

of the vast majority of the Sikhs who reasonably or unreasonably are feeling bitter, hostile and religiously hurt and all that. Therefore, the first thing I say and our Party considered it, that as far as the temple is concerned—I do not say the temple complex, but as far as the temple, the temple proper and the *par kram* surrounding the temple is concerned the Army need not stay there any more. They can come and stand outside, guard the entrance and all that. So long as they remain there—I am told that they are now at least in the Darshan Deori. They are there. I think the functions they are performing now can easily be performed by some other agencies ..

MR. SPEAKER : Your time is over. Kindly co-operate with me.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I will request the Government not to indefinitely prolong the stay of the Army inside the temple because it may be counter-productive in the long run. I do not say that there is no risk involved at all. Some 1 per cent or 2 per cent risk may be there. But can't you check that? As against that, it will be counter-productive to keep the Army there indefinitely and make people feel angry and bitter about it. That should be done.

Secondly, let her call a meeting again of all the political parties. Let us at least put our heads together and consult what to do now. Let some compensation be given to the people who were killed by the terrorists.

Let the pre-censorship be withdrawn ..

MR. SPEAKER : You have taken too much time ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What is too much time ?

I am saying : let action be taken against all papers who write inflammatory or communal things, but let the pre-censorship be withdrawn ...

MR. SPEAKER : Everybody tries to ask the Government to take appropriate action at the appropriate time. Now I am trying to do something on my own.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : I am requesting you also. It is your State. Are you not worried about it. Some steps must be taken—all in good time, I will say people are listening to the debate outside and throughout the country. The Sikhs are also listening. They would like to know what steps the Government is thinking of. And after all it is over now and we have to see that things are brought back to normalcy though certainly it will take very long.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI)** : I thought that in this debate in view of the seriousness of the subject and the gravity of the situation, our hon. friends opposite would refrain from slander and false accusations. I thought that prejudice would not colour their remarks. Obviously I am not painting everyone with the same brush. But it is a fact that some people have made accusations and these accusations are not new ones. They have been answered—some on the floor of the House and some on other occasions. But the whole purpose of this debate—with apologies to some speakers—seems now to be and this we see outside the House also, for an effort to shift the focus from the essentials to purely subsidiary issues with a view to create confusion in the thinking of the people.

Much has been said by some speakers about the elections. Sir, we are not obsessed with the elections. Unfortunately, the Opposition Parties and Groups and, even the two Members—I do not know whether it is called a group or something other than a Group—are obsessed. To accuse me and the Government of allowing the crisis to build up merely for electoral advantage is a contemptible argument which needs no response.

Some hon'ble Members of the deafening

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

silence. The deafening silence is not in the White Paper; deafening silence was maintained by those who to-day assume the role of custodians of the interests of the Sikh community. Certain remarks which I heard—I was not in the House but I was listening to every speech from my room—were far from responsible. Shri Indrajit Gupta just now said that we regarded the Akalis as the only representatives of the Sikhs. Sir, you yourself can think whether there is any basis in this. In the 1980 elections, when the Akali Dal was in power in the Punjab, who won the elections? The Congress Party won the elections. Our Hindu and Sikh members won the elections. The Sikhs and Hindus voted for the Congress. How can we say that only the Akali Dal represents the Sikhs?

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** Because you only speak to them and you deal only with them.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** We dealt with them, and we met all the other Sikhs; I personally met different sections of Sikhs. Several Sikh and several Hindu organisations from Haryana and from Punjab came to see me. The larger number belonged to my party. But some came from other parties. I do not know whether any Communist Sikhs came or not. But, I did have talks with the Marxist Sikhs leader who was very close to the Akalis and who maintained that they were the voice of the Sikhs.

So, let us not get side tracked by these matters. The Congress has always fought communalism of every kind. I am on record in this House if you will look back to the papers from 1966 onwards you will read how I have spoken against communalists; how I still am against any type of communalism, any type of extremism. To-day, communalism has a new dimension and this is called fundamentalism. Even those countries where fundamentalism is supposed to have started are now worried about it and are trying to see how they can contain it because they are discovering the illeffects it could have

