

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): There is a similar Motion in the Lok Sabha, and the Home Minister is there in the Lok Sabha, and I have been asked to deal with this matter here. This is no disrespect to the House at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is a similar Motion in the Lok Sabha also.

### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

#### *Situation in Punjab*

SHRI HARIKISHAN SINGH SURJEET (Punjab): Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the situation in Punjab.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): Sir, as the House is aware, Government have been making earnest efforts to consider and find a solution to the demands of the Shiromani Akali Dal. Extensive discussions have been held with representatives of the Shiromani Akali Dal. In the last few rounds of discussions, the Leaders of Opposition Parties in Parliament as well as the Chief Ministers and Opposition Leaders of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan have been associated.

2. I must express my thanks to the Leaders of the Opposition in Parliament for their participation and their valuable contribution to the tripartite talks.

3. Our effort has been to understand the viewpoint of all the concerned parties. Government have always been sympathetic to the sentiments and interests of all communities. The Honourable Members would appreciate that solutions to any demands and grievances have to be found keeping in mind the larger national interests.

4. The Government have accepted the religious demands of the Sikh community.

5. The questions of sharing of the waters of Ravi-Beas and territorial adjustments concerned other States also. These issues have been discussed with the Chief Ministers and the Leaders of the Opposition of the concerned States as also in tripartite talks. The Government's constant endeavour is to arrive at a solution acceptable to all. Efforts in this direction are continuing.

6. I earnestly make an appeal to all concerned through this House that we should continue to strive for a solution through negotiations, acceptable to all and not do anything which may precipitate the situation. In a democracy negotiations and spirit of accommodating each other's point of view are the only way by which solutions can be found. From our side we shall always be conciliatory. Doors are always open for talks. We believe in resolving problems through negotiations, but the solution of one problem should not give rise to other problems. We will continue to seek solution in this spirit.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in the beginning I would request you to accommodate me for a little more time because this is a very important issue. I also want to speak in the same spirit which the Government says it wants, to find a solution. The position is, the situation in Punjab is becoming alarming. It reminds me, if it is allowed to drift further, it may develop into the same situation which we faced in 1947. The extremists, beginning with the Sikh extremists and followed by the Hindu extremists, are playing havoc with the State. And that is why it is all the more necessary that Parliament, our House plays its part in helping to find a solution.

Sir, in the beginning, there is no doubt that the Sikh extremists raised many slogans vitiating the atmosphere. I had earlier also stated that that person was boosted by the Congress Party itself, perhaps to create a rival leadership against the Akali Party. But now that has become

a problem. Subsequently they put forward a long charter of demands, confusing many issues, with which no democratic-minded person could agree. In the earlier demands they had put across, they had stated that the Sikhs are a nation and they had also talked of the supremacy of the Sikhs. These were written in the Anandpur Sahib Resolution of 1973. But subsequently, as everybody is aware, before launching this struggle, Mr. Prakash Singh Badal, former Chief Minister of the State and an important leader of the Akali Party, on 3rd August, before court-martialing arrest, wrote a letter to the leaders of Opposition parties stating categorically that these were the 10 important demands, four relating to the Sikhs as a religious community and six concerning the whole Punjabi people. That was a clear demarcation from the separatist demands of the extremists. That was a clear demarcation which put the demands on a rational basis, which could be considered and discussed. He courted arrest on the 4th of August. But, Sir, the Government did not take any note of it, and it took the Government three months, when thousands went to prison—and it was difficult to control the prisons themselves—to intervene and try to forge links with them for negotiation. Sir, it was wrong to go on saying, "They are demanding this, they are demanding that", when the leader of that party had said clearly, "These are the ten demands which we are raising at." at that time I had written to the Prime Minister saying, "You take this letter as the base. This has come from an authoritative person, who represents them." Then, Sir, what happened? Towards the end of October, liaison was established and a person appointed to negotiate with them. On the 3rd November we came to know that we were nearing a solution and only some more time was required to discuss with other States. But unfortunately the time given was not properly utilised. The Akalis had to take further steps on the 4th November.

