

[S. Buta Singh]

gers were injured. It appears that the terrorists had boarded that bus at the bus-stop of village Bhagola, District Hoshiarpur. After committing the crime, the culprits escaped on a scooter.

Police officers rushed to the scene of the accident. Combing operations by the para-military forces of the police were started to apprehend the culprits. All police stations in the State have been alerted and intensive patrolling is being conducted.

I am sure Sir that this House would join me in condemning the dastardly acts of violence which create disaffection and misunderstanding among different sections of our society and in conveying our deep sympathies to the bereaved families. Government is preparing to stamp out terrorism and at the same time I would appeal to all communities and sections of the public to work together for foiling the evil designs of the terrorists and anti-national forces.

(Interruptions)

16-30 hrs

DISCUSSION ON STATEMENT
MADE BY MINISTER OF HOME
AFFAIRS RE : SITUATION
ARISING OUT OF KILLINGS BY
TERRORISTS IN PUNJAB

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Mr. Speaker, I was as much shocked by the statement of the Minister as I was shocked by the tragedy about which I learnt from the press today. As some of the members of the ruling party as well as the opposition have rightly said, when we were able to collect more details from the newspapers and some of our friends, we are surprised to find that the

hon. Home Minister is not able to give us information which even a police constable at a police station is able to aver to the visitors.

Sir, I do not want to strike any partisan note. At 11 O'clock today you found that as far as the anger of the House was concerned, there was no distinction between a Congress member and a non-congress one because we acted and reacted as human beings and we did not act as members belonging to different political parties.

Sir; I may quote precedent. Fortunately or unfortunately, I had the experience of being the Railway Minister and I came across some of the ghastly railway accidents. Some of them happened to be sabotage accidents. One hon. member of the parliament died in one of the accidents, which was deliberately engineered by some extremists. There was no Punjab problem at that time Shastriji who was a member of the Rajya Sabha died. We were very unhappy about it. It has been the past tradition.....

SHRI GIRDHARI LAL VYAS : At that time there was Janata Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Please do not adduce to that. I will tell you what happened.

AN HON. MEMBER : But you did not resign;

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Yes I have, for your information.

I would like to inform this House that whenever a ghastly railway accident took place, according to the accepted convention of this House, at the first available opportunity, the Railway Minister, no matter whether it be a Congress Government, in the past the concerned Minister has always come before the House and as many details as possible used to be given. And there have been discussions on

occasions and in the other House, there have been clarifications sought by the members.

Sir, I find that after such a ghastly accident, no details have been forwarded by the hon. Minister while making the cursory statement over here. Sir, it is no secret to tell you that the first telephone that I received regarding this was today and, as ill-luck would have it, I come from Jammu by bus yesterday. We passed through Punjab. The next day morning, when I reached Delhi and opened the papers, I found that there was a massacre in the bus. When such a ghastly massacre has taken place, all that we expected from the Home Minister was — action would take place later on — that at least the details would be given to us as to whose mistake it was that these people come into the bus and how it was that they could not be detected? How is it that they were roaming about and making their plans and conspiracies all those details have not been revealed at all.

You may recall that when this House discussed the 2nd October phenomenon, there were no division in this House. No doubt there was an Adjournment Motion moved by me. Members speaking from the other side only said that the difference of opinion was that instead of an Adjournment Motion, discussion under Rule 193 on that should have been there; otherwise, there was no difference of opinion as far as that episode was concerned. Today, the situation is the same. We have moved a Motion for discussion under Rule 193. Such a ghastly tragedy has occurred and we find that the details have not come forward at all. So, first let me register my protest and anger at the cursory manner in which the Home Minister has made a small paltry statement before the House.

Sir, ever since this problem of extremism and terrorism, Punjab has witnessed untold misery and ghastly massacres. Politics has not meant anything to Punjab,

as far as terrorism and extremism is concerned. There was a time when there was the president's rule. There was a time when Congress (I) Government was there.

