

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : रूल आप समझिये  
(व्यवधान) डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री ने . . .  
(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then I don't allow it.

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please don't record Mr. Rameshwar Singh. I will not allow extraneous matters to be brought n.

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH:

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: आप कृपा करके रूल नहीं बता सकते हैं ?

You cannot go on record.

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH:

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: आप यह किताब ले लोजिए। इस को पढ़िए . . . (व्यवधान)

Please don't record him. He will not go on record. Let him go on speaking.

SHRI RAMESHWAR SINGH: \*  
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we go to Calling Attention. (Interruptions)

Clarifications on the Calling Attention Motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think on Calling Attention, the Minister has already made the statement. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are discussing a very important matter of Punjab, a highly emotional issue, on a Calling-Attention. I would request the House, let calm be restored and let us discuss Punjab. Let not this impression go round the country that even on an important matter like Punjab when Calling-Attention is called, we have not been able to take it up. Let us discuss this important matter.

\* Not recorded.

SHRI V. N. TIWARI (Nominated): I am on a point of order. Will this House give protection to the integrity and honour of women-Members in this House or not?

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): I am on a point of order. Yesterday only one Calling-Attention was admitted and that is on coal. But after the statement by Mr. Sethi, we all agreed that the Punjab situation is so tense that we should have a Calling-Attention on Punjab and after that, coal. So I was expecting eagerly the House will take up the Punjab situation. Many speakers have to say something on that, and then we would go to the Private Members' Resolutions, and then, of course, the Calling-Attention on coal. Now I would request both sides of the House, let us take the Punjab issue for which we fought yesterday, and not spend our energy on other things. There are plenty of other occasions to discuss this corrupt Dhiren Brahmachari.

(Interruptions)

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है ।

श्री उपसभापति : अब झा जी को सुन लिया जाये पहले ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : कालिंग अटेंशन की बात आपने उठायी है ।

श्री उपसभापति : मैंने कुछ नहीं उठाया है । मैंने कोई नाम नहीं उठाया है । मुझे बीच में मत लाइए ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : यदि आपने नहीं उठाई है तो मैं उठाता हूँ; क्योंकि अब कालिंग अटेंशन पंजाब के बारे में आने वाला है । इसके बाद दूसरा भी है जोकि बाद में आयेगा जिसका कि कल फैसला हुआ है । पर कालिंग अटेंशन देने का कोई तरीका होता है, नोटिस दिया जाता है ।

बावजूद आपकी विषय की मंजूरी के, यहाँ आपने मंजूर कर लिया यह विषय फिर भी, फार्मल तरीके से आपके पास नोटिस आता है। कल पंजाब पर जब क्लेरिफिकेशन की बात आई थी, तब यह हुआ कि कालिंग अटेंशन माना जाए ... (व्यवधान) सुनिए ...

श्री उपसभापति : आप मुझे कुछ न सुनाइए। आप भले ही जो चाहें बोलें। मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। आप एक घंटा बोलिए।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : यह जो कालिंग अटेंशन है, इसमें मैंने उठाया कि नाम का नोटिस कब और किस किससे आया, जरा इसको कोई क्लेरिफिकेशन हमको मिले। सेक्रेटरी की तरफ से हमको उसका जवाब आया कि वाइस-चेयरमैन से क्लेरिफिकेशन का जैसे-जैसे नाम था, वह पढ़कर जैसे सुनाया, उसी हिसाब से रखा गया है। क्या जैसा क्लेरिफिकेशन में था पहला, दूसरा, तीसरा उसी हिसाब से कालिंग अटेंशन बैठाया गया है? क्या यह तरीका है या नोटिस पहले देते और उस हिसाब से होता। आपको पूरा अधिकार है किसी नाम को जोड़ दीजिए, किसी को निकाल दीजिए, वह दूसरी बात है, लेकिन जो तरीका चल रहा है, वह ठीक नहीं है। तो मैं इसकी सफाई जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्लेरिफिकेशन के तरीके से चल रहे हैं या नोटिस के तरीके से?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): I would request Mr. Jha to understand the extraordinary situation in which we are placed... (Interruption). You please wait. We have patiently listened to you. You should also be patient.

Yesterday, suddenly that statement came and when the statement came we discussed in the open House that we want to have a discussion, no clarifications will

satisfy us and the statement should be discussed. Finally it was decided that it should be in the form of a Calling Attention Motion. It was also decided that there is no need to give a formality to all these things. That is how names were given and if more names are there, you can take them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All the names are there.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Let us dispense with the formality. Sometimes we have to be informal.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My only request is that let us be very brief in our observations—say, not more than five minutes. The Home Minister has to attend the other House on the same subject at 5 P.M. Let us finish this before lunch. We can sit up to 1.30...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Let us start.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are starting it. I am only making this request before that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Let there be no lunch today.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Today is Friday. Mr. Khushwant Singh, you may start.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH (Nominated): The Home Minister has already made a statement.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you can make your observations.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: All I would like to say is how surprised and deeply disappointed I am with the statement that the Home Minister has made. I am surprised because I have had the opportunity to be in contact with some of the major actors in this tragedy that is being enacted under our own eyes, namely, Sant Longowal, Mr. Badal and Mr. Harkishan Singh Surjeet.

I am disappointed because though he made some references to points of concession that have been made and others that have been identified, he did not in

[Shri Khuswant Singh]

his wisdom decide to go into details about these matters. He did not bother to spell them out.

Then he talked about firm hand in dealing with the situation in Punjab. This, Mr. Home Minister, is the language of confrontation, not of compassion or compromise which is the kind of language that the situation needs. If I may say so, it is for a Sikh like me and not for a Digambar Jain like you to use such language.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. C. SETHI): I am sorry to interrupt you. I have never said anywhere in my statement that we will deal with them sternly.

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I withdraw my words. Then you have spoken like a Jain and I have spoken like a Sikh.

The Akali point of view has been sadly misunderstood. There are three Akali Members in this House and none of them is here. That is always so. Not only have they been misrepresented not only in this House, but even outside. I shall do my best, not being an Akali, to put their point of view because I think we are dealing with them and we should see what they have to say.

I am not sure if the hon. gentlemen and ladies in the House know how Akalis come to pass their resolutions. They are an honest, rustic folk, not highly educated. The resolutions are drafted by a few educated people, some of them highly mischievous and motivated. Particularly in the case of this Resolution that is under consideration. The resolution was drafted, a little speech made and then it is passed by acclamation: 'Jo Bole So Nihal, Sat Sri Akal'. No details I think the most excellent example of this form of popular democracy—or if you call it 'chatic' democracy is the Anandpur Resolution which has become a stumbling block in our understanding of each other.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I will just briefly mention the background of Anandpur. The city was formed by the Ninth Guru, Guru Tegh Bahadur, and it is one of the five seats of authority of the

Khalsa Panth. It was in the year 1699 that Guru Gobind Singh formed Khalsa Panth, and He gave the reason in very clear terms:

"CHOONR KAR AZ HAMA HEEL  
TE DAR GUZASHT HALAL AST  
BURDAR BA SHAMSHEER DAST."

When all other methods fail, it is right to use force.

And it is in pursuance of this spirit that he brought together the different communities—Hindus, Brahmins, Yadavs, Jats, Harijans, Banias—and formed a militant force. He said:

"चड़ियो से मै बात कराऊं सवा लाख से एक  
लड़ाऊं तब गान्धि सिंह नाम कहाऊं।"

This has been beautifully put in one couplet by Josh Maliabadi:

"बाक को जवाब बेदार किये देता हूँ, कौम के  
हाथ में तलवार दिये देता हूँ।"

This was not a separate community at any stage. I quote Guru Gobind Singh's own words:

"सकल जगत में खालसा पंथ गांजे, जागे हिन्दू  
धर्म सकल भांड भाजै।"

Any doubt that in his mind he was thinking of a separate nationhood. . .

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Will you translate it in English?

SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: It means:

All over the world the voice of the Khalsa will be heard.

I will awake the Hindus and put an end to hypocrisy in this world.

These people by this resolution not only bring dishonour to the sacred memory of their Gurus but even disgrace the name of Anandpur.

Having said all that, I would like to draw your attention to these people who are now talking of a separate nation and demanding this resolution to be accepted. How democratic is this resolution? It is the same people who at one time used the linguistic argument to create a Suba

where the Sikhs will be in majority. It is the same people who are now using the linguistic argument to reduce the Sikhs to a minority. It is the very people who, when they were in a majority in the Punjab, were not able to obtain what they called 'Khalsaji Ka Bole Bala', and they reduced the Sikhs to a minority in the same State and propose to have 'Khalsaji Ka Bole Bala'. It is their concept of democracy. It is no wonder that the Resolution was passed nine years ago and we heard nothing about it. Last year, suddenly, it came into notice, otherwise we would have taken up the issue earlier. But let me say a word in support of these people. They talk of Anandpur Sahib resolution and they said that they stand by it, they do not want a separate Khalistan or a separate Sikh State. Let us take them at their word. The resolution has been badly framed. I have no doubt that if we talk to them, man to man, and explain to them that these words are mischievous and they are the dragon's teeth which are spreading separatism in this country, I have not the slightest doubt that I would be able to persuade them to re-draft this Resolution and then come out and present it to the Sikh community. If however, they are unwilling to do it, then I have not the slightest doubt that we shall reject it out of hand. We shall tell them that we do not stand for any division of this country. (Interruptions) And I am quite certain that we will carry the Sikh community with us.