But on the 4th November, they gave time for 15 days. They said they would take further course of action on the 19th November. But the 15 days were lost. The Government did not try immediately to

establish contact and discuss it with other States to find out a solution. It is only on the 16th November that some negotiations started. On the 18th also the Akalis were reasonable and some understanding was nearing when the talks broke down. Subsequently on the 19th what happened? Nobody wanted that somebody should come and create disturbances in Asia. The leaders had made their intentions clear. But so many things were done which strengthened the extremist forces. One would not, cannot; one should denounce what happened in Haryana at that time, how the people, everybody with a turban, coming, was dishonoured. I know one High Court Judge who was coming, he had to take eight hours from Chandigarh to reach Delhi. I know some military officers who were in regular army, how they were insulted. All this was instigated. This was playing into the hands of the extremists, not helping to find a solution. Subsequently again time was lost. It is in the last part of December again the Government set up a committee, a Cabinet sub-committee, who thought direct negotiations will help and they started discussions. So, it was given in the press. Then it was stated that all religious demands have been accepted. After the negotiations of 18th January we find that there is a break, there is a deadlock. Then on 22nd the Prime Minister had called all-parties meeting which we had been demanding earlier. In this meeting of all opposition parties she placed facts and almost the impression was that we have tried to find out a solution but we have failed. This is the opposition now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA) (in the Chair)

In that meeting opposition leaders said that so far as denouncing the extremists is concerned, we are one with you, we will not accept anything which will create bad blood between different communities, we also condemned the murderous attacks being made or assaults being organised by the Sixth extremists, we condemn all that. We also demarcated from 1973 Anandpur Sahib resolution of 1973. At the same time the Opposition had suggested: is it not necessary for us to listen to them whether they can see reason and we may

[Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet]

bring them to some position? This unanimous desire of the Opposition parties was accepted. It was then, on 24th and 25th itself, because they had decided to take further steps, on 26th—that tripartite meeting was called. I can tell you on 24th and 25th, in two days' meeting a big achievement was there on the part of the tripartite meeting. What are the issues? There was a problem. The issue for them was they were also insisting—it had become an important issue—and the issue was State autonomy. It was highlighted in the country in the recent elections as well as in various forums. The Centre, Akalis and the opposition leaders agree on a formula and so they arrived at a unanimous conclusion. It was not a small achievement at that time. That was an important issue, because out of all those issues, after having stated, religious demands have been accepted, the only demands which remained were three important demands. One was relating to the Centre-State relations. That they had put forth in the Anandpur Sahib resolution. The other demand was territorial dispute and then the water dispute. Two out of the three important demands were discussed in two days' time. We were able to come to some conclusion. There was a broad conclusion on two demands. We come to the conclusion on the demand of State autonomy, that a committee of experts should go into the question of Centre-State relations. That was agreed upon by all. The second important question which was debated was the water dispute. On that also a broad agreement was reached. They are demanding a judicial scrutiny. They were opposed to any executive decision this way or that way. They were only demanding a judicial scrutiny over water dispute. In that respect agreement was arrived at. On this question a formula proposed by me was accepted by the Opposition and the Akalis and the Government wanted time to consult the state of Rajasthan and Haryana. The formula consisted four points that the notification of 1976 be cancelled and that the agreement of 1981 be annulled; the dispute be referred to a tribunal under the inter-state River

Waters Disputes Act, 1956. In the meantime the existing arrangement should be allowed to continue; and that Haryana should be allowed to dig the canal so that when the decision takes place, they are in a position to benefit out of it. Government stated that "On this issue, we have to consult the concerned States". The matter was left at that stage.