Now, Akali Government headed by Mr. Barnala is already there. So no matter whatever be the complexion of the Government there in Punjab, these tragedies have taken place. They cut across the political lines and rather than blaming any particular individual or a political party, we must take cognizance as to why, the things are happening. Why the administration has remained weak? Which were the weapons available to those who were administering in order to bring peace and non-violence to this State? You will find Sir, one of the maladies of the situation in which, you even will privately agree and you might not be able to say it from the Chair and that is, unfortunately whatever be the administration in Punjab, the entire approach to the problem of Punjab has been an *ad hoc* approach. It has been, as always said a fire-brigade approach. Whenever there is a fire in one corner, the fire brigade engine rushes to the spot and extinguishes the fire, comes back to the depot, waits in the depot for a warning signal of the next fire. That is how, the Governments have been functioning there now. Therefore, I want to point out to you that this *ad hocism* has to be given up. I do not want to dig up the old controversies, but I may tell you the recent incidents. There can be genuine difference of opinion between the Members of the ruling party and the opposition about one particular step to be taken. Take for instance problem of Constitution Amendment which our hon. Home Minister wanted to bring in. He called the Members of the Opposition. He also consulted the Members of the ruling party. Many of us told him that there was no Constitution Amendment that was necessary in order to create the safety belt with more powers and that already there were powers given to them. There the Prime Minister invited us, I want to repeat this, not for the sake of fault-finding, but in order to see that

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

these blunders are avoided in the future. I am placing on record all these things.

Sir, we told the Home Minister, there are already certain laws to which the hon. Member made a reference just now. There are already certain provisions of law. There are constitutional provisions. There are rights with the Centre. But even the enabling provisions of law and Constitution have not been utilised at all.

Sir, when the Prime Minister invited us to discuss the Punjab situation, and particularly the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, we read out to him Article 249 of the Constitution, in which there is a provision that Rajya Sabha by two-thirds majority could actually adopt a resolution empowering the Centre to legislate on those subjects which are supposed to be in the State List; and that particular implementation will continue for one year. That right was rightly given to the Rajya Sabha because Rajya Sabha represents the States directly. And, therefore, with a two-thirds majority, the resolution could be passed. When the question was pointed out to him viz. that Article 249 was an enabling provision, immediately the Prime Minister within a few minutes, said: "No Constitution Amendment Bill. We will invoke Article 249."

I want to go on record: on that occasion, my friends from CPI(M), myself and many others said; "We have only pointed out the enabling provision of Article 249; that does not mean that the situation is ripe enough to invoke Article 249." On that, the Prime Minister had given a solemn assurance to the members of the ruling party and the Opposition. He said: "We will prepare a Position Paper, to give you an idea as to whether we have been in a position to use, to fully utilize the enabling provisions of law, and the provisions of the Constitution. That paper was never produced. Basically, it was the responsibility of the Home

Ministry and the Law Ministry to prepare that position Paper. You don't expect a Prime Minister to prepare that Paper. That paper ought to have been prepared by the Home Ministry. That paper was never prepared.

Then the Rajya Sabha leaders were called, and they were told: "Here is the resolution. You will be shocked and surprised, Sir, to know that the Home Ministry produced a resolution for the Rajya Sabha; and it was supposed to be to take over the powers of the State List, to legislate at the Centre on Punjab and the border areas; and in that resolution, there was no reference to the border areas, no reference to Punjab. Someone pointed out that this resolution would mean that Government was taking over the powers of legislating on the State subjects throughout India. Then somebody pointed out: 'At least in the Preamble mention Punjab'. The Attorney General was invited; and he gave the advice that according to law, even if you mention Punjab only in the Preamble of that resolution, it has no legal implications. That resolution will continue to be applied to the entire country. In spite of that, by two-thirds majority, the resolution was passed to invoke Article 249.

Why am I saying that there is an *ad hoc* approach? Firstly, they did not go through Article 249. When they passed a resolution invoking Article 249, they had forgotten to read Article 258(1) of the Constitution. Article 258(1) of the Constitution says that when the legislative powers of the State are extended to the Centre, and if the Centre wants the implementation of the law determined by the Centre, and if the State's executive machinery is to be utilized, the consent of the concerned State is required, not merely consultation; and because that happened, the whole thing fell through.

MR. SPEAKER : No.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, you may differ. You can also participate

in the debate. The Home Minister will do the job for you. Why do you unnecessarily take the trouble? you better concentrate on giving the ruling.

Therefore, when this was pointed out to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister decided that Government would not go in for this; and then the Government of Punjab said that they would take the assistance of BSF and CRPF to see that the necessary safety belts were created. And then the question was dropped. I say this in order to point out to you how in an *ad hoc* manner we are trying to solve the problem..