there but, in our country, we have to fight it all the harder because our society is far more vulnerable. This fundamentalism, let me make clear, is not in any one community. I am not referring only to Sikh fundamentalism but also to Hindu fundamentalism, to Muslim fundamentalism and even to Christian fundamentalism. Every religion feels that it has to take an extreme view. Sikhs are not considered real Sikhs because they don't belong to the Akali Dal. What do the Muslims say? That those Muslims who are in the Congress or Communist are not real Muslims, because they do not belong to the Muslim League or to some other such organisation. This is what our party is suffering from because we have kept to our ideal of secularism, because we have kept to certain wider national goals and have not confined ourselves to any type of narrow thinking. We shall continue to fight any type of narrowness of thought, narrowness in the sphere of religion or in any other area. That is the basic Indian tradition. The Congress fought imperialism and to-day it fights neo-colonialism. It is no use making snide remarks because we do not name the countries or people, I do not name groups and I do not name any of you. I do not usually name anybody whether they are abusing me or whether they are praising me. Because the horrible member spoke just now, I took his name. I do not think, anybody can challenge our record on this. The Defence Chief has gone to America or a minister went to Pakistan because we try to find an area of cooperation, we try to increase that area—this has been the basis of our foreign policy from the beginning. This does not mean we don't know what those people are doing. It does not mean that we don't tell them that we know what they are doing.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** Should.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** We not only 'should' but we have. I have been told that people outside have noticed and remarked that there is one person who has said the same thing in different world capitals. I do not tailor my statement to suit the views of the particular country in which I happened to be.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur): You are Praising yourself ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : What do you mean by 'myself' ? I have said what has been internationally acknowledged as India's policy. Today we continue this fight. In fact, some of our problems have arisen because we are pursuing this fight. The hon. Member opposite and others should be aware of this fact. And with all our faults—being human we have many faults—and we do not hide our faults. Naturally we do not want to parade them although India does seem to parade its deficiencies and its shortages and its poverty—everything far more than any other country does. But nevertheless we have taken the country forward in every possible direction. When I say 'we' I am not referring to myself. I am not referring to this Parliament. I am referring to the Indian people. It is the Indian farmer, the Indian worker, the Indian scientist and Indian technologist who have increased our productivity. It is the Indian Army which has defended our borders against foreign aggression. So, when I say 'we' I mean all these people. Sometimes the opposition forgets this. They want to believe everything that those against us say rather than what the government says

We are not talking on behalf of government does matter because it is the government which gives the direction. We do not swing from side to side like some people and some countries. We have set ourselves a steady course, the most difficult course of combining the best of the old with what we consider the best of the modern and in the face of the most tremendous odds and obstacles of every kind, to which I might add some of the hon. friends opposite sometimes contribute. We have not wavered. India has spoken and does speak not only for our people but also for the countless millions, the majority of the world's population and we have been willing to stop aside in order to help others.

Now, Sir, Professor Chakraborty, while concluding his speech yesterday said that the Congress having ruled the country for so many years forgetting that the three years in-between were ruled by others—therefore for it was the Congress's duty to keep the unity of the country. Now, this seems to imply that national unity is a party issue. Is that what he is trying to say ? This is the manner in which it was projected. This is how it came out.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Just now, Madam, you have said that the government formulates the policy. It is not we or my party. You formulate the policy and you are primarily responsible to keep the country together.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : National unity is a national issue and it is the responsibility of all political parties and all Indian citizens. The impression that I got when I heard the hon'ble member's speech was that perhaps other parties can be free to play with fire but run away when the blaze gets too hot. So, for me and for, my party, national unity and integrity are our supreme objectives and nothing can be allowed to come in the way of that, neither elections nor anything else. What is happening in Punjab was not simply a story of cruelty or merciless violence against innocent people. It was a concerted attempt by a combination of internal and external forces to encourage divisive forces and if possible, to divide the country. This was the challenge before us. Another hon. Member who spoke before lunch, who said that although the army had not been sent to other places where there was violence there why the army action in Punjab. The situation in Punjab is an entirely different one although there are links with what has happened in other border States.