Subsequently we discussed the territorial dispute also. But what happened was that we had to adjourn the meeting. The Akalis had agreed to one thing. Earlier they had decided that on the 26th or 27th January they would hand over the resignation letters of all Akali M.Ps. and MLAs. They agreed to defer that decision on the request of the opposition parties. The tripartite conference had to be adjourned because of elections in various States. When it resumed, it had achieved a lot. You will be amazed to know that. Here the statement is very disappointing because it has not taken note of the fact that how the earlier talks broke down and were restarted at the intervention of the opposition and how they helped in bringing them together to find a solution. It seems to me that when the solution. It seems to me that when the Government called the opposition leaders to tell them the story, the talks had broken down. But oppositions' intervention provide useful. What happened was that in those negotiation only one question remained, unresolved, it was a very small question and I tell you that if the Government cannot find a solution for that, I do not know how they are functioning. It seems to me that the Government is depending on its bureaucracy for a solution. They cannot find any political solution to the problem. What was that question? It was that 1976 notification and 1981 agreement should be annulled and the issue should be referred to the Tribunal. The dispute between Haryana and Punjab should be annulled and the issue should be referred to the Tribunal. The dispute between Haryana and Punjab should be referred

to the Tribunal and the canal should be dug in two years. After that the difference remains only on one issue. And that was the arrangement for the interim period. Earlier the suggestion was that the present distribution of water should continue. The Government wanted instead agreement should continue. The difference That was the only problem left. The Akalis were accommodative on territorial demand. I had appealed to the Akalis and told them that it does not make any practical difference whether it is allocation or distribution because anyway it will take two years for the canal to be dug. This was not such a major issue like the Cauvery water dispute or the Narmada water dispute. All the facts and figures are available. Haryana cannot utilise any extra water till the canal is dug. On this can you not find a solution either by discussing with Akalis or after you discuss with Haryana Government yourself? I fail to understand. What does the Government do after this? I am not going into the other details because I want the solution to be found. I am not going to give my opinions on the various issues. But I know that only on this issue disagreement remains. And the Government is silent since then. We wanted to isolate the extremists from the Akalis. They are all mingled together and they are playing havoc with the State. We wanted to help those forces who are taking a rational stand and are in favour of finding a solution. But it seems the Government has taken recourse to another method. A few days ago unilaterally the Prime Minister announced the acceptance of all religious demands of the Akalis by the Government. I do not know much about these religious demands. I cannot understand them either. I am not capable of interpreting them. But I do not understand anything about the holy or unholy cities in the country. And also, Sir, I do not understand somebody calling somebody else holy or unholy. I cannot understand all these things. Anyway, the Government has dealt with them and has evolved some formulae. But, according to me, if this logic carried forward, then, Sir, no city will remain holy because somewhere some incidents take place. But that is a different point

and I do not want to go into that now. Anyway, Sir, the Home Minister has stated that the religious demands have been accepted. So, on that the Government is very clear. But why is it that, instead of carrying on the negotiations with them and finding a solution to that problem, they want and decided like this? Perhaps they wanted to create a wedge between these groups? They have given up the idea of negotiations?

Then, Sir, yesterday, I was amazed to see something. Some five thousand persons were brought from Punjab in the name of Sikhs by the Congress (I) Party to the house of the Prime Minister to thank her and to say, "You have accepted our religious demands". I can tell you that six months back if these religious demands had been accepted, the acceptance of these demands six months back, could have played something. Now, the issues which are before the people are: the issue relating to water and the issue relating to the territorial dispute. Now, five thousand people are being brought and so much money is being spent on them to bring them here.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): It just reminds us of the days of the emergency.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: Yes. So much money is being spent to bring people here. We know the position of the Congressmen. So much money is being spent to bring them here to tell: "We thank you for the acceptance of the religious demands". Those who came here had not raised any of the demands, none of them had raised any of the demands which have been accepted. Sir, it seems that they have started taking this course because they do not want to settle this. You do not want to settle this with those who are taking a rational stand. Perhaps you are inclined to isolate them and to talk to those who are talking the extremist position among the Sikhs and all these things are done only towards that end.

SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANSPAL (Punjab): Sir, I want to correct him on one thing. (Interruptions)

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: No, I am not yielding.

SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANS-PAL: Sir, I want to make a point here. (*Interruptions*). He is stating some wrong facts. He says that the Government had stopped the negotiations. But, Sir, it is the Akalis who walked out of the negotiations.

THE VICE -CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Very well.

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: It is wrong, Sir, I can say on behalf of all the Opposition leaders that the Akalis were reasonable.

SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH HANS-PAL: It is the Akalis who walked out of the tripartite conference. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE -CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): Order, please. Will you kindly resume your seat, Mr. Hanspal?

SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET: You see, I am feeling more concerned because I have done something for the national independence and I know the values created by the national movement. I know the period of 1947 and I know what happened then. This reminds me of that period. I know what values were created and I know what values are at stake today. That is why I am feeling more concerned and this procedure and this practice that you are adopting will not be helping in finding a solution, but it is going to worsen the situation in the State and that is why I want to ask the Home Minister whether, immediately after everything is agreed upon, they cannot find a solution to the problem of allocation and distribution and also whether, they would not establish any contact with the Akali leadership and with others also who are concerned, to see that things are not allowed to drift on this small issue. If this is done, Sir, I am sure even now the situation can be saved and I may tell you that, after a few days, things will not be in the hands of the present Akali leadership, but they will pass on to the extremists who are instigating the people in their speeches in the Manji Sahab. If people go to listen to them and if their feelings are worked up, I do not know

what will happen to the State and with Punjab being a border State and with Pakistan nearby being armed by the US imperialists, if instability and insecurity develop in the State of Punjab, that will affect the whole country. This is not an issue concerning Punjab and the people of Punjab alone. That is why I would like the Minister to take the initiative immediately because everyday being lost is very precious and if the things go out of control and go out of their hands and pass on into the hands of the extremists, then it is going to worsen the situation. I am sure I am expressing the feelings of others also because others are also feeling the same way. This is the feeling which all the Opposition leaders who attended the tripartite meetings expressed and they were all helpful and I am sure the Government will take this course and not the course which it has adopted. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Government deeply appreciate the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member Sir, he is a veteran freedom fighter and his contribution for the independence of the country and subsequently for communal harmony is well recognized in this House. He has been playing a very useful and constructive role in bringing the parties to the negotiating table and find a solution of this very vexed problem. Sir, I have stated in my statement that Government will never shut the doors for negotiation and negotiations are always open. I will again reiterate—I quote from my statement:

“From our side we shall always be conciliatory. Doors are always open for talks. We believe in resolving problems through negotiations. . . .

This is the stand taken by the Government. We are always ready for talks, and whatever solutions have to be found they have to be found to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Two or three points the hon. Member has raised with regard to the sharing of Ravi-Beas waters and territorial adjustments. These do not concern only one State. The States of Rajasthan, Haryana

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah]

and Punjab are all concerned. Efforts are being made. With the help of the Opposition leaders who have participated in the tripartite talks, we are happy, efforts have been made. We are happy to say that the differences have been narrowed down considerably and Government is trying to find a solution satisfactory to these people. The same is the case with territorial adjustments. Talks have been held with various parties, various Governments and also the Opposition parties in this regard. All these efforts go to show that Government is sincere in resolving these differences and narrowing down these differences and have a solution. We will never hesitate to find solutions for these problems.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:** What about the Tribunals, Mr. Minister? He asked you about the Tribunal.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH:** This is what I have been telling. Through negotiations or through tribunals or whatever it is, the parties concerned in these matters will be taken into confidence. The differences have been narrowed down and a satisfactory solution will be found.

Sir, about the Centre-State relationship, the hon. Member has raised a point. Sir, it has been made known that Government was also prepared to consider the suggestion for the appointment of a committee of experts to examine within the present constitutional framework, certain points which have been raised on the question of Centre-State relations. So Sir, I will again appeal to the Members of the Opposition to help the Government in arriving at a satisfactory solution (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET:** Sir, it would have been better if the Home Minister was present, because he does not know perhaps the whole thing. This has been agreed to. Tribunal has been agreed to by Rajasthan, Haryana and Punjab. On this there is no trouble. Only one point remains, and that is, during the interim period till the decision of the Tribunal, what is going to remain. That is the only thing remaining to be settled. Nothing else remains to be settled.

**SHRI GHANSHYAMBHAI OZA:** (Gujarat): It is a very small point—distribution... (*Interruptions*)

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA):** There are 10 hon. Members to take part in this debate today. Today is the Non-official day. So, if it is convenient to all the hon. Members to make their points, the hon. Minister will be requested to answer at the end.

**SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, is it possible for the Union Home Minister to be here at any time, because I may point out that the discussion that we are having today has a direct bearing on the talks that took place and the various nuances and shades of opinions expressed? This is a point raised by Mr. Surjeet in respect of allocation and flow of water and actual utilisation. So the difference was about the allocation and utilisation of water. The Home Minister is fully conversant with these things because he was present. Perhaps, the Minister of State was not present and, therefore, he is not conversant with these things. So, is it possible for the Minister of Home Affairs to come?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA):** Now, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, please.

संसदीय कार्य विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री कल्प नाथ राय) : आदरणीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आडवाणी जी ने जो बातें कही हैं उनके संबंध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने गृह मंत्री जी से सबेरे बात की थी तो उन्होंने कहा कि इसी विषय पर ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव लोक सभा में आ रहा है और उसी समय आ रहा है इसलिए मुझे वहाँ मौजूद रहना है।

श्री अरविन्द गणेश कुलकर्णी : उनको पांच बजे के बाद बुलाइये।

**श्री कल्प नाथ राय :** उन्होंने कहा कि श्री वेंकटसुब्बा जी हमारे बिनाफ पर रिप्लाय करेंगे। ऐसा उन्होंने कहा है। इसलिए उनका आना संभव नहीं है।

**श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी :** वहाँ पर कॉलिंग अटेंशन जो होता है लिमिटेड होता है वहाँ पर पाँच सदस्य बोलते हैं वहाँ इतना समय नहीं लगता, हमारे यहाँ तो यह एक प्रकार से डिबेट हो जाता है।

**श्री कल्प नाथ राय :** श्री वेंकटसुब्बा जी भी उसी गरिमा को रखते हैं, उनको आप सुनिए। गृह मंत्री जा नहीं आ सकते।

**श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी :** शाम को अगर यहाँ आ जाते हैं तो इससे लोक सभा के साथ भी व्याप हो सकेगा और राजा तथा के साथ भी व्याप हो सकेगा तो अच्छा होगा।

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:** Sir, is he coming after 5 o'clock or not?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA):** You have heard what the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has said.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:** Sir, he spoke in Hindi and I could not understand. Please tell me whether the Home Minister is coming at 5.

**SHRI KALP NATH RAI:** The Home Minister is not coming at 5 o'clock. Shri Venkatasubbaiahji, who is also the State Minister, will reply on behalf of the Home Minister.

**SHRI A. G. KULKARNI:** Will he come?

**SHRI KALP NATH RAI:** No.

**SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH (Nominated):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, I would like to express my sense of bewilderment at the tortuous negotiations that have been carried on between the Akali leaders and the Government. We have been literally bombarded by a plethora of statements coming from the Prime Minister, Cabinet Ministers and Akali leaders without any clear indication of what has been going on. It is only through my association with friends like Comrade Surjeet and Mr. Sarup Singh that I got some inkling that we were very close to a settlement which later eluded us. According to Comrade Surjeet the blame lies in the court of the Government, according to Mr. Sarup Singh, in the court of the Akalis. Nevertheless, here we have a situation prolonged over eight months, when matters could have been settled much earlier. The Akalis pulled out from archives an antique resolution which they themselves have not carefully read, and the Government treats it with the indifference that it deserves at that time. Meanwhile Akalis mount an enormous morcha; 90,000 go to jail, over 130 are killed and now their legislators have put in their resignations. However, Mr. Vice-Chairman, one thing that I and, I think, all of us understood clearly was that this was to be a firm and final settlement, that there would be no piecemeal deal, but a package settlement between the two parties. That is why I was a little pained and surprised that last week there was no package settlement, no deal with the Akali leaders but a statement made to receptive audiences