Now I come to the present situation. In the morning, both the sides of the House said: You must take action. What did they mean? All that they meant was: 'Whatever laws are available to you, implement them effectively, no matter whether it is Barnala Government, Central Government or Congress Government in Punjab. Whatever be the Government, you implement the legal provisions that are available.' What are the legal provisions available today? There is a Disturbed Areas Act. There is another Act which has been passed, viz. the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985.

For the information of the House, I may remind that there is 1958 Special Powers Arms Act. The only word 'Punjab' is to be added to that. Then there is a right of the Centre to deploy para military forces like CRPF and also BSF in the concerned distress State.

I do not want to cast aspersion because the Prime Minister was speaking on the spur of the moment. The Prime Minister is not a constitutionalist; he had no copy of the Constitution; he had not got all the relevant laws. He told Mr. Acharia. Will you be prepared to amend the law against terrorists, etc. because there are still some difficulties; will you be able to amend the law? We all shouted, no amendment was needed. Even if the law that had been

enacted by this very House is implemented effectively, you can deal with the situation. I will read out Section 18 of the Terrorists and Disruptive Activities Prevention 1985 Act. Let me go on record. Section 18 (1) says as follow:

"Any power exercised 'over' by State Government under this Act may after consultation with the State Government."

You kindly note here words 'after consultation with the State Government.

"...exercise by the Central Government with the same effect as if such power had been conferred directly on the Central Government and had been delegated by this Government to such State Governments."

Very clear. Prof. Ranga should be happy about it. Already the powers are given. I do not want to blame the Prime Minister because sometimes he makes a statement and then refers to the references. Therefore, if he refers to this, he will find that the Section 11 is very clear. When the members from both sides demanded that you take action, not that you have no power to take action, already Section 18 is there in your possession—and only if you have the will to do so, you can do so. Mr. Home Minister, only if you have the will to do so; I think Section 18 could have been implemented; and that is exactly what was hinted at. We did not want to go into the legal niceties. In fact, at 11 O'clock upto 1145 P.M. when the House was disturbed, it was not disturbed for what you have done so far, the House was disturbed by the fact that when such a colossal tragedy had taken place and ghastly act had taken place, none was coming forward to share the responsibility and pay the price for what had happened and that was expected by the House, but that was not done. This is not only the opposition which said it, members from both sides had said it I am sure, I do not want to attribute any malafide to any member sitting on the ruling side; they are the members of the ruling party. Even when

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

they reiterated and when they made this demand, it was not a partisan demand, but it was a demand that came from the depth of the human mind that had been revaged and enraged; that is how this demand came forward, but they were not prepared to do it. This is the manner in which all the adhocism is going on in the country.

We have government at the Centre and we have government led by Mr Barnala in Punjab Both sides from the opposition and the ruling party—Mr. Barnala must remember that as far as Mr Barnala is concerned, he should remember that members of the opposition as well as ruling party had given all the possible support to Mr Barnala in the past, where Mr. Barnala was confronted by terrorists and extremists, the ruling party and the opposition stood by Mr. Barnala against the whole onslaught. That is what we did. We unitedly said that if you protect the life of the people in Punjab, Mr. Barnala, we will be with you. But what is the position of Mr. Barnala? As my friend Mr. Shahabuddin pointed out to me that it is doubtful whether Mr. Barnala enjoys the majority. There are actually dissensions in his own government apart from those who gave unconditional support to Mr. Barnala. It is in his own Cabinet there are members who are trying to sabotage the government from within. And if there are supporters of the extremists in the Barnala Government, itself, then probably at some stage the Centre will have to decide whether we can allow the lives of the human beings in Punjab to be left to the mercy of the Barnala Government. Even that decision, you will have to take up and arrive at a necessary conclusion. Even that will have to be done here.

