of susceptibility we could not, in time—in time intercept these arms because a temple is normally not a place for keeping arms. You don't look for arms in a temple. Do you? We didn't? But when we came to know, we told the SGPC, we told them: “Look, you are in charge of this temple. You are managing this temple. We have come to know that criminals are hiding here. We have come to know, we have reason to believe, that arms are being kept here. Will you kindly ask the criminals to get out?” We gave a list—X, Y, Z, A, B, C. “Will you see that arms are not kept there or whatever arms are kept are taken out?” If they had done it, there was no question of any action. What the White Paper asks you is. Ask yourself. Is it conceivable that all this would have happened without the knowledge of the SGPC? It was in our knowledge to some extent. The White Paper has said it. Thousands of people are going into the temple. Is it possible to frisk every person? Would that not be resented? Is it possible to search every truck that goes into the temple out of the hundreds that go and come? Is it possible? How much time does one truck take to be completely searched? And is it humanly possible to do that? The most unfortunate

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

part of it is that this temple had been made an arsenal, had been used for things for which no temple is used or should be used. Why don't we attack that point? Why do you say: Why did you not stop this? Why did you not stop that? The point is that I did not stop it because I had not expected such a thing to happen. When I came to know about it, I asked those who are in charge of the temple to help me. What is the reply that I get? "Nothing is happening here. There is no criminal here. There are no arms. What are you talking about?" And as the Prime Minister said yesterday, when we told them, "Look, this is happening; we know that this is happening. Let us discuss how to stop it", they said, "This is an extraneous matter." They refused to discuss it. How is it an extraneous matter? Can any hon. Member say that in the context of the Golden Temple, in the context of the entire agitation, in the context of all the demands, all the replies, all the correspondence that went on, and all the issues that have been thrown up, the question of the Golden Temple being used for this purpose is extraneous? Can anyone seriously say that? But they said it. Absolutely, flatly, they said, "Nothing doing. This cannot be discussed." So what do we conclude? All that was being done by Bhindranwale. But Bhindranwale should be released, according to the Akali Dal. Akali Dal tells us, "Nothing is happening here". And when we go in, we are blamed. Now, what kind of logic is this? I just cannot understand this. Therefore, Sir, the point is that now we have to look to the future, as many Members have said.

My friend, Mr. Khushwant Singh, wanted me, wanted the Government to send in commandos or have a blockade; cut electricity, cut water, cut this, cut that and all would have come out.

यह तो चांदबीबी का किस्सा हो गया
अकबर ने आठ-दस महीने तक अग्रहद

नगर के किले का मुहासिरा किया था
तब भी चांदबीबी नहीं मानी ?

She did not surrender. This is history. So they want us to do an Ahmednagar in Amritsar on the Golden Temple. And when I inform this august House that there were more than 10,000 bags of wheat in the Langar and that there was a whole Sarovar for water, what is the kind of blockade I can do? So all these ideas are not practicable. And what would have happened? We had one experience of Moga. You surround a temple and thousands of people come from all sides. How do you stop them? Do you want to shoot them down outside? Is it possible? Is it not going to create a situation infinitely worse than the situation that we were faced with? What kind of a strategy is this? Coming from a writer, a military strategy of this kind is something which should not be taken seriously. That is all that one can say.

Sir, I come to the last point—Kar Seva. It is not true that the SGPC was kept out of it. There have been negotiations. They have been talked to. They have been given the first opportunity to do Kar Seva if they so wished. They were persuaded to take it up. First what we got in writing from the priests was unconditional. They said, yes, we are going to do it. Within 24 hours all kinds of conditions were put. About Akal Takht they were not prepared to say that they are going to repair it. They would have started it with Sarovar where everything goes under, nothing is seen, and for months and months, if not years, Akal Takht would have remained like that. Is it good for the country?—I am asking. It is not because we want to do anything ourselves. Would any honourable Member say that Akal Takht should be left in that condition, for any length of time? Should the No. 1 priority not go to Akal Takht? We wanted this. They did not agree. They were not prepared to commit on anything. And

finally they said, every armyman, even in mufti, even not in uniform, should go and hand it over to us first and then it is up to us what we would like to do. Is it possible to accept this? In any case, what has Kar Seva got to do with the army? They are there in order to meet a particular situation. Their presence there has **nothing to do with the Kar Seva**. Thousands of people are coming and thousands more will come. Kar Seva will be done, because the devout people, Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims, everybody, would certainly want this to be reconstructed. Nobody would like these pock marks to remain for all times. That is why it has to be done and, as the Prime Minister said, it will be done.

Now about another dramatic incident which was cited here, very dramatic. An aircraft is waiting there at the airport. Some talks are going on here. Something has finally been settled. Someone is to take this to Amritsar to put the final seal. It is at that time that this Government went back on it and, therefore, it fell through. A beautiful scenario with all the elements of suspense in it! But is that true? And if someone has been briefing honourable Members on these absurd lines, I only say, please don't believe...

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: It has appeared in 'The Hindu'

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Khushwant Singh... (Interruptions).