Sir, there are a few major issues which are of substantive interest. They are basically three—the future of Chandigarh, the re-drawing of the boundaries according to linguistic populations, and the distribution of river waters. They involve the interests of our neighbouring States. It is only fair that when we discuss these matters, our neighbours in Himachal, Haryana and Rajasthan should be consulted, their views should be taken into account. But I don't think they are such matters that can not be resolved. Any Commission honestly framed and acceptable to the people can go into these matters. This has become a festering sore—the division of the boundaries. And I am

quite certain that this would also be settled without any problem and within a short time. Finally, what can we do about it? I have no doubt in my mind that ultimately any Government at the Centre or the State will have to deal with the Akalis. You cannot wish them away. The vast majority of the Sikhs do in fact support the Akali party. Ultimately you will have one day to devise means of sharing power with the Akalis. I do not know how it will be done. But, I think, that has to be done soon because we are at the cross-roads of history. I do not think that this matter can be settled by sending aged retired Cabinet Ministers as emissaries. This matter, Mr. Home Minister, cannot be dealt with even at your level but at the level of the Prime Minister. This problem needs a Gandhian approach, a man of the stature of Gandhi—I don't think we could have one, but somebody holding authority may do. Therefore, may I suggest with all my humility that it is time that the Prime Minister herself went to Amritsar, not as Prime Minister of India but as a pilgrim. Diwali is one festival. We share all festivals with the Hindus. Diwali is one of the biggest. Let her go there and talk to these people. And I know there are people who have patriotic sentiments. They will listen to her. And our good wishes and blessings will go with her. Otherwise, we are in for a period of severe trouble.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) :

उपसभापति महोदय, सिख कम्युनिटी भारतीय समाज का एक अंग है, बल्कि जो उनका पंथ का दर्शन है वह विशुद्ध रूप से भारतीय समाज का बल्कि मेजर समाज का, हिन्दू समाज की रक्षा के लिए है। उनके अलग होने का सवाल ही नहीं है। लेकिन जो परिस्थिति उभर आई है पंजाब में अकाली ऐजिटेशन से, इसको यह सरकार सही ढंग से हैंडल नहीं कर रही है। परिस्थिति बिगड़ रही है, इसकी जिम्मेदारी इस सरकार के माथ पर है। इसकी वजह यह है कि इनकी नीति बहुत टार्डी है, इनएफिश-

[श्री शिव चन्द्र झा]

वेंट है और अंडरस्टैंडिंग साफ नहीं है । मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इनका जो ऐजिटेशन चल रहा है उसका हल हो जाएगा, निराकरण हो जाएगा यदि पीसफुल वह बातचीत चलती रहे । लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि सरकार घबराती है कुछ बातों को लेकर ।

श्रीमन्, पहली बात तो यह है कि सरकार इस बात को मंजूर करती है कि भारत की जनता को ऐजिटेशन करने का अधिकार है । हमारे संविधान में पीसफुल ऐजिटेशन करने का अधिकार है हमारा लक्ष्य गलत हो, थोड़ी देर के लिए आपके दृष्टिकोण से, लेकिन क्या भारत की जनता को शान्तिमय तरीके से अपने हक के लिए संघर्ष करने का अधिकार है या नहीं ? उनको भी हक है शान्तिमय तरीके से वे संघर्ष करें, ऐजिटेशन करें, जन्स निकालें और मोर्चा निकालें । इसमें हम लोगों के और आपके बीच में तफरका हो सकते हैं । लेकिन इस तरह की बात कहना कि ऐजिटेशन करना उनका अधिकार नहीं है, यह सरकार का बिल्कुल गलत दृष्टिकोण है । अभी भी परिस्थिति यह है कि अनन्तपुर साहिब के प्रस्ताव को लेकर झमेला खड़ा होता है । मेरे हाथ में अनन्तपुर साहिब का प्रस्ताव है जो चंडीगढ़ के ट्रिब्यून में छपा है । उसमें पोस्टुलेट्स हैं, मेजर परमिसिज हैं, मेजर उनके आदर्श हैं । मैं नहीं समझता उसमें आपको भी या किसी को भी मदभेद होगा । मेजर उनका पोस्टुलेट्स हैं, उनका आदर्श है, गुरु नानक ने अपने कथन में कहा है—कीर्तन करो, नाम जपो और बंद चखा । यह ट्रिब्यून में छपा है ।

These postulates are enshrined in the Trident of the commandments of Guru Nanak कीर्तन करो, नाम जपो फल मिलेगा । इसमें किसी को क्या एतराज है । अब आइये दूसरा पहलू पर जो उनका जनरल एम है—

“Driving away poverty and want and efforts to increase production in order to set up a just system in place of the present unjust distribution of wealth and exploitation.”

इसमें किसी को क्या एतराज होगा । जो अपने को समाजवादी कहता है इसमें किसी को क्या एतराज होगा । उसके बाद दूसरा पहलू आता है—

“Banishing illiteracy, untouchability, social inequities and caste-based discrimination, which are contrary to the great teachings of the famous Gurus.”

इसमें किसी को क्या एतराज होगा । इसके बाद तीसरा पहलू देखिये —

“An end to the course of ill-health and disease and condemnation; banning of narcotics and intoxicants; to provide proper physical growth to people in order to prepare the nation for national defence.”

इसमें भी किसी को क्या एतराज होगा । ये जो मेजर पोस्टुलेट्स हैं, ये जो आदर्श हैं इसमें कोई मतभेद नहीं हैं । फर्क वहां आता है, जहां पालिटिकल बात आती है । पालिटिकल बात में भी खासकर जब बात आती है इलाके की । अमृतसर और कालका इन सब ब्लॉकों को लेकर जैसा मंत्री महोदय ने अपनी स्टेटमेंट दी कि उनसे बात करनी होगी । थोड़ी देर के लिये इसको मान लेते हैं कि इन पर विचार हो सकता है । है । इन सबों में एक बात और साफ है कि चंडीगढ़ उनको मिलना चाहिये । मैंने पहले भी कहा, फोर्थ लोक सभा के

टाइम में कहा गया था कि चंडीगढ़ पंजाब को दे दिया जाएगा तो देरी क्यों हो रही है। यह सरकार की इनएफिशियंट हैंडलिंग की वजह से है। यह उनकी मांग है कि अमृतसर को आपको एक होली सिटी बनानी चाहिये। इसमें भी कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये। दूसरे, उनकी जो मांग है पर्व वगैरह की इसमें भी कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये। पालिटिकल जो मांग है उसमें ऐतराज होगा। जब बात आती है नेशनल एक्सप्रेसिंग्स आइडेंटिटी, सेन्ट्रल-स्टेट्स रिलेशंस डिफेंस की इन सब के लिये और हमें अपना एक संविधान बनाने का अधिकार हो तब ऐतराज हो सकता है। इसमें मतभेद होगा ही भारत का कोई भी अंग अपना अलग कंस्टीट्यूशन बनायेगा इस संविधान के बाहर तो भारत की जनता उसको बर्दाश्त नहीं करेगी और यह अनुकूल भी नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि जल्दबाजी में अगर निर्णय होगा तो परिणाम गलत निकलेगा और यदि सरकार उनसे ठीक से बात करेगी तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि अकाली नेता भी उसको रिवाइव करेंगे। सरकार जो उनकी मांग मजे में मान सकती है उसको मानने में कोई ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिये। जैसा कि अखबार में आया है कि 19 तारीख को यह मोर्चा जबकि एशियाड के खेलों का उद्घाटन है, उस दिन आंदोलन कर रहा है। क्या यह बात सही है कि 19 तारीख को उनके मोर्चे ने इस प्रकार का निर्णय लिया है और क्या उनसे आपने बात की है कि यह देश खेल का अड्डा बना हुआ है। आजकल इसलिये अपना इस कार्यक्रम को हटा दो? दूसरे यह कि आपको अधिकार है आप अपना पीसफुल एजेंडेशन कर सकते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : यह तो हो गया।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : दूसरे चंडीगढ़ के लिये आप डिक्लेरेशन अभी कर दें कि हम इसको देंगे। इसमें होली सिटी की बात भी है और वह अमृतसर के बारे में है। इसी तरह से चण्डीगढ़ के संबंध में एक बात यह भी जरूरी है कि आपको हरियाणा को भी समझाना होगा। उनकी फाजिल्का के इलाके की मांग है। यह सब आपको देखना होगा। जो एजेंडेटर्स है उनके संबंध में एक बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये। आप ये बातें कह चुके हैं।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : मेरा कहना यह है कि उनको आप पोलिटिकल प्रीजनर क्यों नहीं मानते हैं? पिछली दफा भी आपने उनको पोलिटिकल प्रीजनर नहीं माना था। मेरा कहना यह है उनको पोलिटिकल प्रीजनर माना जाना चाहिए और जेल मैन्युअल के मुनाबिक सुविधाएं उनको मिलनी चाहिए। ये मेरे सवाल हैं।

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the situation today in Panjab is extremely bad. Although communal riots have not broken out, there is a simmering discontent and fued among the two communities, the Hindus and the Sikhs, there. I would like to point out that this situation could have been avoided if the Government had taken proper steps at the proper time. We know that certain extremists egged on by external forces are working for dismemberment of this country and they have raised the slogan of 'Khalistan', a separate independent State from India. But our main question today is, how to isolate these people from the mass of the Sikhs, not to confuse masses and the Akali leaders and the Akali people and how to separate these elements. This is

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

our main issue and in this context I say that the Government has failed. Now I am pointing out these things so that the Government may take immediate steps.

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's Award was given on 29th January, 1970. At that time, during Sardar Tara Singh's fast, I was very much connected with the negotiations. I had seen the Prime Minister, I had met the Chief Ministers, other Ministers and the Akali leaders. At that time, as a result of those negotiations the Prime Minister had given the Award. Now what are the terms of the Award? The first item is that Chandigarh will no longer be a Union Territory, it will be immediately transferred to Punjab. That is the first item. Then, the Hindi-speaking areas of Haryana which were added to Chandigarh Union Territory will go to Haryana and the Punjabi-speaking areas, outskirts which were added to Chandigarh, will go to Punjab. That is the first item. With regard to Fazilka and Abohar also the things are very clearly stated here. It was stated in the Award that Fazilka and Abohar will go to Haryana subject to a Commission being appointed. That Commission will go into the Hindi-speaking areas and the Punjabi-speaking areas and paragraph 8 says that the Hindi-speaking areas will be transferred completely to Haryana. This is stated there. And both these things will take place simultaneously. That is, the transfer will take place along with the Commission's report and on that basis the Hindi-speaking areas will be transferred to them. That is the Award. At that time, unfortunately there were certain enclaves, areas inside Punjab where there would be Hindi-speaking areas and it was stated that one furlong corridor between Haryana and those places will also take place. This is what is stated. For Haryana to make another Capital a sum of Rs. 10 crores was at that time promised by the Central Government. It had to select the place within five years and during those five years they could continue to remain in Chandigarh. Why did you delay the implementation of the Award all these years? Secondly, with regard to

water also certain things have been accepted there. As a matter of fact had you completed the Thein dam, no problem would have arisen with regard to the water dispute at all. But you went on delaying, delaying and delaying. At that time, I want to point out to my friends of the BJP that in a joint meeting held in Amritsar after this Award, our party, the Congress Party, the Jana Sangh—at that time its leader was Mr. Yagya Datt Sharma—all unanimously stated that as far as Fazilka and other thing is concerned, this is not a principled stand. Let us stand on the basis of principle. The principle stand will be linguistic States on the basis of village as a unit and contiguity. Mr. Yagya Datt Sharma was a party to that decision. These were the things which were stated on principle. Unfortunately this has not been implemented so long. This was in 1971. Now we are in 1982. Twelve years have gone by. Meanwhile certain other elements have come into the field and the demand for Khalistan and all these things have come in. When this thing came, I want to point out that other people got swayed away by some people. There is a race for leadership. At that moment, our party had written a letter—Comrade Surjeet wrote it—to Sant Longowal long before, asking him to demarcate himself from these extremists. Later on Mr. Badal had written a letter. When Mr. Badal wrote this letter, Comrade Surjeet, on behalf of our party, had written a letter to him in which he had pointed out that this was not a question of misunderstanding their position, but “they wanted diversion and the Sikh fundamentalists under the umbrella of Sant Bhindranwale provided them with that opportunity”. He further said:

“Can you deny that an Indian Airlines plane was hijacked to Pakistan by leaders of the Dal Khalsa? Can you deny that Lala Jagat Narain was murdered in broad day-light? Is it not a fact that 20—25 innocent Hindus were murdered by Sikh extremists?