both at the Prime Minister's House and then at a local Gurdwara conceding what are described as religious demands. I agree with Comrade Surjeet. I do not see anything particularly religious about them. And they are so peripheral that they do not deserve to be taken seriously. I concede that it is a legitimate exercise on the part of a politician to take the kind of step that the Prime Minister did. I think it is legitimate on the part of any politician to try and sow the seeds of discord in the ranks of his or her adversaries. It is legitimate for a politician but it is not farsighted and it is not an act of statesmanship. Giving sikhs the right to carry a kirpan in aircraft—hardly any Sikh bothers to carry a kirpan longer than a tooth pick size replica in their combs—these are merely scratching the surface of the problem unless we grapple with the real issues things with more tack and firmness, this festering sore will become a plague which will continue to plague us for many generations to come. The point that I would like to emphasise above all is that if a deal has to be made, it must be made with the Longowal faction of the Akalis. Any deal with little splinter groups scattered here and there is of no consequence and it will not last.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear.

**SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH:** Secondly, Sir, the issues are very simple and my friend, Comrade Surjeet has analysed them very carefully. One is about the future of Chandigarh and minor adjustment of boundaries in the agreement with the States of Punjab and Haryana, and the other is with regard to river waters where, again, Comrade Surjeet has pointed out, hardly any difference remains.

**DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra):** If Haryana does not agree, what happens?

**SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH:** Haryana agrees.

**SHRI HARKISHAN SINGH SURJEET:** If you do not want them to agree, that is a different matter.

**SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH:** There is basically hardly any difference left which cannot be sorted out. In addition, I would suggest that when the Government does come to the negotiating table and brings the Akalis with them, they should also incorporate a couple of more points in this settlement so that peace finally returns to the Punjab. The first is their demand for more industries in the State. The State is woe short of industries, like textiles, sugar, fertilisers and I would even suggest a nuclear power plant, because the State has hardly any mineral resources, to exploit for producing energy in any way. Another point which I would like to mention, because I think it may become a problem in future, is regarding the migration of non-Punjabi labour to Punjab. I do not suggest by no means that there should be any impediments in the way of one Indian citizen going from one State to another State to earn a living. But if it takes place on a large scale as we have seen taking place in Assam it can create social, economic and communal troubles, which can have far-reaching consequences I would suggest that some means should be found so that such a problem does not arise. We should bear this in mind because we do not want another kind of Shiv Sena building up in Punjab. We do not want the sons of the soil theory erupting in the Punjab.

I emphasise as Comrade Surjeet has pointed out that the time is running short. When the solution is possible, it should be grappled immediately. I, as a part time historian, can foresee that the most serious danger of allowing the Punjab affairs to drift will create a further rift between the Hindus and the Sikhs. Today we may be able to stop this. In the history of this country it has been seen that communities which have broken away from the Hindus, like the Jains and the Buddhists, have gradually come closer to the mother community. We are now witnessing in the Punjab a reverse process. A community born out of the Hindus is being deliberately allowed to break away

[Shri Khushwant Singh]

from it and create a distance which may be too serious to bridge at a later stage. We have already paid a heavy price for it and if we do not stop it our future generations will pay even a heavier price.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while the hon. Minister took care to express thanks to the leaders of the opposition for their participation and valuable contribution in the tripartite talks, it has been rather surprising as my friends, like Mr. Khushwant Singh, have just now said that the subject which was sought to be raised above partisan level through the induction of opposition leaders has somehow, for some reason, been dragged back to a partisan level. It is unfortunate. It is unfortunate on a number of counts. Firstly, when the Parliament was in session we do not understand how the Prime Minister thought it prudent to make such a major policy announcement outside the House and not only outside the House but at a congregation, at a religious congregation, where she went to thank the Sikhs of Delhi for their support to her party in the last Delhi elections. If that was the approach..... (Interruptions). The Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs are supposed to have some Parliamentary sense and to understand that when a point is being made, the best way to counter the point is always not to interrupt one like this.

So, sir, the Prime Minister took a decision to make that announcement about the religious demands. The next step followed. The Sikhs of Delhi—as my friend Mr. Khushwant Singh said—quite a number of them, were brought to her residence to thank her for granting some of the demands which had been causing concern to the Akalis and other friends in Punjab. This, as I said, is almost an insult to Parliament. Secondly, it does not fit in with the spirit in which the Opposition leaders were trying to associate themselves with the solution of the problem. And if it was decided for partisan gain, well then, I do not know how the Minister again wants the Opposition leaders to help him in the solution of the rest of the problems. This is one part.