I have no disrespect for any religion. We live in a land of Mahatma Gandhi and in the land of Gandhiji our concept of co-existence is the peaceful co-existence of all religions. That is the concept. We want Sikhism to exist, we want Islam to exist, we want Hinduism to exist, and we want Christianity to exist. But every religion

must accept the norms and ethical norms of our public life. Nobody can allow any religious place of worship to be made an arsenal of weapons and if it becomes an arsenal of weapons, then it is not only the Government or the Opposition that destroys the sanctity of the Gurdwara or the temple, it is those who make it an arsenal, they themselves denigrate the dignity of the places of worship and therefore, that has to be appreciated, and the entire House with one voice must say that while we will respect any religion, no place of religious worship will be allowed to become an arsenal, while the extremists have gained, and here I would like the hon. House to remember 1947. In 1947, when the partition took place there was a Mountbatten Plan. And the national leaders went to Mahatma Gandhi and sought his advice on the Mountbatten Plan. Mahatma Gandhi told them, "You discuss and discuss up to the bitter end, the plan of Mountbatten". But that old fakir of India told all the national leaders: "Only tell Mountbatten, 'Everything is negotiable except the unity of India. No discussion on partition of India can take place'". But the national leaders of discarded Khan Abudul Ghafar Khan and Mahatma Gandhi and accepted the partition of India.

PROF. N. G. RANGA : Only the top level leadership;

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is right.

Today, let me tell you, the extremists, why they are continuing this terrorism. There is a method in their madness. They feel that just in 1947 by pressurising the national leadership, when there was bloodshed and they saw millions of people shedding their blood, they were able to force the national leaders to accept the partition of the country. Gandhiji was one man who writing in *Young India* and *Harizon* he said, "I am an apostle of peace and non-violence. But even the blood of one million people will not make me change my loyalty to the unity of the country". That is what Mahatma Gandhi had said.

Let the Prime Minister and Home Minister announce in this supreme House. Let them warn the extremists that "we are against violence, but if you are under the impression that by bloodshed and violence you can destroy our will and make us compromise with you, and that you are under some belief that Khalistan will be won, you are under a great illusion. And, it should be told to them in no unclear terms, the 1947 partition of India was the first and the last partition of India, there will be no other partition of the country and no Khalistan at all. If that firm stand is taken, then they will realise that even if one million people are killed, there is no going to be a Khalistan, there is no going to be a partition of Punjab there is not going to be a partition of the country. So, that type of enthusiasm and edication to ideals which Khan Abdul Ghafar Khan and Mahatma Gandhi had, that type of dedication we want. Mahatma Gandhi and Khan Abdul Ghafar Khan were not communalists. I have not seen better secular leaders than them. It was from the depth of their heart that they talked about the unity of India. And I would also stand by the unity of India in no uncertain terms. I am sure, the extremists may try to create violence and terrorism, but we will tell them that any kind of terrorism will be met with, and it will never be allowed to divide the unified character of India. That particular aspect will have to be kept in mind.

There is one more aspect to which I would like to make a reference. There is inter-state bus traffic. Similarly in the railways also, we have got the Government Railways Police (GRP). I will draw a parallel. Let Home Minister take cognisance of this. Very often what happens is that Government Railway Police is under the State control. Therefore, if some dacoits commit a crime on the train and loot the train in a particular State and when the same train goes over to the next State, even when he may see that there are dacoits sitting in the next compartment, and the GRP man is from one particular State, he cannot touch them. Whenever he has tried and caught them and when they were produced before the court, the judgement of

the court it, dacoits are set free, but the GRP are actually punished, because, they say that they have transgressed their limit. They are supposed to be within the jurisdiction of the State. Therefore, some sort of a coordination has to be found out. The Railway Ministry is already trying to evolve some modus operandi by which some sort of inter-connection between detecting the crime on the railways is to be found out. Similarly, when one bus service moves from one State to another, remember, today also the difficulty is that the State Police belonging to one particular State cannot actually intervene in the jurisdiction of the next State. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon Home Minister, let there be the use of para-military forces. Let them protect the buses. If the lives of innocent people cannot be protected by local police in different States, I would suggest that on each bus, let there be at least one para military troop man with stengun in his hands, so that if anybody tries to actually create difficulty and massacre the people, the people may die but at least they will not die helplessly. Sometimes, even a single man with stengun acts as a deterrent.