“Did it not affect the communal atmosphere of the State. Sant Bhindranwale has been openly expressing sympathies for the extremists and it is ama-

ing that the main opposition party of the State—the Akali Party—did not unequivocally condemn these incidents. Have you not read the statements of Harsimran Singh who has been behind the activities of the Dal Khalsa? Can you deny that those responsible for placing cows heads before temples held a Press Conference in the Golden Temple to announce this decision of desecration? Have they not been getting protection in the precincts of the Golden Temple?

All these things, we pointed out and finally he said

“Therefore, the real issue is not the confusion created by interested quarters about the Akali Dal joining hands with the extremists who have been busy in vitiating the atmosphere of the State

This is what Mr Badal had stated—

“ by advocating separatist slogans. Unless you denounce these elements and demarcate from them, you can not clear the confusion” etc etc

So we had pointed out all these things. We have been campaigning against this from that time. I ask: Did your party do any campaigning at all at any time? Did the Congress Party take up a plan of educating the people on this issue at any time? On the contrary, your party itself divided into inner party quarrels between two very big people—one the Chief Minister and the other man equally big. This unfortunately is the position. Therefore your party was equally divided and this gave strength to all these elements. This is what has happened.

When the Akalis decided to have a *morcha* on the 3th of September, 1982, on behalf of our party, Comrade Surjeet had written a letter to the Prime Minister in which he had pointed out

‘Whereas the Akali leadership by launching a *morcha* at this stage along with Sant Bhindranwale has played into the hands of the extremists, the State

Government cannot be exonerated of its role in worsening the situation. To substantiate my point, I give you three instances. Firstly, the policy of arresting people and killing them in lock-ups and then making them out as deaths in encounters only provides grist to the mill of the extremists who are able to pose themselves as innocent and are looked upon as martyrs. Secondly, the statement of the Chief Minister about the involvement of Bhindranwale in the attempt on his life before eschewing all facts and apprehending the culprits.”

This is what I pointed out here some time back and the Home Minister had agreed that this was a very unfortunate statement—

“ shows immaturity in dealing with a very difficult and complicated situation. Thirdly, the general round-up of Akalis in the night of August 27-28, 1982, throughout Punjab was nothing but an act of provocation which is bound to further worsen the situation and play into the hands of the Six extremists who use out to whip up communal tension in Punjab and intensify the movement for separation”.

So, as far as our party is concerned, we have been carrying on this campaign, we have been approaching him with a view to helping you—to cooperate with you—making positive suggestions for the purpose of isolating those people and solving this problem. This is what we have been doing. As a matter of fact, in that attempt, when the things became very bad we called back Comrade Surjeet from foreign countries, we have asked him to come here so that he can deal with the situation and do all these things.

What do we find today? After all, what are the final things? As far as those religious demands are concerned, I have not very much to say. You are prepared to concede them and I am not very much concerned with that. As far as the political demands are concerned, Mr Badal's letter shows that they won't formally give up those things, but he is emphasising only on ten points—four religious and six poli

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

Therefore, you should take them on their word. You don't expect people to say, "All right, I have committed a mistake, this resolution is bad, I repudiate it" and all those things. It never happens in politics. You don't do it and other people also don't do it. Of course, our party also commits mistakes but openly acknowledges it. But our party is an exception.

Now the whole question boils down to four demands. What are those four demands? The first demand is the question of Chandigarh. With regard to Fazilka and Abohar, appoint that Commission, demarcate it on the basis of villages with regard to interspersed here and there where some may be Punjabi-speaking and some Hindi-speaking then have a rough settlement. But don't have this corridor business within the same country. You don't have a corridor inside a country. This is a bad thing. Don't have this. On the other hand, take a principled stand. In the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis, we took a principled stand and the same principled stand should be applied, and if you do that this problem can be solved. Similarly with regard to the water question. About the water question, you can refer the matter to a Supreme Court Judge for arbitration and the matter will be solved there.

The most important thing they are raising and which, probably, you will not be able to concede, is, greater powers to the States—Centre-State relations. This is a question which is raised by many parties, many States and you cannot simply brush them aside. I don't want you immediately, here and now, to say, "All right, these are the powers you will get" and all that. Can't you agree for a review of the Centre-State relations? Is that also banned? Is it so sacrosanct—the relations that have been put in the Constitution? After 32 years of working of the Constitution, don't you find something wrong and the Centre-State relations worsening? Why should they worsen? In strengthening the unity and integrity of the country, why should we not create greater confidence in the States and for that let us join our resources together and go forward as a united and strong country? Therefore,

why can't you accept a review of these things? These are the simple things. You accept them and on that basis you can certainly have that.

I am glad that those people did not decide immediately to intensify the agitation. They have given you time till the 19th. Therefore, for heaven's sake, you need not wait till the 19th, the last moment. You always take problems till the last moment and when things come very hot. So, long before that, within a week, do it. You say, you want to consult the Chief Minister of Rajasthan. You said it in your statement yesterday. The Rajasthan Chief Minister can come here immediately. They are at your back and call. So, call all these people and find a solution quickly so that the extremists are isolated. I want to tell you that in our letter to the Prime Minister we have asked you to issue a White Paper with all the facts in your hands with regard to the extremists, with regard to the Dal Khalsa people. In the Consultative Committee meeting of 30th September, 1982, the Home Minister promised—that such a White Paper will be issued. Even now you are not coming forward with that so that people in this country are aware of the real forces that are behind this Dal Khalsa.

Therefore, are you serious about fighting this menace? My charge is that you are not serious in fighting the disruptive forces. You are only saying 'disruptive forces; disruptive forces' people should beware. How are the people to beware? I request you to come out with a white paper listing the activities of these people, wherefrom they get money, who are the powers behind it, and what steps you are taking about it. It is always stated that CIA is behind them, America is behind them. But you have got the Home Ministry in your hands. So, with your powers, can't you trace the source of the money and, on that basis, can't you prevent the pouring of the money? These are my points.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, the statement which was laid on the Table of the House yesterday containing four paragraphs is rather disappointing. We thought that today the Home Minister will add some more information on the basis of developments that happened yesterday. The

fourth paragraph of the statement is a little wrapped in mischief. The subject is so tense, mixed with strong emotions. It is such an emotional subject as can create tension where there is none. But, nevertheless, we have to spell the blum truth which the Government nas perhaps avoided, as it is avoiding in all other cases. And that is why we find complications in Assam, in Mizoram, in Nagaland. And now it is there up to Punjab. We do not know what next. Such is the efficiency of the Government which is ruling the country today.

Sir, on the basis of the statement that was tabled yesterday, we welcome that the Prime Minister has indicated that the religious demands would be accepted subject to details. We are only asking you: Why could these not be accepted before? Why was tension allowed to mount? And if you accepted them, what are the reasons for the delay in implementing them? On this, the explanation should come today. We are very firm about it. As Comrade Ramamurti said—and he stated the truth—unfortunately it is the CPI and the CPM which are out in the streets to bring about communal harmony. And that is why our party Secretary, Avtar Singh Malhotra, has been threatened with death; that is why Jagjit Singh Anand, ex-MP, has been threatened with death. Our people are out in the villages creating harmony whereas your party like in Assam is disintegrated, paralysed and your people have taken shelter in Delhi or elsewhere.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): In hotels.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: ...or in hotels, as I am told by Mr. Kulkarni. Today's and yesterday's papers stated two things which are unacceptable to us completely. Harchand Singh Longowal had told, "We will not rest until the demands contained in the Anandpur Sahib resolution are conceded". He also stated, "Nor will we allow the Government to rest." Our firm view is that the Anandpur Sahib resolution, as is interpreted, is totally unacceptable to us. It cannot be the basis for negotiations, because it is plainly, nakedly seces-

sionist and can lead to further division of the country. As a matter of fact, it is surprising that many of those who left West Pakistan are today drafting the resolution which will lead to creation of not one India but many Indias to be swallowed by the Super Powers all around us. I would like to know whether the Minister is prepared to give us a categorical assurance that the Anandpur Sahib resolution cannot be the basis of discussions.

Mr. Ramamurti has stated, which has also been stated by Mr.

1 p.m. Longowal, that the Sant was sure that all States in the country would demand more powers. Unfortunately, it is not that Akalis who have raised the issue. The issue was raised by the Left Front Government, to which Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was also a party, in 1967, for more equitable distribution of powers between the States and the Centre. The way the Centre is directing the economic, industrial and fiscal policies is leading to gross discrimination. More and more powers are being centralised with the Centre, which the provinces are being treated as municipalities. The situation has become intolerable. Therefore, we also hold that the time has come for a thorough review and study-in-depth, and you should discuss immediately not only with the Akalis but with all the political parties and State representatives to see why this question of autonomy is getting raised more and more, where you have gone wrong, or tell us where we have gone wrong. But in this Round Table Conference some other demands of the Akalis can be raised and settled.

My third point is whether the Government of India and the Home Minister can give a categorical assurance now, on the basis of so many things happening in Punjab unfortunately for the last one year, that temples and gurdwaras will not be the sheltering places for murderers, smugglers and absconders. This is a most unfortunate development which has taken place. Known criminals are seen to hide in mosques or temples or gurdwaras and the police stand impotent before the gates.

[Shri Kalyan Roy]

This is one aspect where now the time has come for the Government of India to take a firm stand. Nor do we support the stand that the Asiad will be paralysed. This is absolutely an anti-national stand. We stand for the unity and equality of all nationalities. We stand for the integrity of India. Unfortunately, the Anandpur Sahib resolution is not going to help us, and should not be the basis.

There is one thing which is surprising us. This Government which is so mighty powerful in arresting hundreds of workers in Bombay or in coalmines—the strike is allowed to continue for ten months—is proving so weak before the Akalis. There was a news yesterday in the 'Statesman' Akali Threat Scares Ministers. All the Punjab Ministers have cancelled their tours and are staying at the headquarters. The police have told them to do so. This is the position in Punjab.