Now, the question of the foreign hand is also mentioned. This was brought up earlier by several members. We are asked for evidence we are asked to name the countries, the people and so on. Now, we are not sitting in a court of

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

law. We are dealing with historical forces and movements. We are fighting for our freedom. During the struggle for our freedom, did we have any iron-clad evidence that communal riots were being provoked? We could not have. But we did discover after freedom that some of them were deliberately instigated. In fact, as I have said earlier, I met a high official at the time of Queen Elizabeth's Coronation who told me of his role in one such-communal riot.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
They were ruling the country.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :  
That is not the point. The point is what happened even after colonialism. Imperialism as such has gone but we all know of the views which several industrial countries hold about developing countries; we all know of events in other countries. At this moment we can only guess. We cannot produce proof of what any body is doing. We can only judge from what is happening in other countries, what has happened on other continents. Those events have been acknowledged. They are no longer guess work. Some of us did human inkling and I spoke of it. I was hooted down, by my own party. Members when I said something like that at a party meeting. Later, books appeared and evidence appeared describing what had happened. We can only judge from our political experience, from the knowledge of what is happening in the rest of the world. We must recognise the nature of contemporary world forces. There are well documented activities of external agencies in other countries. The question before us is : whose interests are being served by casting doubts on the role of these external forces ?

AN HON. MEMBER : Come to Punjab.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Punjab is very much at the centre of it. That is I am speaking of these matters. Why should this collusion take place at this

time? The link between communalism and neo-imperialism are deep-rooted, India is among the few developing countries which is a democratic and secular State. India is also among the few developing countries to establish through planning which was at first so strongly denigrated in some parts of the world, a strong independent and self-reliant national economy. India is in the fore-front in the movement for peace and disarmament. India's voice is loud and clear for re-structuring the existing inequitable relationship in international economy. India symbolises non-alignment and is its most positive force. Efforts to subvert our independence through open aggression, through overt and covert pressures have failed. Because, true to our tradition, the Congress did not succumb during the post-independence period to the pressures or blandishment of powerful forces.

So, now some other way has to be found to weaken India, and this is the true significance of events in Punjab. That is why, the agitations in Punjab, a sensitive border State, a State with a dynamic economy. In other parts of India also although these may have different reasons, yet there is some link between them. Can we ignore the remarkable coincidence of troubles in Punjab with the re-arming of our neighbour? Can we ignore the strong revival of secessionist forces in Jammu and Kashmir and those in Tripura and the north-east border? In fact, not only in Tripura, but we have that problem in the whole north-east.

As I said, some are willing to believe the good intentions of everyone else except their own Government. To them these events may have no connection, but anybody else will see that they are closely connected.

The main point is-need the army have gone to the Golden Temple? And how did we deal with the demands? A name has been mentioned, and the person is now supposed to be a hero of the Sikhs. I do not want to go into this business,

This accusation has been refuted ; there was no connection between any person there and the Congress. If the press or some people say that two of our M. Ps won their elections because of him and so forth, I can say there is no truth in that allegation.....(Interruptions)\*\*

MR. SPEAKER : No ; there is nothing on record. Will you please keep silent ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : This matter has been gone into yesterday and again today and I am not going to reopen it. But it has been very clearly stated that what the hon. Member has said is incorrect. There were internal quarrels amongst the Akalis themselves. We know, they were there before, they were visible even during the talks. And it is possible, I cannot be positive about this, but what I have heard is that some candidate of his was defeated by some other Akalis in their own elections so to take revenge, the decided to defeat their candidate. That has nothing to do with us. Anyway, the question is about the demands.....(Interruptions)

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR—rose.

MR. SPEAKER : I will give you a chance to speak if you like, but if you do like this, I will name you. Sit down. Do not look up there .....(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : You have stated the real reason for all these remarks ; You have correctly identified the real reason for such accusations and remarks.

So far as the demands are concerned, I have made my views and my stand, which is the government's on the religious issues clear from the second meeting at which the opposition was not present, the second meeting with me. When that meeting was over, they said, these are not the real demands ; the real

demands which had not been mentioned up till then were water and territory. Naturally, I said, 'if those were the most important demands you should have mentioned them earlier. We have sat for 2 1/2 hours today ; we sat for, perhaps 2 hours on the previous occasion. Then I had some public function and I had to leave. So, from then on the religious demands were pushed into the background and these other two were brought forward. My stand on these has been categorical I have stated time and again and I think Shri Chavan or some one who spoke has also said this—that Chandigarh would go to Punjab.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It should have gone by now.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It could not go unless Haryana got something in its place. Well, it is on this that we could not get any agreement. They were not willing to talk to the Haryana people.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : That was not true.

MR. SPEAKER : Don't interrupt, Will you sit down ? I object very much to it.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : The Prime Minister should state the facts.

MR. SPEAKER : No, this is an interruption. I would like you to sit down. How can you say that it is not a fact.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I know it. You please sit down. Not a word should go on record, whatever he says, without my permission.

(Interruptions)\*\*

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Let them quarrel amongst themselves.