I will conclude by giving my own experience. After Indiraji's death, when I wanted to rusa to Delhi, no air flight was available. So I came by Rajdhani. Some gangsters entered in some stations, tried to get hold of every Sikh and kill him. I came down and met the Station Master and Military authority and asked the police to give us some people to guard the compartments. Only one police man in the corridor between two compartments was kept. I took a portable mike in my hands and I went from compartment to compartment in Rajdhani Express and talked to the passengers and said: "I assure you, do not be frightened; do not open the doors, do not allow gangsters to come in, in every corridor a police man is standing he will protect your lives; some military men are standing, they will protect your lives." Then safety the entire train arrived at Delhi Station. In the meanwhile, nine friends were killed. They were killed with rods, hammers and they were actually burnt to

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

ashes. This happened on the Rajdhani train. This is likely to happen in buses. Therefore, I would suggest that whenever there is an inter-state service, that has to be done. But all these precautions are not to be taken. The Home Minister does not apply his mind. How many victims does the Home Minister require to take precautionary measures for the future?

Mr. Buta Singh, the opposition and many Member of the ruling party demanded your resignation. You are our good friend, we have the warmest respect and regards for you; we have no personal enmity against you. But because a man holding a particular position has failed in his duty, as some sort of a symbolic gesture he has to come forward and say that he is prepared to resign. That is why, we demand his resignation. I hope, this will be taken note of.

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI (Mandsaur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a submission. I would like to submit that a very serious and important human problem is being discussed in the House but not even a single hon. Member from the two factions of Akali Dal is present in the House. Do you have any information that Members of Akali Dal would not be present in the House today? Have they sent any communication to you to the effect that they would not be present in the House? Why is it so that they are not present in the House?

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit that this discussion is no cause to feel happy. Last time, when a discussion was held in this House, the officers were killed there. It should not happen that if a Member speaks forcefully here, he may be murdered later on necessitating a by-election. You should pay attention to this aspect and take some concrete action. It should also yield good results.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDEVATE : Sir, we are not worried if anybody kills us for our saying the truth.

[Translation]

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : I am not talking of any particular person. I am talking of the entire House. I also speak forcefully.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Tulsiram, fear breeds fear. Fear vanishes when we face it boldly.

SHRI SHRIPATI MISHRA (Machhlisahr) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you I would like to place a few points before this august House. This House has discussed the situation created by terrorists many a time. The discussion in the House on this subject was invariably followed by some tragic incident resulting in further discussion by the entire House.

This is very tragic incident and situation as well. It is out of compulsion that are having a discussion on it otherwise no one lives to discuss it. This morning you must have seen the tense atmosphere in the House. As Professor Saheb has said just now, perhaps there was not a single hon. Member who may not have been emotionally charged or who may not have been feeling agitated. But the problem is that strong feelings and a sense of agitation, both combined, cannot solve this problem. And this unresolved problem is a serious threat not only to Punjab but to the entire country, our freedom, unity and integrity and even to our very existence. Keeping this in view we should take part in this discussion rising above our emotions. I would request the hon. Minister that he must consider the views being expressed by the Members on the floor of the House.

The terrorist activities went on increasing unabated and today when we say that there has been some let-up in the activities, it appears that it is almost negligible.

I would like to refer to only yesterday's incident which would show how extremism is gaining ground. Elections for Shiromani Akali Dal were held in which Shri Tohra was one of the contestants. He contested the election and won it. Before that a news-item had appeared in the Press. I do not know how far it was correct? It had appeared in the Press that both Barnala group and Badal group had agreed that Baba Joginder Singh be elected for this Management Committee. Ultimately why it could not materialise and how far this news is correct that I cannot say. But it indicates a mentality that both Barnala group and Badal group had agreed on the candidature of Baba Joginder Singh who is the father of Bhinderanwale and everybody is aware of the tendency which he represents. All the groups of the Akali Dal had agreed unanimously and were prepared to elect such a person as President of the Managing Committee. Perhaps Shri Tohra came forward only when Baba Joginder Singh might have felt that he would not be able to win the elections. People voted for Shri Tohra. Shri Kabul Singh had issued a statement earlier to the effect that it cannot be said categorically that under no circumstances police or army would not be sent to Gurudwaras or religious places. Perhaps there is not even a single Member in the House, who will not support this statement. He issued such a statement before the elections. People say that this statement was the cause of his defeat. If he had not have issued such a statement, perhaps he would not have faced the defeat. I want to draw your attention to this fact that this growing tendency.

You make security arrangements. Just now one of our hon. Members said that if some Member speaks here forcefully, he might be done to death. Perhaps a person speaking forcefully might be saved because you would provide security to protect such a person.