SHRI SADASHIV BAGAIKAR (Maharashtra): That is why jails were taken over by the prisoners and the Government was informed accordingly.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: If this is the situation, what is the answer of the Home Minister to this? When the law and order has totally broken down in the very eyes of Mr. Sethi and the Prime Minister, what is the remedy for that? It is mighty and powerful in the case of the working class, mighty and powerful with the *Kisans* and the landless labourers, but so coward and so timid before a gang of people who are openly inviting the leader of the fascist military regime, Zia-ul-Haq, to Amritsar—open invitation, as if President of a country is extending invitation to President of another country. Would you allow the situation to continue like this; or would you take a firm stand? Your party is disintegrated. That was there in the very beginning. Our party people are getting murdered in Punjab. They were removed from houses. What are you doing about it?

Sir, before I sit down, I tell you that we want some categorical assurance so that the germs which we find in many places may not spread further and the integrity of India may remain united.

And I want the House to appeal to the Akalis to give up this line of dividing the country and come to the mainstream where you can sort out some of the problems. Some of their problems are our problems, like State autonomy. I appeal to the Home Minister and also to the Leader of the House not to tinker with the State autonomy in this manner. This is becoming a highly explosive subject, and if you delay calling a round table conference to review the State-Centre relations, there will be many more States tomorrow which will be clamouring for independence. Thank you.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, I am not going to take much of your time, since the whole situation has been very lucidly expressed by my friend, Mr. Khushwant Singh. In the backdrop of what has been stated, I want to ask direct questions so that we can get an appraisal of the Government's intentions. Sir, as I see, the Government has no coherent, logical policy. It is a policy of ad-hocism and administering decisions by fits and starts. When I complimented here the Prime Minister for taking a bold stand in releasing the prisoners, at that very time you yourself gave an impression that you were going to accept certain of the demands which, in your estimation, are not very serious and can be easily conceded. This cordiality which was created by the Prime Minister's action has been wasted by the administration. That is my first observation. I would appeal to Mr. Sethi that time is still there. It is a very dangerous situation, as I see it. My party people and I myself have gone there and we find that the position is very bad. And these approaches are not proper.

About the Anandpur Sahib Resolution, my party has also discussed this problem and the President of my party has discussed this matter with Longowal, Badal and Hindu leaders of that area for some other purpose. Sir, he has been given to understand, as Mr. Khushwant Singh has rightly stated, that there is a move to re-draft it. If you concede some points, they are in a mood, they are prepared to re-direct it, whichever demand is not proper, not in the interest of the country, not in the in-

terest of national integrity. I have got the highest respect for Mr. Swaran Singh. He was President of my party. He was an hon. Minister here. But, Sir, the deputation of Mr. Swaran Singh itself is a negative act. He could have sent Mr. Khushwant Singh and he would have done it very pleasantly and without rancour because, you know Mr. Swaran Singh's image is that if you want to delay something to somebody, you send Mr. Swaran Singh. (Interruptions) Mr. Mittal, I know. मित्तल जी, आपको सब

कुछ मालूम है मुझको ।

What I want to say is that I have got the highest respect for Mr. Swaran Singh, but it was not proper to send him.

**SHRI SAT PAUL MITTAL (Punjab):** You cannot say that. He is not here to defend himself.

**SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI:** What I wanted to say in this connection was that the approach was not proper.

And thirdly, I have been harping on the problem of Centre-State relations. They have all along been saying, and they have stated today again, that they feel that they are second class citizens. Why should they say so? The Sikh race has defended this country for thousands of years and they are occupying a very important position in the military. This type of approach will hurt them. On Centre-State relations, the Prime Minister was reported to have said the other day that when the States and the Centre have got rapport, have got the same ruling party, then their problems are studied or appreciated better. And yesterday the denial came. What was the time-lag? And by that time, whatever Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh had to understand, they have understood and whatever any State had to understand, it has understood. If really she wanted to deny, either her Information Secretary is not taking proper cognizance of what has come to the press or the Government wants to take political advantage of the statement made by the Prime Minister. On this account I say, suppose the Akalis feel that if this were the attitude of the Prime Minister, then, what is the use of fighting elections democratically, it would be better to go to the

streets, you imagine what will happen. And then the Prime Minister's statement about regionalism. What else can they do? You are concentrating all the power at the Centre. You are not allowing people to grow. You have dismantled out any dialogue. Even no dialogue was is what you are repaying for in Punjab. I am only appealing in the interests of cordiality, cordiality should remain. The Prime Minister had taken the initiative. For heaven's sake, please do not be hasty. I rightly agree with Mr. Khushwant Singh when he says that from the things emanating from the press and your own statement there is an underlying idea that you have become suddenly tough. I am aware of what the problems are and I am also aware of your political stakes in Punjab, the fight between your party and the BJP and you are trying to score out each other. Don't do that. This is a national problem and I demand of you that only objectivity and nation's interests should take priority.

Lastly, about the release of prisoners, whatever has been demanded by them, out of them, as I am told, if there are hijackers or those who have killed my friend, the former Rajya Sabha Member, Shri Jagat Narain, they should never be condoned. But at the same time, whatever other stern methods you can use to deal with this problem, I invoke you, do it.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, एक बड़े गंभीर विषय पर हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं । श्री खुशवन्त सिंह जी से मे सहमत हूँ । उन्होंने बड़े सुन्दर शब्दों में वहाँ की स्थिति का वर्णन किया है । उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा है कि आज वहाँ पर सख्ती से शायद काम नहीं चलेगा । लेकिन एक दूसरा पक्ष भी है । सख्ती नहीं चाहिए, लेकिन वहाँ पर कमजोरी भी नहीं चाहिए । इन दोनों के बीच कोई न कोई बुद्धिमत्ता का रास्ता, दृढ़ता का रास्ता सरकार को अपनाना होगा । मुख्य प्रश्न यह है

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

कि आनन्दपुर साहब का प्रस्ताव है क्या ? उसकी अनेक व्याख्यायें की जा रही हैं और आज तक कोई अधिकृत व्याख्या और अधिकृत से मेरा मतलब यह है कि जिसको सारे अकाली ग्रुप मान लें, ऐसा कोई प्रस्ताव का रूप सामने नहीं आया है । खुशवंत सिंह जी ने कहा और अन्य लोग भी कहते हैं, उदाहरण के लिये गुजराल साहब ने एक प्रस्ताव रखा है जिसमें अलग संविधान की चर्चा नहीं है । इससे पहले अनेक नेताओं को बादल जी ने पत्र लिखे सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिये । उसमें जो बातें लिखी थीं उसमें इस प्रस्ताव का जिक्र नहीं था । तो मुख्य प्रश्न यह है कि आनन्दपुर साहब का प्रस्ताव क्या है । उसका अर्थ क्या है । जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, जो पिछली बार पढ़ कर सुनाया गया था उसमें साफ है कि उनका अलग विधान होना चाहिए केवल 3 विषयों को छोड़ कर । अन्य सारे विषय प्रांतों के अधीन होने चाहिए । (संविधान) आप पांच विषय कह लीजिए, मैं उन विषयों में इस समय जाना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन उस बात को ले कर कोई भी बुद्धिमान व्यक्ति, कोई भी राष्ट्रभक्त उस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं कर सकता और न मैं चाहता हूँ सरकार उसको स्वीकार करे । यदि आनन्दपुर प्रस्ताव में कोई पृथक्तावादी शब्द है, उनकी झलक है तो उसके आधार पर कोई बातचीत अकालियों से कभी नहीं होगी । यह बात स्पष्ट हो जानी चाहिए । मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने जो अकालियां से बातचीत की है अथवा उसके पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से जो उनकी बातचीत हुई है तो उसमें आनन्दपुर साहब के प्रस्ताव के बारे में उन्होंने क्या कहा ? यदि कहीं पर भी उस बातचीत में पृथक्तावादी शब्द

हैं तो वह मान्य नहीं होनी चाहिए और कल जो गुजराल साहब ने जो कुछ रखा है, जिस रूप में वह हमारे सामने आया है, उसमें भी पृथक् विधान की चर्चा नहीं की गयी है, लेकिन उस में 3, 4 विषयों को छोड़ कर सारे विषय राज्यों के पास हों, खालिस्तान के पास हों यह कहा गया है, लेकिन यह बात भी देश को और हमको अस्वीकार्य है । हम इस को स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते । यह आज का 'टाइम्स आफ इंडिया' है । कल ही मनजीत साहब गुरुद्वारे में बहुत बड़ी सभा हुई है । उसमें बादल साहब से लेकर लॉगोवाल आदि भव प्रकार के लोग थे । क्या खालिस्तान के बारे में उन्होंने एक स्वर से नहीं कहा कि खालिस्तान चाहिए ? एक तरफ मेरे सद्भाषी खुशवंत-सिंह जी का यह कहना है कि वह पृथक्तावाद नहीं चाहते । यह विचार बहुत ही उत्तम है, लेकिन से घटनायें हमारे देश में संदेह पैदा करती हैं कि वास्तव में मंशा क्या है । मैं इस चर्चा को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ, लेकिन इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि भाषा के प्रश्न को लेकर महा-पंजाब की बात चली जो आज पंजाबी सूबा बना है, वह महा-पंजाब की बात स्वीकार करके बनाया गया है । आज आपकी वार्ता में जो भी फैसला आप करेंगे, उसमें यह निश्चितता कर लें कि इससे आगे कुछ नहीं होगा, जो कुछ होगा अंतिम होगा ।

जहां तक धर्म का प्रश्न है, भारत में इस बात में दो मत नहीं हैं कि धार्मिक स्वतंत्रता सबके लिए हो । गुरुवाणी का सवाल है तो उसमें हिन्दू हों या सिख या अकाली गुरु की वाणी को सुनने के लिए कौन तैयार नहीं होगा । यह छोटे-मोटे प्रश्न कभी बाधक नहीं हो सकते । लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि क्या यह छोटे-मोटे प्रश्न जिनको धार्मिक कहा जा रहा है, क्या वास्तविक आवश्यकतायें हैं या

पृथक्तावादी प्रवृत्तियों पर पर्दा डालने के लिए यह किया गया है। तो साफ तौर से मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने कहाँ पर रेखा खींचने का निश्चय किया है। मेरी दृष्टि से रेखा वहीं होनी चाहिए जहाँ पृथक्तावाद की झलक आती हो। एक सदस्य ने अभी एक बात कही कि केन्द्र और प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में पुनर्विचार होना चाहिए। ठीक है, सन् 1927 से आज तक बहुत से प्रश्न खड़े हुए हैं। यह संदेह पैदा कर रहे हैं कि केन्द्र और प्रदेशों के सम्बन्ध क्या हों। दोष संविधान पर नहीं है, मैं समझता हूँ कि इसका दोष कांग्रेस दल पर है, जिसने विरोधी दलों की सरकारों के साथ दूसरा व्यवहार किया। यह संदेह जो पैदा होने लगे हैं, इनकी जिम्मेदारी कांग्रेस (आई) पर है। इसलिए संविधान के संशोधन की आवश्यकता हो या नहीं, लेकिन इस प्रकार के विचार की आवश्यकता जरूर है कि केन्द्र और प्रदेश की सरकारों के सम्बन्ध कैसे होने चाहिए। मेरी दृष्टि में आज की परिस्थिति में पृथक्तावाद के वातावरण में शायद इस पर विचार करना उचित न होगा।