\*\*Not recorded.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
When Atalji was speaking, a number of interruptions were there.

MR. SPEAKER : This is something wrong basically which is irrelevant.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER ; I have given you time. Without my permission it is irrelevant.

*(Interruptions)\*\**

MR. SPEAKER : Without my permission, it is irrelevant. I am not talking about it ; without my permission it is irrelevant.

*(Interruptions)\*\**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
When Atalji was speaking, did they interfere with your permission, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : No. That was also irrelevant.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :  
We do not want to disturb when the Prime Minister was speaking. Please take note of that.

MR. SPEAKER : That was also irrelevant.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I might be irrelevant, but I was.....

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : When I am saying that you are irrelevant; I am saying that the interruptions without my permission are irrelevant, unnecessary. Why do you take it on yourself unnecessarily ? Don't drag yourself unnecessarily ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You had seen how Atalji was being interrupted ?

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER That : is what I said about that; that is why I was harsh; that is why I took objection to that also, not to this one only.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : He made personal remarks. I am not making personal remarks against anybody.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Shri Atalji did not make any personal remarks.

SHRIMUTI INDIRA GANDHI : He did you please look into the record. I was listening to his speech. It did not make any difference that I was in my office. The voice is exactly the same and the words are the same.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorkhpur) : You were sitting in your room. That is why you could not hear it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : No. I heard every single word. Now, the question is that originally we had said that Fazilka and Abohar should go to Haryana, but once Punjab said, they wanted them. The question was what would Haryana get instead. Punjab said that we should give money for a new Capital. We have no objection. We said we would share the cost with Punjab, but we felt and I still feel that Haryana should get some compensation in land also. Now, this is my view. It does not mean two or three villages which Haryana would get anyhow. This is what Bagriji must also have thought. He knows the posting. We could not get a lasting solution by starting an agitation in Haryana simultaneously. Therefore the two matters have to be balanced.

AN HON. MEMBER : It was engineered.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It was not engineered. It was well control-

led as soon as it broke out. It was a tragic occurrence and we were deeply—I was deeply—distressed that our Sikh friends should have been harassed their turbans taken off or whatever else was done. But as soon as we heard of the incident we took the strongest action and from then on it did not recur. But I am referring to that demand. Had we made a declaration that Chandigarh would go to Punjab while keeping the Haryana matter hanging, then there would have been trouble in Haryana. This is what I am trying to say. But just now I am not concerned with the demands that were discussed. I am concerned with the demand that was not discussed, which is the Anandpur Sahib Resolution. The opposition parties were not able to convince me that the Akali Dal had given up the Resolution entirely. All I was told was, "They will not raise it now".

**SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR :** Why should they give it up ?

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** Now, he is saying, "Why should they give it up". Please see the significance of that statement.

Now, what is the Anandpur Sahib Resolution ?

**SHRI FRANK ANTHONY** (Nominated Anglo-Indian) : Mr. Longowal had repeatedly stated it. May I just make it clear ? He repeatedly stated that the Anandpur Sahib Resolution was his minimum demand. He had said it repeatedly.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Please do not interrupt.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** whenever the Akalis were asked about this, they said,—I do not know whether they used the word 'minimum'—but they said—that they had not given up the Anandpur Sahib Resolution. Furthermore, when I asked the opposition leaders who were present at some of the meetings about this resolution they confirmed that

it had not been given up, it was only shelved. Shelved for how long, they could not say, whether that could be for three months, six months or one year.

In those circumstances I did not see any point in the Government officially announcing what it was agreeing to. What were we getting in return ? The Akalis were not willing to accept that there was terrorism from the Golden Temple. They were not willing to accept that there were arms in the Golden Temple. Vajpayeeji said that I asked them if there were arms. I did not ask them. The then Home Minister wrote to them to say that we have information that there are arms. we have information that in such and such room such and such wanted person is hiding, so please hand them over, so that we do not have to take any action. And that is why we repeated that we did not want the Police to go in, that we did not want to interfere in any way with religion. It is only when we came to a dead end that the army action had to be taken.

One word about the Anandpur Sahib Resolution. My colleague Shri Sethi made his statement in Parliament that the Akalis were changing their demands. In his reply Shri Longowal asserted that the Akalis had at no time given up the Anandpur Sahib Resolution.....  
(Interruptions).

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** Why did you not include that in this ?

**DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :** That should have been included in this.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** Apart from the endorsement of the Anandpur Sahib Resolution in the presence of the Janata Party leaders in Ludhiana in 1978.....

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** What is the date of that letter ?

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI :** May 1st, 1984.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why did you not include it in the White Paper ?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Why did you not include it ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : So, this means that the Janata Party accepted it then.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI (Hissar) : Who was its leader then ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Whoever the Janata Party sent. And therefore, the Akalis said that the terms of the Sarkaria Commission fell far short of the demands of the Akali Dal.

There is also much talk about who is moderate and who is not.....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Are you referring to that on page 73 of the same document which you have produced ? There is the commitment of the Akali Dal to the integrity and the unity of the country.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not refer to any document. I refer to a communication received from Shri Longowal.

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : वहाँ पर जनता पार्टी का लीडर कौन था ।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मुझे क्या मालूम कि कौन था । किस वक्त कौन जनता पार्टी थी और कौन लोक दल था, किस पार्टी में कौन है, आज कल की राजनीति में यह तो पता ही नहीं चलता है ।

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : मैंने पूछा है कि आनन्दपुर साहब प्रस्ताव के पास होने के वक्त वहाँ पर जनता पार्टी का लीडर कौन था ।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : जो भी होगा, यह वहाँ की जनता पार्टी को मालूम होगा ।

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : आप बता दीजिए ।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मुझे नहीं मालूम है ।

I am told that in July, 1981 Shri Tohra, President of the SGPC and Shri Gurdial Singh Ajnaha, Head Priest of the Akal Takht went on a tour of the UK and USA. We have reason to believe that they established contact with the proponents of separatism. I do not want to take names, you know the names prominent in that movement. From the Talwandi Group, the General Secretary and the former Minister in the Badal Ministry is reported to have sent an application to the United Nations for associate membership of the UN for the Sikhs a nation. So far as we know, the application was more or less at the time of this visit to the countries.

We know how the Akal Takht and the Golden Temple complex were being used. And we know that at first this was denied. Soon after the Army action when I sent somebody to the Golden Temple, one of the important persons there said that he was in charge of the Akal Takht but for four months or so he had not been allowed to go there. He was in the complex but he was not allowed to go there.

We have heard of the feelings of the Sikhs. When I went to Amritsar, I was acquainted with some of the authorities for a briefing meeting but some of those who had accompanied me went into the city and met a number of Sikhs and also Hindus. One taxi-driver said : "You people who were not living in Amritsar have no idea of what we have been through. I am a Sikh; I am a Jat Sikh. I am not basically a political person. I do not belong to any political party. But when I left home in the mornings; my family did not know whether I would be back in the

evening. If there was a noise near the door, we did not dare open it." This was the atmosphere before the Army action. The further you go from Amritsar you find the atmosphere changes because those people do not know what was happening there. Such was the situation.

You say : 'Did the Government fail ?'

Well, to some extent, it was a sort of failure. But what is the reality of the situation ? Because Police forces consist largely of the majority community of the State. This makes it difficult for them. They do not necessarily agree with what is happening but they are pressurised; not just they themselves but their families are threatened with death. Anybody who tried to help to find the terrorists or who gave information was killed, his family was threatened his family members were killed. Some days ago, just before parliament opened, two Sikh women came to see me. They said : We have been here for some time, we wanted to see you but did not know how. I said ; Well, did you contact anybody ? They said : 'We did not know whom to contact'. And finally, they thought of telephoning. They telephoned in the evening. They were given an appointment the very next morning. One of them said she was living not far from the Golden Temple. Three of her sons were killed in front of her. She said : I am an old lady, I have three daughters-in-law to look after. I have grand-children to look after. I dare not go back, I do not want to go back to Amritsar. I was born there, I was brought up there, I do not know any other part of India but I do not want to go back to Amritsar. Please give me some place to live in Delhi or anywhere else. Such were the things that were happening there. So, when in spite of our best efforts, the police was not effective any more. And this is not peculiar to Punjab. We have been seen this happening in Assam. I referred the other day to the language riots. I was not in the Government then but I was sent there as Head of Committee on behalf of my party. The question there was not of Hindus versus Muslims. It was between Hindus and Muslims who spoke Assamese

and Hindus and Muslims who spoke Bengali. What did we find ? In those districts where the officers were Sikhs or where they came from South India, there was no trouble. But where communities, the officials were Assamese whether Assamese speaking or Bengali speaking, they were so terrified that they could not function. If a Bengali upheld the just case of a Bengali, they would say : 'No, he is a Bengali, that is why he is supporting him. And I must admit that even a Bengali who was with me, whom I thought was well above such narrow mindedness believed that an Assamese could not be believed. This sort of atmosphere is terrible. This is what we have to fight together. It can not be achieved by Government alone. This is why in the National Integration Council in Srinagar, the minorities made the proposal of having a mixed force.' I am sorry that we have not succeeded in having one. Something has been done to induct more minority people in the police force and other forces but I must confess it is inadequate. In Punjab there is one kind of situation, in U P. it may be another, in Kerala it may again be different.