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am not talking about the Markists. I am talking about whoever is briefing. I like 'The Hindu' very much. But I do not know whether you take it as a gospel truth in all situations. I do not know.

First of all, I would like to say that there is a discrepancy in the date mentioned by the honourable Member. The first secret meeting was on the 16th and 17th November. It has been mentioned here. It is a fact

that at this meeting, draft formulations on various issues which could form the basis of a settlement were discussed. If anyone wants to see how many papers and non-papers were discussed—I have not destroyed them still—you can step into my house. I will show them. You will need almost half the room to fill them with. So many papers and, in diplomatic language, non-papers were discussed. These non-papers flew around in their hundreds, I must say. Any number of people came to me with formulations. Yes, why not? If somebody has some bright idea which can disentangle the whole thing, why not take it? Very patiently myself, Venkataraman or Pranab Mukherjee listened to them. Whosoever brought some idea or solution was talked to. Advaniji had a dig at me. He said I had become the *de facto* Home Minister then. No.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Nothing wrong about it?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is only factually wrong. It is a fact that at these meetings draft formulations on various issues which could form the basis of a settlement were discussed. However, no agreed draft had emerged. There were number of differences in the standpoint of Akali Dal and that of the Government on the issues under discussion. I have already related all the differences. We can give you a blank cheque. You tell us how Akalis are right and how we are wrong on any of these issues.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Nobody supported Akalis.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: You did not. But it is not true that nobody sided with the Akalis and put the blame on the Government. Many did in this very debate. Here are the issues. Here are the Government decisions. Here are the Akali decisions. You be the judge. Therefore, it is fantastic again to say that something emerged and we killed it. I may further add that shortly after the meeting representatives of Akali

(Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao)

Dal informed that they consider inclusion of Yamuna waters an essential point of reference to the Judge who will adjudicate the river waters issue. Would you have liked me to take that as the starting point of negotiations? So, who broke it? Did the Government break it? Is it the case that because the aircraft was waiting in Palam I should have rushed to occupy that aircraft anyhow? What kind of dramatisation is this? At every meeting with the Akali Dal leaders we had very, very cordial and friendly discussions. No rancour at all because we thought that those discussions would fructify. There was no question of blaming them. Even in the White Paper we have not blamed anybody. We are placing facts before you, what they said and what we said. It is for anyone to judge. There is no question of our blaming anyone. What happened at the very last meeting on 26th May? Mr. Badal said on the 22nd that they are not having any meetings with Government. On the 26th we had met, three days after he said that. This is the crux of the matter. That was the most crucial meeting in which Pranab Mukherjee and myself were there. They said:

“हमारी सारी बात आप मान लीजिए और कोई तरीका नहीं है” जो हम चाहते हैं सारी बात मान लीजिए। आपसे इतना ही कहने के लिए हम आये हैं।

although it took two hours to bring that *fatwa* out. But that was the crux of the whole thing. Would any honourable Member ever have wanted me to agree? It was not possible. We have been taking the stand and no one in Parliament will really agree that we should agree to all the Akali demands. On Chandigarh, how many variations came including, at one meeting, the division of Chandigarh? Someone said that they were prepared to agree to a division, that they said so in one of the tripartite

meetings, in one of the asides. I do not know how it emerged. We had not thought of a division of Chandigarh. But, if the Akali Party is going to agree to that, then, even so, we said, बताइये कहाँ करें।

Then somebody said, “Madhya Marg”. Then somebody else said, “No Madhya Marg because that would mean that somebody’s house would fall in Haryana who happens to be a Punjab leader”. How can such a thing happen? So, they suggested some other line. Now one full meeting was devoted to this. Where do you draw the line? We never wanted to draw the line and we never wanted Chandigarh to be divided. We were told by someone, by someone who is a knowledgeable person, who had been talking to them, that there is a possibility and if we press a little, they would agree. Well, at that meeting—it was my impression—in any case at that meeting, they did not reject it. We had to go to another meeting to find it rejected. So, all these things have gone on for whatever reasons. Again, I am not attributing motives. After all, we have to live together. That is a party with which we have to deal and there is no question of running down any party or any individual. The point is that the situation was such that they could not do anything and we could not do anything. In spite of all our efforts, we did not succeed, and this is the story that is related in the White Paper. So, if somebody asks me what we were doing all these days or months, this is my simple answer. Therefore, please don’t attribute motives and they will not stick in any case in the face of what has been said in the White Paper. That is the point and that is the purpose of this White Paper. Not to blame anyone, but at least not to let anyone blame the Government as nauseam as has happened in this debate. Sometimes one feels hurt because all the restraint shown in this White Paper, all the sobriety shown, all the factual authenticity shown, have been thrown to the winds by some of the speeches.

So, I would say, "Let us go back to the White Paper and this is a document which shows the way for the future also". In a very very sober manner it shows the way and it shows what is on and what is not on. We want to take steps and we want to continue our efforts to find solutions. All these are on. What is not on is what the Prime Minister referred to yesterday.