जहाँ तक आर्थिक सम्बन्धों का प्रश्न है, फाइनेंस कमीशन बैठता या और भी बैठ सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं जब कह रहा हूँ कि धार्मिक आधार पर समस्याओं को हल किया जाए, तो उसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि इन सम्बन्धों पर इस आधार पर विचार हो। लेकिन जहाँ तक राजनीतिक अधिकार का सवाल है उसकी पृष्ठभूमि में इसको स्वीकार करना या उसके आगे दबना ठीक नहीं होगा।

एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ कि गुरुद्वारे, मन्दिर, मस्जिद, गिरजाघर, ये हमारे पवित्र स्थान हैं। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि इनमें से बहुत से पवित्र स्थान आज दंगों का अड्डा बन

जाते हैं। उनमें हथियारों को जमा करके वहाँ पर मुजरिम मुंह छिपा कर बैठे रहे और पुलिस वहाँ न जा सके तो यह अच्छा नहीं है। मुझे याद है कि पंजाब में मास्टर तारासिंह गुरुद्वारे में छिपे थे तो उस समय वहाँ अश्विनी कुमार आई० जी० पुलिस के थे, वह गुरुद्वारे के अन्दर घुस गये थे। उस समय जो आन्दोलन खड़ा हुआ था, उस समय से पुलिस का गुरुद्वारों के अन्दर जाना बन्द हो गया। गुरुद्वारों का सम्मान हम करते हैं, उनका अपमान हमसे सहन नहीं होगा, लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि क्या जो वहाँ पर मुजरिम घुस कर बैठ जायें और गुरुद्वारे, मन्दिर, मस्जिद या गिरजाघर में पुलिस न जा सके, यह ठीक नहीं होगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जैसे खुशवंतसिंह जी ने कहा है वह बुद्धिमान हैं, तो उनको चाहिए कि वह गुरुद्वारों से मुजरिमों को निकाल कर बाहर कर दें। (समय की घंटी)

तो श्रीमन्, मैंने आपसे दो-तीन बातों का स्पष्टीकरण चाहा है। एक तो आपने रेखा कहाँ खींची है। प्रधान मंत्री जी से जो बातचीत हुई वह कहाँ टूटी है? आपने अब कहाँ से प्रारम्भ की है? गुरुद्वारे के अन्दर जो मुजरिम खड़े रहेगे, उनके बारे में आपका क्या कहना है?

दूसरे आपके पास जानकारी यह है, हो सकता है कि मेरी जानकारी अधूरी हो, आपको यह भी ज्ञान है, अन्य सूत्रों से रूस के माध्यम से आपके पास पी० टी० आई० का समाचार आया है कि किस प्रकार से कहाँ से पैदा आ रहा है, कहाँ-कहाँ किस प्रकार शस्त्रों की शिक्षा दी जा रही है। यह आपके पास जानकारी है। यदि नहीं है तो प्राप्त कीजिए मैं राममूर्ति जी की इस बात से सहमत हूँ मैं खुद भी कह देता अगर वह नहीं कहते कि एक श्वेत पत्र आप जारी

[श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर]

करें जिसमें आज तक क्या हुआ है, आपने क्या देखा है, कनाडा में क्या हुआ है, अमेरिका में क्या हुआ है और यहां क्या हो रहा है, इसकी सारी जानकारी देते हुए एक श्वेत पत्र सरकार को प्रकाशित करना चाहिये। इसके साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI V. N. TIWARI (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the statement made by the hon. Minister on the Punjab situation shows the concern of the Government to save the state and the country from communalism and separatism. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what were the bottlenecks which stood in the way of settlement. Sir, as far as the political problem in Punjab is concerned, that problem may be in all the States of the country. One can deal with them, Political parties can deal with them. As far as the relations between the Centre and States are concerned, over which my hon. friend was exercised, certainly they are problems which may be looked into. But I am more worried because I come from that State. Sometimes these political problems and regional problems ultimately turn into communal problem and, being a border State, it has international dimensions also. Therefore, the problem is serious not only for Punjab but, to my mind, for the entire country. Sir, in regard to the meeting at Manji Sahib, the slogans of Khalistan, and threats of tearing the National Flag, the House must show not only its concern but tell the Government to deal with these extremists firmly. The idea of a theocratic State in a secular country like India cannot be tolerated by anyone.

Sir, as in the statement of the hon. Minister, religious demands could be accepted. My submission to you and through you to the Government will be that as far as 'Bani of Guru Granth Sahib' is concerned, not to talk of Jullundur and Amritsar, I would like it to be transmitted from Bombay, from Lucknow, from

Jaipur and many other AIR stations. Namdev belonged to Maharashtra. And if Kabir is recited from Lucknow and the 'Bani of Guru Granth Sahib' is recited from other stations, what are we going to lose? Shri Guru Granth Sahib is, to my mind, only a link between the medieval national sensibility and the modern Indian sensibility. People ask why Chandigarh was one of the bottlenecks. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I had written a book as early as in 1967. 'Language of Chandigarh', in which the villages around Chandigarh—Sarangpur, Kanthala, Khudda Ali Sher, Tawa clearly proved that 82.2 per cent, 86.1 per cent, 98.4 per cent and 91.56 per cent speak Punjabi. What is the delay in implementing the Prime Minister's Award of 1970 which should have been implemented in 1975? I would like to know this through you, Sir, from the hon. Minister. My suggestion is that whatever is acceptable to the Government, it should be announced to wean away the public from the extremists and the separatists. That is one suggestion of mine.

Secondly, I would urge upon one thing. Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi gave Punjabi Suba in 1966. She gave the Award in 1970 that Chandigarh to be a part of Punjab. In 1981, she air-dashed to Chandigarh to save Punjab from communalism. In 1982, she released all the Akali prisoners for restoring normalcy. If the bottlenecks have come, there are still 15 days. Let her keep the initiative in her hand to save Punjab from communalism and separatism which is essential for the solidarity and the integrity of the country.

श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसवाल (पंजाब) :  
जनाब डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब इससे पहले कि मैं कल आनरेबल होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो स्टेटेमेंट दिया है उसके ऊपर कुछ कहूं, मैं सरदार खुशवंत सिंह जी ने गुरु गोविन्द सिंह साहब का जो एक कपलेट कोट किया है उसके बारे में एक जरूरी

बात क्लेरीफाई करना चाहूंगा। उन्होंने बहुत अच्छे ढंग से उसको पेश किया। उन्होंने कपलेट के मतलब में यह कहा और जो बहुत ठीक कहा कि जब बहुत ज्यादा जुल्म हो रहा हो तो गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी ने यह कहा कि तलवार निकाल लेनी चाहिए, स्वोर्ड ड्रा कर लेनी चाहिए। यह बिलकुल ठीक है, गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी ने बिलकुल यही कहा था। परन्तु देखने की बात यह है कि उसको इस वक्त यहां पर कोट करना चाहिए था या नहीं। I have my doubt about it. क्या आज ऐसी हालत पैदा हो गई है जो उस वक्त गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी के टाइम पर थी? पहली बात तो यह है कि आज ऐसी हालत नहीं है। सैक्रेडली कौन इसका फैसला करेगा कि स्वोर्ड ड्रा करनी चाहिए या नहीं? गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी गुरु थे, उनकी मान्यता सिख धर्म और हिन्दू धर्म के बारे में क्या थी, इसका इस वक्त यहां पर जिक्र करने की जरूरत नहीं है। सारा हाउस इस बात को जानता है। लेकिन इलैक्ट्रेड लीडर्स इस बात का फैसला नहीं कर सकते हैं कि स्वोर्ड ड्रा करनी चाहिए। कोई आदमी जो गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी के स्टेचर का इस बात का फैसला कर सकता है। ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है कि एक 5-10 या 15 आदमियों की कमेटी बना दी और खुद उसके प्रेजिडेंट बन गये और वह इस बात का फैसला कर दे कि हमारे ऊपर बहुत ज्यादा जुल्म हो रहे हैं और इसलिए स्वोर्ड ड्रा कर लेनी चाहिए। I hope, Mr. Khushwant Singh will not mind it.

\* SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH: I have been quoted out of context. I never mentioned this, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I mentioned the historical event of 1699.

डा० मदन मोहन सिंह सिद्धू (उत्तर प्रदेश): वे इसको समझे नहीं।

श्री हरबेश्वर सिंह हंसपाल: वह तो रिकार्ड बताएगा कि इसको कौन ज्यादा समझता है... (व्यवधान)।

श्रीमन्, मैं समझता हूं कि संत लोंगोवाल बहुत पीस लविंग आदमी हैं, समझदार आदमी हैं। वे मोर्चे के डिक्टेटर हैं। उन्होंने लगातार मोर्चे को पीसफुल रखने की कोशिश की है। लेकिन देखना यह है कि क्या वह मोर्चा पीसफुल रहा? यह उनके बस की बात नहीं है। कल वहां पर मंजी साहब में जो मीटिंग हुई आज उसके बारे में रिपोर्टिंग हुई है और यह कहा गया है कि वहां पर खालिस्तान के खुले ग्राम नारे लगाये गये। यह सब जानते हैं और अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि नारे लगवाये जाते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि अकाली लीडरशिप ने नारे लगवाये। ऐसे कुछ एक्सट्रीमिस्ट एलीमेंट्स होते हैं जो उनके स्टेज से खालिस्तान के नारे लगाते हैं। इसके अलावा जब हमारी प्रधान मंत्री अमेरिका गई तो वहां न्यूयार्क के गुरुद्वारे में क्या हुआ?