This is why people have confidence in the Central forces rather than in the local police. It is not that we want to interfere, that we want to send the Central forces, but a situation is created in which there is confidence on those who come from outside whose families cannot be threatened. Some people want the army withdrawn from Punjab admitting that one or two incidents may take place. But others threaten saying what will happen when the army goes away. I do not want the army to stay there permanently. Of course, it is not going to stay. It should come out as soon as possible but we must, in the meantime, create conditions in which the people of Punjab feel safe, not only the Hindus but a large number of Sikhs as well. They may say something publicly but privately they have admitted that because they were against extremism, they are in peril. There is no day when I do not get letters with photostat copies of these threatening letters which people in Punjab are receiving.

[Shrimate Indira Gandhi]

All these things have to be kept in view.

There is no doubt that.....

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Withdraw from the Golden Temple itself.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The army is already out from the main area, it is outside the *parikrama*. But a new situation has arisen, that of *kar seva*. We are trying to talk to every different group. It was our information that the Akalis did not want to repair the Akal Takht. They want to keep it as a monument for the future. Hon'ble members can well understand that, if it is kept as it is, will it not increase the bitterness day by day? This is the problem. Hence we felt that if one group is not willing to do it, somebody else should do so. Whoever is willing to undertake this task should do so. Frankly, I say that if nobody else does it, then the Government should do it. But it should be done, After that if the Akalis want to break down the Akal Takht that is their business. But, if it is broken because of our action, then we should see that it is repaired, that it is left in the condition—not in the condition in which we found it, because when we entered it was full of terrorists and full of arms, I do not mean that past—it should be a building which is as beautiful, as strong and complete as it was before the days of terrorism. This was our only motive in trying to encourage the *kar seva*. I do feel that the sooner this work is complete, the sooner it will be possible for the army to leave.

When one man takes courage,— and it requires a lot of courage, in the face of threats to do this *seva*, he is entitled to protection. People were allowed in the Golden Temple earlier, they went in thousands and thousands. I do not know what the exact situation is today. But there was a risk of people going in large numbers and women squatting to stop the work. This would create a bad situation. So, until some of the building work is done, full protection must be there.

However, even now the army is not in the main areas. They are not in the Harmandir Sahib, they are not in the *Parikrama*, they are outside.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : They are in the *Darshan Deori*

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : They may be, I do not know. They may or may not be. I said they have to be in a position where, should the trouble arise, they can immediately control the situation and save the people.

When we were talking about *Kar Seva* some people demanded that the army must go out completely and ultimately suggested that it could stay on top of the gate. What can they do from the top of the gate? They can only shoot. If they were put somewhere on the ground, they can stop the people or do something less drastic. These are some of the problems. If one goes into all the details, it will take hours and hours. These are some of the important points which have to be understood.

I am happy that people have praised the role of the army, the courage of the army. But an hon'ble member of the other House who is not a member of our party made a rather derogatory statement. I know that we are not supposed to refer to the other House, but I have already spoken there and shall not get a chance to reply there. I must deplore his remarks. They are not conducive to bringing back harmony or for the national good.

Earlier people denigrated the police. I mentioned just now why the police was not effective. It is not just that they were terrified. But when people in responsible positions are denigrating authority, they cannot, at the same time, expect people to obey authority. There are two contradictory attitudes, you speak all the time strongly against the police. Naturally, the police wonder why they should act. If anything happens, the onslaught is on the police or on the para-mi-

litary forces. It is demoralising for them as an open attack. The reinstatement of the police who were dismissed because of sabotage or other indiscipline will certainly demoralises the rest of the police, those who have stuck to their duty.