So, this is the position. I can go into many more details. But I do not think that is necessary. I have given the spirit of the Government, the approach of the Government. Some of the points that were raised were just to create an impression that the Government are responsible for all the delays and they went back on everything and that was why everything fell through. That is not correct. In all sincerity I can tell you that that is not correct. If Akalis went back, I am not also blaming them because there had been pressures on them to go back everytime. You may remember that at every stage, when something was jelling, when something was seeming to fructify, there were fresh killings.

3 P.M.

This is well known. The technique is well known. Why should I blame them? What I am saying is that they were under pressure. They were under so much of fear of all kinds that they went on changing their attitude, their position. And the most important, the most dramatic, if I may say so, graphic, is article 25. When did they ever tell us what they wanted under article 25? When? Did they tell us here? Did they tell us outside? They said: we want article 25(2)(b) or whatever to be amended: on the third day we court arrest and we start an agitation. In my very first meeting I asked them—several important persons were there—I said: Did you ever tell us what you want about article 25? At least tell us now. I was alone in that meeting: other colleagues were not there.

मैंने कहा, आप बताइये, क्या करना चाहिए।

They started looking at each other. (Interruptions) One said something: the other contradicted. So I said:

यह ठोक नहीं है। आप बताइये, ऐसा क्यों आपने शुरू किया ?

Why should you go to jail for this? We are prepared to look into it. If there is any doubt that article 25 is something which is not in your interest we are prepared to look into it. Why do you have to go to jail?" I asked them. You know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in answer to that I got a few enigmatic smiles. (Interruptions) So, Sir, this is the story. We would like to look at it positively. But first normalcy has to come. There may be different opinions on what we mean by normalcy. Mr. Khushwant Singh said: you did all this and still terrorism is continuing, as if terrorism is something which can be switched off and on at will. (Interruptions) It is continuing in many other parts of the country. It is continuing in the other border areas—for how many decades. I do not know. So does it mean that the action was wrong? What kind of logic is this? Therefore, normalcy has to come. Yes, everyone has to see to it that whatever feelings have been frayed, sentiments have been hurt, they will have to be mollified. But whatever is done, it cannot be at the cost of unity. That has of course to be understood. Within these limits certainly. Let us all try to obliterate the memory of this from the country, from the nation, from the mind of the nation. Government is all for it.

Failure of intelligence also has been mentioned. I do not think anything has been concealed in the White Paper. That aspect has been clearly brought out. To what extent intelligence was adequate, what was the deficiency, to what extent it was right—these things have been brought out. Naturally we will have to look into those things: if something has gone wrong how to set it right. So all this will have to be looked into. It will take time. It is not going to be done overnight.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: But the point is that we are looking into the future in the right manner, in the right direction and in the right spirit, Sir. So I would like the House to pass this Resolution. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up the Calling Attention.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IM- PORTANCE—

Recent Violent Incidents of Commu- nal Nature in Bhiwandi and Bombay

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the recent violent incidents of communal nature in Bhiwandi and Bombay and the action taken by Government in this regard.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN
THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH):** Sir, it is a matter of great sorrow that communal strife took a considerable toll of life and property at Bhiwandi, Thane and Bombay in May, 1984.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I request the hon. Minister to wait. Let us be serious. We are talking about a communal riot which took away almost 250 lives. The Treasury Benches are more interested in leaving the House. They might as well wait for two minutes. I cannot hear anything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The whole House has been sitting throughout the lunch. Naturally, Members would like to go out. Mr. Minister, please read from the beginning.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, it is a matter of great sorrow that communal strife took a considerable toll of life and property at Bhiwandi, Thane and Bombay in May, 1984.

At a meeting organised by the

Hindu Maha Sangh at Bombay on 21st April, 1984, Shri Bal Thakre spoke in critical terms of Muslims and what he called their anti-national activities. An Urdu weekly of Bombay, namely 'Akhbar-E-Alam' reported the speech in distorted terms alleging derogatory references about the Prophet in its issue of 13th May, 1984. Another weekly 'Sobat' of Pune carried a provocative article under caption 'Muslims cannot stay in India' in its issue dated 6th May, 1984. Muslims at Parbhani took out protest demonstrations from 7th May, 1984. An effigy of Shri Bal Thakre with a garland of chappals was taken out in a procession on 11th May, 1984. Shiv Sainiks reacted by organising 'bandh' in parts of Bombay on the 16th and 17th May. This evoked counter-reaction in Bhiwandi which included hoisting of green flags by one community, which in turn led to altercations between the two communities. There was also some talk of a 'Muslim Sena' being raised. These events led to riots in Bhiwandi which later spread to Kalyan, Thane city, rural areas of Thane district and Bombay.

The State Government took immediate steps to control the situation by moving S.R.P. companies and also by deploying Army. The situation became almost normal by early June, 1984. These incidents, however, continued to take place in the latter part of June in Bombay and its suburbs and army was called in and normalcy was restored.

In these riots 278 persons lost their lives. 1307 cases were registered in which 3860 persons were arrested. 8587 persons were taken in preventive custody and 154 persons have been detained under the National Security Act which included some Shiv Sena Pramukhs. Cases have been registered for inflammatory utterances against Shri Bal Thakre, the Editor of 'Sohat' and others.

The State Government took immediate steps to provide relief to the riot victims by organising relief