गुरुद्वारे के अन्दर जब वह जा रही थीं तो दोनों तरफ से नोजवान लड़के स्कूल के लड़कों को खड़ा किया गया रिसेप्शन के लिए और उनके हाथों में तलवारे दी गई। वह शेड आफ स्वोर्ड के दरमियान से निकल गई और बड़े रिलायबुल सोर्स से मुझे यह मालूम है कि एक बच्चे ने कहा - खालिस्तान जिन्दाबाद। ये वाक्य ऐसी हैं जो कि हमारा ध्यान उस तरफ दिलाती हैं। इसके अलावा यह बात भी भूलनी नहीं चाहिए कि अकाली जो है वह एक पोलिटिकल पार्टी है। अकाली दल इज ए पोलिटिकल पार्टी। उनकी एक शिरोमणि गुरुद्वारा प्रबंधक कमेटी है जो रिलीजस बाडी है। वह आज क्या कर रहे हैं? रिलीजस सैटीमेंट्स सिखों का उभार कर वह पोलिटिकल गैन लेना चाहते हैं। यह सब ओपन बात है, यह कोई सीक्रेट

[डा० मदन मोहन सिंह सिद्धू]

चीज नहीं है। आप सिखों के सैटीमेंट्स को एक्सप्लाइट करके रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स की आड़ में वह लोग पोलिटिकल गैन लेना चाहते हैं।

मैं यह बात मानता हूँ कि रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स को मान लेना चाहिए और मैं सरकार से भी कहूँगा कि सरकार रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स को मान ले। अब सेठी साहब ने अपने स्टेटमेंट में भी कहा —

"The Prime Minister indicated to them that all religious demands could be accepted; of course, subject to the details being worked out."

इसमें यह कहा जाता है कि हम पैकेज डील करेंगे। यह सेठी साहब की या सरकार की क्या स्टेटजी है, यही जानते हैं। लेकिन जितने लोग जेलों में थे उनको यूनिफॉर्मली सरकार ने छोड़ दिया, प्रधान मंत्री के कहने से पंजाब सरकार ने उनको छोड़ दिया जिससे कि सिचुएशन सारी डिफ्यूज हो गई। लेकिन यह अच्छा किया गवर्नमेंट ने कि उनको छोड़ दिया। इसी तरह से अगर उनकी रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स हैं वह भी मान ली जाए, सरकार उनको मान ले तो उसका भी फायदा होगा।

यहां पर मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूँगा कि जो भी रेफरेन्स दिया जाता है वह पंजाब सिचुएशन के लिए होता है या सिखों के लिए होता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह सिखों का ही झगड़ा नहीं है। यह अकाली दल का पोलिटिकल झगड़ा है। यह रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स उनकी अगर मान ली जायें तो बहुत से सिख जो अकाली नहीं हैं, पोलिटिकल अकाली नहीं हैं, वह समझेंगे कि सरकार उनके साथ कोई जायज काम कर रही है। जैसे कृपाण के लिए इन्होंने अलाऊ कर दिया है कि इंडियन एयरलाइंस पर ले जा सकते हैं।

उनके अलावा वहां पर इस तरह से सचर्चा की जाती है, मेरे जैसे आदमों को वह मेटल डिटेक्टर लगाकर देखते हैं और कृपाण नहीं ले जाने देते हैं। अगर सरकार इस बात का खयाल करे तो बहुत से लोग जो अकालियों के साथ अटैच हो गये हैं, लेकिन वह अकाली नहीं हैं वे आर नाट अकालीज। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि वह उनके साथ नहीं हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने सिख सैटीमेंट्स को इतना एक्सप्लायट कर लिया है कि वह उनके साथ जुड़ते जा रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं कहूँगा कि सिखों का रिलीजस डिमान्ड्स सरकार को मान लेना चाहिए और जो पोलिटिकल डिमान्ड्स हैं, जिनको यहां पर चर्चा हुई है वह पोलिटिकली मोट होना चाहिए। यह सारे पंजाबियों की नहीं है।

यहां बातें कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the statement of the hon. Home Minister shows at least one thing. It is that they have got up from a Rip Van Kinkle type of sleep, a torpor and they have expressed at least a desire to tackle the situation. In our own country, we call such a sleep as Kumbakharna nidhra, which is only broken by sound of drums. Not otherwise. The problem, as I understand, in Punjab, is four-fold. Firstly, it relates to the territorial adjustment of Punjab and the neighbouring States, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana. That problem cannot be isolated and discussed with one State alone. There are two vital States, Himachal Pradesh and Haryana. They are both concerned. The second problem is the religious demands. The religious demands are very simple demands, very innocent demands. These demands could have been conceded without any dialogue. Even no dialogue was needed. There was not much of the need for agitation to be prolonged or the Government trying to see the progress of a community or of a nation or of the people. These religious demands could have

conceded. Then we have certain demands regarding changes in the Constitution based on the Anandpur Sahib Resolution. And the fourth is the law and order problem created by the lumberous torpor of the Government. Torpor I say because in 1956 the matter was taken up when Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon was the Chief Minister of Punjab. At that time a representative committee comprising almost of all political parties and comprising also of the Akali party sat round the table and a solution was evolved where Hindi and Punjabi speaking regions were demarcated, a formula was evolved where Hindi and Punjabi speaking regions were envisaged. Subsequently, again in 1966 a meeting was held and in 1966 they finally decided that Haryana and Punjab could be formed on the basis of the 1956 formula except that whereas in 1956 certain districts, tehsils or Zails in particular cases were particularly considered to be units, they said 'villages' which adjoined each other State and which speak the language of that State could be treated as a unit. People commanding influence, confidence of the peoples of both the States participated in that meeting and came to a conclusion. And they finally had the Award. Now I cannot understand what happened, why this long time has elapsed between this understanding and the Award and till today. They could have easily implemented it. Chandigarh could have been easily transferred. The other areas, Fazilka and Abohar, could have been given to Haryana. Other areas could have been decided by a Commission. There was no dispute about it. There was no point of creating tension, but the Government slept over it. Why it slept over it I do not know. The hon. Home Minister will make it clear why they did not appoint a Commission, why they did not transfer Chandigarh to Punjab, why they did not transfer Fazilka and Abohar and other areas, why these States were not made again to sit round the table and decide on the outstanding issues. The Government owes an answer to the nation. These are the problems, basic in character and once we have grappled with the problem, it is imperative that the Government must, with full speed, implement these things. Non-implementation smacks of the old

imperialistic type of regime, waiting for the people to agitate, to prove their prowess and then the Government comes forward to recognise their demands. In a democratic set up you do not have to wait for the people to prove their prowess. Here you have to look in advance, you should know what the aspirations of the people are, what they want, what should be done in advance to satisfy their aspirations so that these agitations are not resorted to.

I can understand there may be complex situations beyond probably understanding, which crop up once here and once there, but not every time. Everytime you find strike here and there, everytime you find an agitation going on here and an agitation going on there. All types of agitations are there in this country. The Government never tries to even have a dialogue with the people. Finally they are able to fill the jails. This is what is happening. I think it has been tried and the way the Government is going on, it also wants to try out the prowess of the people of Haryana. I cannot understand this. Certain areas are to be transferred, the award is there, the understandings are there and those people still exist. I have a document here which shows that the people who participated in the 1956 discussions in which this formula was evolved were late Pratap Singh Kairon, the then Chief Minister, Prof. Sher Singh, the then Irrigation and Power Minister, Ch. Devi Lal, the then Chief Parliamentary Secretary, Shri Mau... Chandra Sharma, Giani Kartar Singh, and Shri Virendra of Daily Pratap. Then in 1966, the people who participated were Ch. Ranbir Singh, M.L.A., Ch. Devi Lal, Chairman of the All-Parties Action Committee, Prof. Sher Singh again, Chairman of Haryana Lok Samiti on the one hand and S. Chanan Singh, President, SGPC, S. Prakash Singh Badal, leader of the Akali Party in the State legislature on the other. So all these people participated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. The point is clear now.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA:

No, Sir. I have a point to make. The

[Shri Sushil Chand Mohunta] question is when all these things were decided, why the Government has slept over these all these years? This answer the hon. Minister should give.

Regarding constitutional amendment, in the statement, the Home Minister has not said a word about it—what part he accepts, what part he rejects and what is the view of the Government, whether it considers that the question of meeting round the table by all the States on inter-State relations and relations between the Centre and the federating units is to be re-considered, or whether the Government is of the view that this is not negotiable at all? Somebody should come forward, the Home Minister should come forward to make a clear-cut statement on this aspect whether the question of constitutional amendment concerning Centre-State relationship is still open or it is final and not negotiable. The hon. Home Minister has not made any statement on this point.

Another important thing is that because of the circumstances, a law-and-order situation has cropped up and we feel as if we are sitting on the brink of a volcano in the Punjab State and it may erupt at any time. Who is responsible for this? And why have the things come to such a pass? I quite agree with my hon. friend, Shri Khushwant Singh, when he says that still the language is not a language of negotiations; it is still a language which speaks of strength. You cannot negotiate like that, talk with people of equal status across the table. It is a separate thing that today you are occupying the seats of power and they are not. But yesterday S. Prakash Singh Badal was also in the Cabinet. So you cannot talk to people of equal status with a threatening language. And you are not talking to one or two persons. You are talking to a whole lot of people. It is not a communal problem. I say so because the religious demands of any community—whether it is in Punjab or Tamil Nadu or any other State—should be acceded to. The problem regarding the inter-adjustment of areas is a linguistic problem and it was recognised long ago that such problems should be

solved across the table and there is a mode prescribed for it. On the Anandpur Sahib Resolution, the Government must state what its reaction is. On that point I am very sure that if the Government is earnest in meeting it and is not standing on prestige, it is not a difficult situation and an agreement between all concerned can be arrived at. But the Government must realise and the hon. Minister must realise that it is not only he and the Chief Minister or one or two other persons who can be involved and the discussion held, but the discussion has to be with the real representatives of the people whose hearts and minds are supported by the people, by the masses. In these negotiations we find that in 1956 the negotiator or the person who brought about a compromise or settlement was Sardar Swaran Singh. He said then that he would not at all agree to this idea that the States would be divided on a linguistic basis, and today we have again sent him. I do not know what the intention is, whether it is to stall the whole discussion. Therefore, I would again earnestly request the hon. Minister that if a serious attempt is to be made, then people from all the three States, especially from the State of Haryana, should be associated with it—not those people who are just manning the Government but those who were there at the time originally when the agreements and accords were realised. The last point. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How many last points?

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: I won't say anything more than this.

When you have finally realised that all calculations and all arrangements of the present Government in Punjab have failed, how is it that up to this time that Government is still being thrust upon the people and tolerated and why was President's rule on Punjab not declared so far and why is the Government sitting pretty over it?

DR. SARUP SINGH (Haryana): Sir, originally Mr. Rameshwar Singh was to speak but I thought he might introduce more heat than necessary. So, I chose to speak,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much....(Interruptions)....

DR. SARUP SINGH: Because, he is a very militant kind of person and I am, in the language of Mr. Khushwant Singh, more or less like a Jain, not of course, from his State but from another State, though he doesn't know that Jains are extremely hard nuts to crack. Not me!

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): No reference to Mr. J. K. Jain, I suppose!