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : You might be getting security, not us,

SHRI SHRIPATI MISHRA : May be you too may get. But security guards cannot shadow a publicman everywhere. Then there is his family and there are his children who cannot come in the public because if they come, then there is risk to their lives. You cannot provide security to all of them.

Now the question is what sort of people are there among the terrorists? Professor Saheb has expressed his concern over the problem which we are facing today and the statement that was read in the House does not contain all the facts. It is a fact that many details which have appeared in the Press have been reproduced in the statement. After all this problem has been continuing for quite a long time and it is said that some foreign countries are involved in such activities and some local people are also providing help to these people. It is also said that some people in the Banks are financing such activities. I would like to know if the Central Government or the State Government has collected any information or data regarding the people involved in these terrorist activities as also the countries helping them? Have the Central Government or the State Government identified the personnel of the armed forces or the police who are extending help for these activities? If so, what action has been taken on the basis of such an information? If not, how can you take any action without such an information or data?

So far as I understand, I think the hon. Members of this House would be one with me on this issue, these terrorists comprise three types of people. One of the types of people are working at the instance of foreign powers, the second type of people are anti-social elements and there are third type of people who have a firm belief in their mind that formation of Khalistan is beneficial to them and it is their religious duty. You can deal with two types of people i. e. the people getting help from foreign countries and the anti-social elements, but how would you deal

[Shri Shripati Mishra]

with third type of people who have firm belief regarding formation of Khalistan and its formation. They can sacrifice even their lives? You will have to identify such people. Instead of blaming the entire Sikh Community for it, you will have to isolate only such elements and take action against them.

16.49 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the chair*]

You will have to make efforts to effect change of heart. But you will have to take the most stringent action against the other two types of elements i. e. foreign agents and anti-social elements. You will have to attack them and destroy them but you will have to follow a policy of persuasion so far as the third type of people are concerned and change their hearts because the young boys who provide information to the terrorists are in the age group of 14 years to 20 years. For them, it cannot be said that they have joined them in a premeditated manner or due to some or allurements. They seem to be with them merely under some sentiment or on the basis of some ideology. Therefore, an effort should be made to bring them round. In this connection the persons at the helm of the affairs must reveal whether anything has been done or not.

Sir, in almost all the murders that have been committed, it has been stated that scooter or motor cycle borne persons have committed these murders. The person who is driving motor cycle or scooter cannot on his own commit such an act unless someone else is with him on the pillion seat. I have already asked in the House as well as outside whether it is being strictly followed that pillion riding on scooters or motor cycles will not be allowed. It has been observed in the cases of shoot out that one person remains sitting on the scooter or motor cycle keeping a watch and the other shoots the persons dead. Has any action been taken or not against this to date?

Several such incidents have taken place in the buses. Once such an incident takes place, how a killer carrying arms is allowed to travel in a bus? You keep an eye on every one and track down the culprits. But have you ever tried to search the passengers of the buses to ensure that they are not carrying any gun or stengun? If an incident takes place in a bus, the killers run away by road, It is a matter of common sense that when they run away by road, have the link roads ever been blocked so that the culprits are unable to flee even upto 20 kms. and are apprehended in between? Has such type of block ade been resorted to? If not, what are the reasons? The son of an S. P. of Amritsar has been killed. Sir, you will excuse me, those of our colleagues who were afraid that by speaking forcefully they may be killed have left the House. I want to submit that this feeling is bound to arise among the officers—may be that the S. P. or the D.S.P did not feel so—that their children might be murdered while they are doing their duty of apprehending the terrorist. You will have to take some concrete steps to allay this apprehension. Regarding concrete and effective steps, an hon. Member has said that all the laws and the rules available to us are not being enforced and followed. These should be enforced properly.