These are many factors which created an exceedingly complex situation. The army had an arduous task and they did it bravely. We have praised the Army on many occasions, not only for their work in war time, but also for the efficient selfless work they do in peace time. Some of our Jawans have lost their lives or limbs in the course of food dropping in the North-Eastern area or in flooded areas. We do not want to use the army on every pretext or make them do the work of civilians but there are certain occasions when the use of the army is inevitable. As I said, the situation in Punjab was not an ordinary situation. It went far beyond any normal agitation or normal violence and crime.

As regards the Sant who is now guiding the Kar Seva and his attitude towards the Granthis, a journalist who cannot by any stretch of imagination be accused of partiality for my government or for me personally, wrote in his paper that the SGPC Chief had over-ruled the Priests objections and allowed the terrorist leaders to establish themselves in the Akal Takht and convert it into an arsenal. So, why accuse Baba Santa Singh.

Some hon. Members have asked why we delayed the action. It seems one cannot be right no matter what one does. We delayed it precisely because we did not want to take it, because we wanted some way out, some kind of understanding which would include the throwing out of terrorists, the dismantling of the arsenal and the ending of a situation which threatened our country's unity and integrity. It is because we were trying until the very last moment, that we did not take the action earlier. But when we came to a stage when we felt that there was no other way, we had to ask the army to go in. I did not choose the day. I suppose various things were taken into consideration.

There is talk of a person becoming a hero and some people are trying to separate him from the other Akali leadership. The Opposition leaders, may know that one of the first demand of the Akali leadership was for Bhindranwale's release.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : (Azamgarh) : He was released earlier than that, It was not in the tripartite meeting

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is mentioned in the White Paper.

(Interruptions)

आप लोग सुनते नहीं हैं और अपनी कहते चले जा रहे हैं। मैंने यह नहीं कहा जो आप कह रहे हैं।

It is in the White Paper. Here you are all criticising the White Paper. You are telling us it does not have this and it does not have that, but it seems to me that you do not know what it contains.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : We have seen it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Then how do you say that you do not know about it ?

(Interruptions)

Anyway, he was not released by us but by the Court, but that was the Akalis' first demand.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : Yes, it was a demand, but it was not in the tripartite meeting.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Madam Prime Minister, along with the Minister I was present in all the tripartite talks and at no meeting any representative of the Akali Dal demanded the release of Bhindranwale.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : They did so in writing then.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV : But the Government had released him earlier.

SHRI A. K. SEN : The court had released him.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Now, it is mentioned in the White Paper. That is what I am telling you that you do not bother to read yet comment on it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am telling you that it is wrong.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I strongly deplore the remarks made by the hon. Member opposite about saying that India is many nations. India is one nation, it was one nation and it will remain one nation. *(Interruptions)*. I heard when he said that.

SHRI C.T. DHANDAPANI : No, no. I want to correct myself. I did not want to say 'many nations'. I meant 'one nations, many Nationalities'.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : (Calcutta North East) : Madam, that may be the political view of so many political parties in this country. What objection can you have ? In spite of these things, political parties do assert that it is one country and shall remain as one country.

MR. SPEAKER : That is what she said.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : That is what I am saying.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : But how can you object to somebody telling that

India is a country of so many nationalities ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The word 'nationality' may have many meanings, but I am afraid it is a dangerous word to use.

SHRI MANI RAM BAGRI : India is one nation, one country.

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : बागड़ी जी षन्यवाद ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सोवियत रूस में, और कहीं पर भी आपने यह कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान में कई नेशनैलिटीज हैं और उस पर हमने आब्जेक्शन किया था ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : No, no. Never, never, The word I used is 'Community', never 'nation'.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI : Perhaps I have been misquoted by the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : All right. But it is true that in some Communist countries they do use the word 'nationalities'.

\* SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : That is why you used this ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I did not use it. I have never used it. I do not approve of it, let me make this quite clear. But the Akali leadership was using the word 'qaum' as nationality. This I clarified, I used the word 'qaum' because we have always used it to mean 'community'.

There is no question of there being different nationalities in India. We are all one nation, we are all Indian citizens, and as I understand, the word 'nationality' means different citizenship.

I am not bothered about the dictionary meaning, (*Interruptions*). It may be wrong. If you mention it in any.....

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : Mr. Speaker, Sir, she has been wrongly tutored. 'Nationality' and 'community' are two different things.