The second part is, all along the Government was insisting that it would be a package deal because it does not help in the solution of a problem if you accede to a part of the demands, they are put in storage by the party concerned and negotiation or fight continues about the rest of them. And then there is second instalment of acceptance, and the fight continues for the rest. Had the situation been such that the negotiations were almost on the breaking point, one could have understood this approach. But, Sir, what we hear from the people who were associated with the talks—I myself was also there for a part of the negotiation, although my leader Mr. Advani was there for the major part—it is true as we have been told that the differences had been narrowed down to such an extent that it is really surprising that things should have come to this pass at all. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, therefore in this matter if they have practically given up the hope of solving the problem after reaching a stage where the only remaining problem was of the difference between 'allocation' and 'utilisation' of water. If that is so, it is hardly a compliment to the statesmanship of our country's leadership.

Sir, one point which I wish him to explain. There is something which affects the life of Punjabis much more than anything else it is, the atmosphere of terrorism and violence which has unfortunately resulted because of all the delay or dilly-dallying about the problem. As my friend Mr. Surjeet said, it is true that at the earlier stage, the Congress Party did take part in trying to create a sort of rival leadership among the Sikhs and that plan has boomeranged today, what they thought would be a helping hand to them has become a problem, a headache. But that, Sir should have been the end of the political experimentation. Why should that attitude of trying to have always an eye on the votes, to look out for electoral gains, continue? Why that should be the attitude of the ruling party, is something beyond our comprehension. As far the violence and terrorism, I would appeal to my Akali friends also. I know some of them are as good law-abiding citizens as anybody else. Why should an impression go round that they are equivocal or they do not have a

clear-cut stand on the question of violence, on the question of murders, on terrorism? Why can't they make clear and forthright condemnation of such incidents?

What I am, therefore, asking is this: the people of Punjab have to be assured that their life and liberty would be protected and nobody would be allowed to use religious shrines for the purpose of taking shelter after committing such a crime against any other citizen.

So far as the question of the claim of Punjab on water is concerned, I think there is a case and it has been supported by no less a person than Dr. Kanwar Sen. The only point that was troubling us at the earliest stage of the negotiations was whether the notification of 1955 was also sought to be reopened or only the agreement of 1980. Sir, so far as the agreement of 1980 was to be reopened, there was no difference of opinion. Haryana agreed, Punjab agreed and the matter was to be referred to a judicial tribunal. Even the Akalis unequivocally said that they did not question, they did not mean to reopen the question of water flowing to Rajasthan. Rajasthan has its case and if I am informed correctly even in the court case filed by the Akalis on this question, the Akalis have not questioned the claim of Rajasthan to Punjab waters. Then there is territorial issue.

I must admit—that at an earlier stage some interpretation of the Anandpur Sahib resolution was causing anxiety because in the official papers that had been given to us their was one stated to be the "Anandpur Sahib resolution, Talwandi version." Now this part of the resolution did make certain abnoxious statements. It referred to 'brute majority in India' and accused it "thus shackled and enslaved in unethical and cynical repudiation of solemn and binding commitments and public promises" against the Sikhs "Nation". When we raised it, the Akali leaders said that they did not stand by this and the Anandpur Sahib resolution by which they stood was confined to a demand for re-examination of Centre-State relations on certain matters. Therefore, that again was agreed to be referred to a judicial tribunal. After that why should a situation have arisen when the talks broke down? I am also aware of what happened during the Asian

Games. What happened in Haryana was a disgrace, a scheme. Not only people who could have been considered Akalis but even persons belonging to our party—or for that matter anybody who had a beard and turban—they were not allowed to proceed to Delhi, even for personal business. This is something which should not have.....