DR. SARUP SINGH: Kindly don't put me into difficulties.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, first of all I would like to comment on what Mr. Khushwant Singh has said. I, in fact, came to the House this morning largely to listen to him because I thought he would help us find a way because it is a very difficult situation, and if I were a Home Minister today, I would really not know what is the straight answer to a very difficult question like this. It is not that the Home Minister is not concerned and not anxious to find an answer. But, how does one find an answer? I noticed three positive things that Mr. Khushwant Singh has said. • Firstly, he said, talk. Very good, talk. How do you talk? They refused to talk to the Government of India. My information is that they told the Government of India that they will not talk to anybody in the Government of India unless their demands were met, and Sardar Swaran Singh was selected to go there because he was the only individual who is acceptable to them. No one else was acceptable to them. However, if they are willing to accept Mr. Khushwant Singh, I would say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, let the House send him. Let the Government not involve itself, or, let the Government involve itself. If Mr. Khushwant Singh can find an answer, let him find an answer because the country needs an answer. All of us want peace. We do not want the Sikhs to feel alienated. The tragedy is that they are feeling alienated. It is not a question of a handful of Akalis. Slowly and gradually, this feeling has gone even to the most ordinary Sikh that he is being discriminated against, even though he is not being discriminated against.

People do not go by facts; they go by feelings. Don't forget that in 1945-46, ordinary Muslims could not understand what Pakistan meant, where it was to be located. They came to feel, "O! Yes. Muslims must have a separate land" and the enlightened Muslims who wanted India to stand as one slowly and gradually got isolated and the country faced partition. In 1945 in Punjab itself there were Muslim leaders who said they did not want partition, were opposed to Pakistan and yet this virus spread in such a way that by end of 1946 they were silenced. I greatly admire Mr. Khushwant Singh. Some work should have been done. Unfortunately, the tragedy is not with the Government of India. The tragedy is with the politicians. They are extremely weak when they come to two things. The moment religion is mentioned, they start shaking and trembling. Some priest came and occupied a piece of land which was the property of the Delhi University and constructed a small hut and called it a temple. The Delhi University, with all its might, could not remove him from there because everybody said that there was the temple. Who had built the temple? We know that there was no temple there. Somebody had built the temple overnight. The next morning it became a vital question. The whole Indian nation could not do anything about it. Then it became a temple. We could demolish it because we could expect after all that nobody could say that it was a communal question because it was a question of a Hindu. If it is a question of a Sikh or a Muslim, everybody is helpless. Why are you not able to look at the problem on merits? Why do merits disappear the moment religion is mentioned. Mr. Khushwant Singh may be correct. I may be correct. It is immaterial. He is a Sikh: I am not a Sikh. The fact is that both of us are so similar to each other. In one sense, of course, we are not similar. He is a very distinguished man while I am not.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra): He has a beard; you do not have.

DR. SARUP SINGH: Excuse me. I can have a beard tomorrow.

I do not have the talent and intelligence he has. But I assure you that I have the

[Dr. Sarup Singh]

same heart. His speech was very compassionate. I am myself very compassionate. He made a point which is a sentimental point. And I am a sentimental person. He said that the Prime Minister should fly to Amritsar, go to the Golden Temple and talk to them. I say this is a sentimental kind of statement. But I will go along with this provided two things happen. One, he said that he would persuade the Akalis to change the language of the resolution. Now, the language is not important, Mr. Khushwant Singh. You know what happened when I was the Vice-Chancellor of Delhi University. Once the Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi said to me that the students were willing to apologise. She produced a piece of paper on which was written, "We never misbehaved. However, if the Vice-Chancellor thinks that we misbehaved, we express our regret." I said, "Madam, this is not an apology." She said that they could put it in different words. I said, "This is not a question of words; it is a question of spirit." If there is the spirit that there is no question of any separatist movement, there is no question of any feeling that the Sikhs are separate from others, if there is a genuine kind of that feeling, I would be the first man to say that the Prime Minister should go. That is number one.

Number two, I want another condition also to be accepted. I want this House to understand this, not only the Prime Minister or the Sikhs or anybody but all of us. Can we all agree that our religions are our private affairs, but that politics is not a private affair? Can we agree that we will not mix the two? Can Hindus agree, can Muslims agree, can Christians agree, can Sikhs agree? All of us accept that; but when we need to get votes we exploit castes to get votes. Mr. Deputy Chairman, we the politicians of India have reduced the country to such a state that you have no option today except to face this problem every day. Why do you shake and tremble? Why can you not take action when somebody goes into a gurdwara? You cannot because the Sikhs will get angry. Mosque? Muslims would

get angry. Temple? Hindus will get angry.

In what kind of a country are we? The Government of India is not recognised. A political party says that they will not talk to you or your leader. To whom will you talk? We are the Government of India, properly constituted, properly elected. I may dislike a Minister or anybody. But he is a Minister, and if necessary I will talk to him. Why not? He is my Minister. You represent not only those people who voted for you, but you represent even those people who voted against you. You represent everybody. Long ago, in the 18th century, Mr. Deputy Chairman, an Englishman was elected, Edmund Burke, from Bristol. When asked, "Whom do you represent? What will you do there?", he said, "As long as I am here I represent you. When I will become a Member of Parliament, I will represent not Bristol but the whole country, the whole of Britain." Why do we not represent the whole country? We represent our constituencies. We represent our castes. We represent our religious groups. We represent this, and we represent that. What kind of people are we? And we, the Members of Parliament, are people's representatives. Who are the people? Whom do we represent?

Therefore, something is wrong with us, Mr. Home Minister. It is not your fault, it is a disease that has overtaken us. Will anybody consider it seriously, as to what the final answer to this is? Politics and religion must never go together. Whatever rules, whatever laws you make or the Election Commissioner or somebody else makes, anybody who uses his religion or his caste or any such loyalty in order to get a benefit, should be disqualified. He may be clever. He may not use it in so many ways. There may be other ways of doing it. Some law should take care of it. You should do it. You should purify it. Why has politics become a rotten, dirty game? Politics and religion should not be mixed. Politics is a very pure game of transforming society. But the moment we involve these other things, it becomes a game of exploitation, personal, caste, this and that. Therefore, Mr. Khushwant Singh, you and I understand

each other because I am sure that you know I mean well. And since I mean well, sit together with some people, not me, because I am not in active politics, with the Government. If you like, get this assurance in your own way. One, when the Prime Minister goes to Amritsar, people talk to her. Even their leaders should talk to her. They should not say that they will talk when she accepts this or that. That attitude must change. She is the Prime Minister of India. I may belong to the Opposition. But she is my Prime Minister. I will not like to expose her in the eyes of foreigners. I may quarrel with her inside India. I may accuse her of all kinds of things, corruption, this and that. But when she goes abroad, she is my Prime Minister, and I will talk about her with respect. The view now is to expose her in the eyes of foreigners at the time of the Asiad.

Then, I recently read in the "STATESMAN". You know, they give those statements during the week. It said, "Glory or death." Why? However, he made one extremely important point, very practical, realistic, from which there is no escape. That is to share power with them. Yes, you have to share power with them. But do not share power on the basis of religion. Share power with them because they are a very important political party in the State. You cannot share power with religious leaders. You have to share power with them as a political party because they are a very important political party in Punjab. Punjab is a State in which the Akali Dal can share power. That way you cannot have the Central Government, as you cannot have an effective Government. The Government of India should see how this can be done. But this is a valid point. Sooner it is recognised, the better. If the Congress Party or the BJP or the Lok Dal or any other party tries to be clever and converts the Sikh majority into a political minority, then, they are playing a game which pays no dividends. I do not mean that you should appease a religious minority or majority or whatever.

Now, Mr. Longowal says that the Chief Minister will not be allowed to enter any village in Punjab because after all in the villages the Sikhs are not

only predominant but - sometimes they are totally Sikh, in the sense, of course, there are no Hindus and only Sikhs.

Now the last point, I am sorry I would not go into what you call the territorial adjustments because my friend did say something about it. But there is one difficulty. And the difficulties, again, have been born out of, I am sorry to say, confusion in our minds. You have to appease so and so or so and so. Whom shall we appease? If there is a fight between a man who is strong and another who is not so strong, you appease the strong. If there is a fight between a gangster and a gentleman, you appease the gangster. And it goes on and on. And we have reached a stage at present—I am not talking of Akalis or Punjab; Please don't misunderstand me; I am talking of the rest of the country—where we appease the gangsters in our own party. Forget other places. We appease the gangsters in our own parties. In our own parties, the best man cannot come on top. Only one kind of man will come on top.

I will not like to go into the question of territorial adjustments because there is a history, and please don't forget one thing. The Haryana people are equally restive. Between Punjab and Haryana, the difference is only in the mode of worship, which is very minor. You look at the mode of dress, including the beard and so on. They come more or less from the same stock. They are as volatile, as sentimental, as decent, as foolish: all those adjectives that he was using in a very sophisticated way can apply to us. But, for God's sake, don't take Haryana or anyone also for granted. You know it is a very dangerous kind of situation there. You know there is a pistol to your throat. Somebody is holding the pistol. Tomorrow the other man will acquire a pistol. Therefore, this is not a correct way of handling any situation.

Sir, only one thing more and I will finish, and that is somehow the Sikhs who live outside Punjab should be involved in some kind of a discussion. You know, the Punjab Muslims did not suffer at all when Pakistan came. In fact, they

[Dr. Sarup Singh]

flourished. They became rich, they became powerful, they ruled over the country. But the Muslims in the rest of the country suffered. And education, therefore, has to be given to the Sikh masses, both in Punjab and elsewhere, that what some of the leaders are saying is dangerous for them. If it is dangerous to the country, who bothers? If it is dangerous to me, then I will bother. The Sikhs have to be reminded about this. I am glad Sardar Khushwant Singh has been playing a very very important role in this. In fact, I started buying his newspapers only recently. And look at my tragedy! The day I started buying it, he raised the price. The Statesman which I have been reading since 1940 costs 50 paise while his paper costs 70 paise.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Who told you the Statesman is not going to raise its price?

DR. SARUP SINGH: They may raise it. But he has raised it. But he has raised it the moment I started buying it. It is an act of hostility against Haryana!

I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Home Minister should give thought to this and involve the enlightened Sikh opinion both in Punjab and elsewhere to find a way out. And don't handle it at the level of diehards in this or in any other matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. C. SETHI): Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members, namely, Shri Khushwant Singh. . .

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is a very peculiar situation. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: YOU have had so much discussion.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Our names are there, and I had a talk with you. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called from all the parties. There has

to be some end to the discussion. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: You do not go by any rule. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some rule is followed. We have discussed it for two hours (*Interruptions*).