MR. SPEAKER : You were too young at that time to teach us.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY : 'Nationality' and 'citizenship' are two different words.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : How can a foreign national become a citizen ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Why not you take Indian nationality. Then you become a part of the Indian nation.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He becomes an Indian citizen, he does not become an Indian national.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : He does become an Indian national (*interruptions*). Let us not get bogged down in semantics here.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : जिस किसी ने भी भारतीयता अख्तियार कर ली है वह भारत का कोमयत म शामिल है ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : No. I am not interested in dictionary meanings. I am interested in how this particular word is understood in the English-speaking word.

MR. SPEAKER : That means nation.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am

confining myself to one language, and not to other languages.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If you go into Marxist vocabulary, you will be in trouble.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Prof. Dandavate, I had myself mentioned that in Marxist parlance it is.....(*Interruptions*).

I think I have made all the points and my colleague the Home Minister, will go into the details. But the question is: Now, what do we do? And the first thing is that we should bridge any division between different Communities. We must, all of us, and this is the responsibility of all parties and all citizens of India, to heal whatever hurt is there. Not only our Sikh friends are hurt. All of us, are hurt.

I myself was deeply pained in taking the action. You can ask my colleagues what I went through. Perhaps, this is the first and only time in my life when I did not sleep. But I felt that the step had to be taken in the national interest. And today we have been to see how we bridge the chasm that has been created and the distances that have been created between one community and another. That is, our foremost duty.

We have to fight communalism of any kind because that is the greatest danger to our unity.

Where did this cry of separatism rise? It did not arise in India. It rose far from our shores from people who are affluent. Some may be wanting citizenship of other countries. Many are actually citizens of other countries. Some may feel that this will bring them some advantage. Whether there were pressures or suggestions from others, I do not know. But this slogan is strongest to-day outside our country. We must meet this challenge as one nation as and one people. We should not bring in party politics.

Some people feel alienated. The Sikhs feel alienated for some reason. Other

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

people feel alienated not because of religion but because of economics. There are many reasons for alienation. There is also alienation because some people suddenly became rich. They became alienated from the places from which they came and from their families. There are all kinds of alienation.

Our effort is to try to have a balance in the country so that we can pursue with our programmes and not only strengthen, but consolidate our unity to go ahead strongly on our accepted path of socialist development. We have to revitalise, the tradition of our national struggle. We have to move the entire people. This is where we have to have a massive movement—a movement for unity has to be created, just as during the freedom struggle and even after the freedom struggle my father said—“Freedom is in peril, defend it with all your might”, this is what we need to-day, to revitalise the tradition of our national struggle and to move the people by a vision of a new society based on equality and social justice.

The battle for secularism, the battle for unity is not only in our words. It must be in the hearts and minds of all our people. This we have not been able to achieve. At the slightest provocation we find some communal trouble arises or class trouble arises. We have also to remove the cause for grievances. But for this great task of building a strong and united India we have to rise above our narrow outlook and short term gains, look ahead to a future that is worthy of the sacrifices of those who suffered and laydown their lives for our country's freedom and its defence.

श्री मनी राम बागड़ी : भाखड़ा नहर जो दो बार काटी गई है, उसके बारे में आपने कुछ नहीं कहा ।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : उसका हमें बेहद दुख है । मैं हर वक्त हरियाणा गवर्नमेंट के संग और इंजीनियर्स के टच में हूँ और

पता कर रही हूँ कि क्या हाल है और किस प्रकार वहाँ का मदद कर सकते हैं ।

जिन लोगों की जानें गई हैं, पहले भी उनके लिए हम शोक यहाँ व्यक्त कर चुके हैं बाहर भी कर चुके हैं ।

लोग कहते हैं कि फौज को हटा लो, खाली गोल्डन टेम्पल में जो हुआ, उससे खतरा नहीं गया है । खतरा अभी है । इस का सामना करना है । किस तरह से करना है यह हम सब लोगों को मिलकर तय करना है ।

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Nadar.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister intervening in the debate is only an eye-wash, It was a deliberate attempt to fool the people of this country through this House.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the people of this country have been kept in darkness for the last almost four years in regard to the happenings in Punjab as the reports either through the Government media like Television and All India Radio or through even the newspapers have been censored. There has been an undeclared press censorship regarding happenings in Punjab for the last two-three years. There is now a declared press censorship. Even this White Paper is a censored document.

Actually, this White Paper is a document of white cover on back deeds of the Congress-I leaders and their Government. Whatever may be their opinion, whatever may be the opinion of the members of this House belonging to this side or that side, I am of the firm opinion that a democratic Government which uses army to control the law and order situation has no moral authority to remain in power.