**SHRI HARI SHANKAR BHABHRA** (Rajasthan): Even I was prevented.

**DR. SARUP SINGH** (Haryana): If he was prevented, that was the only sensible thing that the Haryana Government did.

**DR. BHAI MAHAVIR**: So, the question, therefore, was, what happened in Haryana. I do not know how it could have appened without at least the knowledge of the Central leadership. That is something for which the Haryana leaders and the Central Government also have to make amends. I hope they have already expressed regrets, the Home Minister did express regrets during talks and that should settle the matter.

Now there are two other minor points which I want to make. One is the question of an All India Gurudwara Act. I hope the Government stick to the stand that inclusion of other gurudwara would be with the agreement or the acceptance of the people concerned. For instance, lots of our Sindhi people have small gurudwaras of their own although they do not fulfil the qualifications which sikhs are ordinarily need to possess. So, if the Nirmalas, the Udasis and the Namdharis are to be included in the campus of the Sikhs, they have to be included with their acceptance or agreement. Today there is an editorial comment in the Hindustan Times that the President made some plain talking with the Akali delegation which went to call upon him to resign. He referred to the incidents of beef having been thrown in places of worship and asked them how that could be justified. I think it is something that the Akali leaders and the Sikh brothers owe it to themselves to explain that they did not approve of any such action. Another news which appeared in today's paper is that the Akali leaders are likely to contact the heads of the countries present in the capital in connection with the Non-aligned Conference. If there

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]

is any truth in it—I am not sure then it is very regrettable that on a question which is our internal, domestic problem anybody should try to ventilate grievances to other countries, to the leaders of other nations. This is not going to add grace to the country's name or to that of any political party or religious group.

With these words, I hope the Government will be able to retrace the wrong steps which seem to have been taken under some pressure or with some temptation or the other and restore the situation where the agreement seemed almost within reach, so that we can reach it with one last effort.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. R. MORARKA): The discussion on the Calling Attention Motion will be resumed at 5 o'clock. The House stands adjourned to meet again at 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one minute past one of the Clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-four minutes past two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. (SHRI-MATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA) in the Chair.

#### CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1977

..(To amend articles 120, 210, insertion of new article 342-A and amendment of articles 343, 344, 346( 348 and 368)—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. (SHRI-MATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA): Now let us take up Private Members' Legislative Business. The Bill for introduction is the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1983. Mr. Murasoli Maran is not here. Now we shall take up the next Bill—further consideration of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. Mr. Gopalsamy, please resume your speech.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Madam Vice-Chairman, with a painful heart I start my speech.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): Why?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Please listen. You will know why. (Interruptions) That

is his custom. Because when I turn my eyes to the Opposition Benches, I am not able to see my esteemed colleague, the great parliamentarian of wit and wisdom and foresight, who stoutly defended this Bill on the floor of this House, hon. Mr. Piloo Mody. The day when the Bill was about to be discussed, when I asked him to participate in the discussion, he told me, "Normally I do not sit in the afternoon." Then I explained to him, "In my State, in Tamil Nadu, there is a strong feeling growing that the politicians in the northern States, irrespective of their political ideologies, are the fanatics of Hindi imposition." Then immediately he told me, "Then I will definitely participate in the discussion." And that day he made an excellent speech. His voice is still ringing in my ears. He was not a pro-DMK man. But he was interested in strengthening the unity of this country. I think that was the only occasion when he participated in a Private Member's Bill discussion; and I think that was his last speech. Usually he would interrupt in the Question Hour; he would participate in the Question Hour. But that speech of his is his last speech. So I pay my homage to him. And I request the other Members of this House to kindly go through his speech, which is essential, for many of the Members who stoutly oppose this Bill and criticize us say that we are not patriotic. And some of the Members also criticized Mr. Piloo Mody and Mr. Ramamurti as if they are the slaves of the English language.

One thing I was stressing that day, when I had started my speech, was that the unity of this country was brought by the English language. Many empires were there. Mauryan Empire was there, Gupta Empire was there, Moghul Empire was there. But neither the Pali language of Ashoka nor the Urdu language of Akbar could unite the whole landscape. It was only after the British came that this political unity was established. So, in this connection, I would like to quote the late lamented Jawaharlal Nehru, who was having the same opinion. I quote:

" If the United States had a long history going back hundreds or thousands of years before modern science and