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: I am not responsible for that. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us hear the Minister.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: We gave our names for seeking clarifications.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not called all the Members who gave their names.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKABORTY (West Bengal): You see the record. We are here to represent our party. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: What you say, you must observe.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request you, please resume your seat.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: You don't even have the grace to say that you could not call some Members who had given their names. You curtilly call the Minister. This is a very peculiar situation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All the views have come. All the parties have been called. All the questions that can be put have been put.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Is it for you to decide, whether all the questions have been put or not. Are you the judge? If you ignore us, then, what is the use of the name 'Calling-Attention Motion'?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Please resume your seat now.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: What is the use of the motion? What is the use of whatever you say? It is useless to sit in a House\*

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

**SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY:** Yes, intentionally you are doing it. In protest we walk out.

**PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE:** In protest we walk out.

**SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA:** He is a Congressman.

**PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE:** You are\*

It is clear.

*[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber].*

**SHRI P. C. SETHI:** I would like to clarify that it is not as if I have not stated anything. As a matter of fact, I would like to repeat it with all the emphasis that the Prime Minister has gone much out of the way in accommodating some of the demands even after annoying certain sections of the people. That is why I have stated in the very beginning of my statement that as far as the religious demands are concerned, namely, the holding of a kirpan, the relay of the Gurmukhi, the question of the holy character of the city of Amritsar and also the all-India Gurdwara Act, we have said practically all the religious demands could be accepted...

**SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE (Maharashtra):** Then will you allow other religions also to have the relay of their religious scriptures, Jains, Buddhists, all those people? If you are allowing Sikhs to have their religious scriptures relayed on the radio, are you allowing other religious to have their scriptures also relayed on the radio?...

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Now please sit down. You have made your point.

**SHRI P. C. SETHI:** I have only added that certain details are to be worked out. Now, this is not to say that we are therefore not in a position to accept them. For example, as far as the kirpan goes, there

is the question whether in the Indian Airlines it should be 4" as submitted by them to the honourable Prime Minister, Or it should be 6" as normally carried. Similarly, with regard to the Gurudwara Act, the question is whether it should be based on the 1925 Act or some other thing, and whether the definition of the 'Sikh' has also to be changed, whether the Nirmallis and the Udasis, who do not actually form the Sikh Act and who do not go by them, whether they have to be included or not. Therefore, I have said certain details have to be worked out. But, by and large, she has said very clearly that these could be accommodated. Now, I have also further gone to say that we are prepared to resolve the crisis and we have gone into the points made by the five-member committee of the Akali Dal through Sardar Swaran Singh. Here I have also repeated that certain agreements have been identified in respect of certain demands. Therefore, my statement is not negative. I have positively said that certain areas of agreement have been identified in respect of other demands also. But I have only added that there are demands concern other States and other people, and it is an emotional question, and therefore, we have to consult not only the Chief Ministers of the other States but honourable members of all the political parties as well as honourable Members of this House and the other House belonging to all the political parties and some independents. Therefore, what I have said is that these consultations with regard to these matters are likely to take some time and therefore we have requested that this morcha should not be intensified and it should be done in a manner which would not aggravate the situation. I have nowhere said that we will deal with the situation sternly. Sir, it is very apparent that if any satyagraha, according to democratic traditions, goes on peacefully, there is no question of dealing with it sternly. But if violence creeps in and if the extremists come to their own point of view, then of course Government is bound to deal with such activities. Therefore, I am quite sure that Sant Longowal will stick to what he has said even in his recent speech that the morcha which he is thinking of launching will be peace-

\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

ful and there will be no violence. I hope they will strictly adhere to it. At the same time I would appeal that whatever may be the nature of the morcha, I do not feel any justification for extending the morcha to Delhi at the time of ASIAD. This would create some more complications and, therefore, I would again appeal to them that they can certainly have their peaceful agitation in any manner they like and it should not be violent.

I have also made it very clear that in taking any decision the Government cannot ignore the overall interest of national unity, integrity and welfare of all sections of the people. This is very important.

We do not understand how a feeling is going round that the Sikh community is being discriminated against in India. There are some sections which are particularly spreading this news not only in India,

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA (Andhra Pradesh): It is otherwise. I am very sorry to interrupt you. You are dealing with them as if they are a privileged class. If a Scheduled Caste embraces Sikhism, the shape is changed and still you give the concessions to him or her. But if a Scheduled Caste embraces Buddhism, even the shape does not change. But you do not give those concessions. The Sikh are like Hindus. But still they are a privileged class...

SHRI P. C. SETHI: You are on a new subject. What I am trying to emphasize is, as far as Indian community or Indian society is concerned, the Sikhs have been enjoying a respectable position in India. They have enjoyed the respect and confidence of the nation.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: In 1956 you amended the Act and you have given them facilities. To Scheduled Castes converts to Sikhism. You are not extending the concessions to Buddhist converts. Why should there be such discrimination?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your point is clear.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: The point made by Mr. Maurya is that Scheduled

Caste converts to Sikhism are getting all the facilities, but Scheduled Caste converts to Buddhism are not getting them.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I have heard with respect and attention what Mr. Maurya has said. You are starting a new discussion. You have given a new turn to the whole thing.

What I was trying to say was that we are not dealing with the Sikh community as a privileged class.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: Yes, you are.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: They are part and parcel of the nation and therefore, they enjoy that much confidence not only in Punjab, but throughout the country.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: As if Buddhists are not part and parcel of the nation.

MR. REPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: As far as the question of the Akali leaders meeting the Prime Minister is concerned, it has been made clear that they would not even like to meet any of the Cabinet colleagues and they would like to have a talk with the Prime Minister herself. As far as their talk with the Prime Minister is concerned, she has never said that she is not going to have talks with them. If they agree to come for talks, then talks could be held. But before the talks could be held, we would not like a dead-lock to be created again. Therefore, some proper and congenial atmosphere should be created and at the same time something has to be sorted out even at the junior levels so that, whenever the talk takes place, something could be resolved positively. I would also like to make it clear, Sir, that...

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Did you say that they are not willing to meet any of the Cabinet Ministers but only the Prime Minister?

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I was referring to what Mr. Khushwant Singhji has said

that they would not meet any of the Ministers even of the Cabinet rank, except the Prime Minister. I have not said anything.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Khushwant Singh said he has repeated.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Therefore, we are trying to resolve the Punjab situation with the greatest and utmost sincerity. I remember last time when Khushwant Singhji spoke here, he was very emphatic and asked, what is the harm in accepting the religious demands? Now, as far as the religious demands are concerned, I have made it very clear in the very first paragraph that practically almost all of them are acceptable to us but certain details have to be worked out, which, of course, would be worked out in consultation with them and with others. Some of the Sikh community leaders from other Gurdwaras want to be included in the All-India Gurdwara Act. They should be consulted. I am not injecting any other communities, as far as the Gurdwara Act is concerned. This is to be discussed among the Sikh leaders themselves and the Government. Therefore, Sir, this is the position at present and we are still hoping and trusting that they would see reason and consider the whole question in the broader context of the unity of the country and would not play into the hands of the extremists. Therefore, we hope that they would agree to the appeal made by me not to escalate this agitation and arrive at some consensus, before a meeting can be arranged.

SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR: I would like to know the Government's view about the previous agreements which were quoted here. Are these agreements alive or closed? You have not made that position clear. Secondly, in your earlier statement you are making no reference to the reaction of the Government as far as the Anandpur Sahib resolution is concerned. You have touched on that point at all. These are crucial points.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Has he received the Anandpur Sahib resolution officially or not? (*Interruptions*)

1580—R. S.

SHRI B. D. KHOBRAGADE: What about the Anandpur Sahib Resolution? The resolution mentions that the Centre should deal with Foreign Affairs Defence, Communications and Railways and, all the matters should be left with the State Government. What is the Government's reaction to this? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. C. SETHI: So far as the 1978 Award is concerned, I would like to say that according to that Award it was agreed that barring certain villages roundabout Chandigarh, Chandigarh would be given to them, but at the same time Abohar and Fazilka were to go to Haryana. Of course the question of the Commission was there.

DR. SARUP SINGH: Excuse me. Kindly make it clear that the Commission that you are going to appoint did not cover Abohar and Fazilka; it covered other villages in that vicinity. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. C. SETHI: That position still stands.

SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR: What about the earlier agreements? Kindly clarify your position about that. What is the Government's reaction to that? Are these agreements alive and can be implemented or you consider them as closed?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, as far as 1956 and 1965 Resolutions are concerned, we are dealing with the demands as they stand today. As far as the question of Centre-State relationship is concerned, it is not a question limited to the negotiations with the Akali party alone. It is a wider question concerning many States and, therefore, it has to be discussed and some consensus has to be arrived at about it in a different forum.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश) : 1965 का समझौता क्या है उसको तो आप कहें . . . .

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है वह तो आपने कह दिया है। (व्यवधान) आपने पूछा है वह जवाब दे रहे हैं।

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : वह तो मैं कहता हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : आपने तो कई बार कह दिया है उनका जवाब सुन लीजिए।  
You draw your own conclusions

श्री भा. बे. खोब रागडे : वह तो कुछ कह नहीं रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्री सुशील चन्द नेहरो : कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेन्डमेंट के बारे में सरकार का क्या व्यू है (व्यवधान)

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Therefore, Sir, beyond this, in the present circumstances, it is difficult for me to spellout more than what I have said. And I would again request for the co-operation of all the hon. Members and the political parties in the solution of the Punjab problem. (Interruptions).

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Sir, are you satisfied with the reply? (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time left.

श्री लालकुश आडवाणी : उपसभापति जी आपको भी जानकारी है सदन को भी जानकारी है। इस सारी वृत्त में जो कुशन सुद्धा है वह है आनन्दपुर साहब रिजोलूशन और हम सरकार से इतना जाना चाहेंगे कि उनके पास क्या आनन्दपुर साहब रिजोलूशन की आर्थेटिक कापी है। यदि है तो उस पर आपका रियेक्शन क्या है। हमारी सारी चिन्ता

उसी के कारण हैं। कांस्टीट्यूशनल अमेन्डमेंट की जितनी बात है, जिसके कारण हम बहुत चिन्तित है वह है आनन्दपुर साहब रिजोलूशन, उसके बारे में आप प्रकाश डालें।

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Sir, I have made it in my statement very clear that whether it is any Resolution or any demand which will go against the national integrity and the unity of the country, the Government will not accept. (Interruptions)

#### MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we, take up the Motion for election to the All India Institute of Medical Sciences.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): Sir, I beg to move the following Motion:

"That in pursuance of clause (G) of section 4 of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956 (25 of 1956) this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among the members of the House to be a Member of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

#### THE DELEGATED LEGISLATION (PROVISIONAL AMENDMENT) BILL 1982

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI JHULAM NABI AZAD): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend certain Acts to implement the recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation regarding publication and laying of rules and other delegated legislation.