Sir, the Government wants that law and order should be maintained there, the Opposition also wants the same thing and every sensible citizen is also for it but in spite of all this, it is not happening. I want to know why is it so? The reality is that some persons are migrating to Punjab and others are migrating from Punjab. People going from here are selling their property but in the case of those who are shifting from Punjab, no buyers of their properties are available. Why should a thing be bought which can be had free? This is the feeling prevailing there. To allay this feeling, you will have to take some definite measures. Daily discussion of the subject just incites the feelings. An effort should also be made to find out some solution to the

problem. I would like to say to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that ever since Barnala Government came to power—it is for the Central Government to see whether the Barnala Government should remain in power or not—I have been observing through several newspapers that its Ministers, their sons and other relatives have links with the terrorists. They are advisers of the terrorists and provide shelter to them one way or the other. These are the people who are in the Government but there are thousands of people who though not in favour of terrorism, do not hesitate to give shelter to the terrorists due to fear. They give them shelter to save their lives. They want to save their lives and are not ready to serve a people's cause. In such a situation when you repeatedly say to them that we will protect you, we will give you security, you need not leave Punjab, they are not impressed and assured. Rather it becomes a laughing matter for them. We are speaking at the top of our voice from this air-conditioned august House for those who are always haunted by the fear whether they will be able to return to their homes safely and this feeling haunts them day in and day out—be they in a bus, on road, in the train or are sitting in their shops or making their daily purchases. When any member of the family of a Government officer or an employee or any teacher goes out of the house, his wife is not sure whether he will return or not. We not give them sermons and discourses. We should set examples before them. You may identify certain districts and border areas of Punjab and make such arrangements there that no terrorist activity is allowed to take place. At least let these areas become safe. You may not make the entire Punjab safe but you should set an example by making one, two or three districts so safe that people instead of coming here, may take shelter there. At least there should be something to depend on. Thankfully, Shri Riberio, a valiant officer, was saved, though it was only by chance. He was assaulted at Police Headquarters. What does an attack at the Police Headquarters mean? If no one

was responsible for this from our own people then there is nothing to hide. I would request the Government not to hesitate on this ground that if it is said that extremists are active in Punjab, people there will get annoyed or if you doubt someone then some particular community will get annoyed. Now the situation is not like this. You should expose the persons and take action against them whatever may be the risk. There cannot be more danger than this. After all, for how long people will go on dying helplessly. The concept of the Government came into existence in the world to protect people from dying helplessly. If people go on dying helplessly, then the Government is not needed. Therefore, I want to say that save people from this helplessness and take action. If in the process some more accidents take place, let that happen because they will lead us to solve this problem. If you continue with the present situation, more and more people will join their camp but if you take a firm step, people will come and support you. Majority of the people are peace loving and want integrity and unity of the country intact. But if people find you weak and ineffective, then they will start supporting extremists due to fear. Kindly do not prove yourself ineffective. Make yourself effective.

17.00 hrs.

I wish that at least from now onward we will not have a chance to discuss any incident of Punjab.

[English]

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI (Adilabad)
 At the outset, I would like to express my strong sense of resentment and anger at the ghastly incident in which 26 persons have been brutally killed. There had been killings in the past in Punjab and this is not the first time that we have heard such a tragedy but there was no other incident which has shocked the nation so much as the incident which has occurred yesterday.

Without repeating what has been already said, I would like to say briefly

[Shri C. Madhav Reddi]

what action the Central Government could have taken. This morning we had witnessed a very noisy debate between the Prime Minister of the country and the Opposition and other Members. Mention was made of various sections, particularly of the Terrorist and Disruptive Practices Prevention Act, Section 18 to which a mention was made by my friend Prof. Madhu Dandavate. It was also read out to the House. Under that Section, the Government of India has got full powers to take action against the terrorist activities in Punjab. Now the Prime Minister was telling this morning that "we do not have executive powers. We just pass the Act. But where is the executive power? That rests with the state. How can we take any action?" But that was wrong. Article 73 of the Constitution clearly says :

"73 (1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the executive power of the Union shall extend——

(a) to the matters with respect to which parliament has power to make laws."

In this, not only parliament has got the power to make law. We did make the law. But we had also taken the powers to ourselves to act concurrently with the state Government. Why don't you act? Now the sincerity of the Government will be exposed by the fact that after many months of passing the Act, no rules have been framed under Section 5 of the Act. Why have you not framed the rules? How are you going to implement the Act without framing the rules?

Now, under this particular section, it is said that concurrence is needed. No. Concurrence is not needed. At that time, when the Bill was being discussed, the Prime Minister called a meeting of the Opposition leaders and, in that meeting, he insisted that there should be a Clause inserted in the Section stating that "consult

the State Governments." That was agreed to. Consultation does not mean concurrence. You had been consulting the state Governments on several matters day in and day out and certain state Government agree and certain State Governments do not agree. You never hesitate to take action simply because you have got to consult. Consultation means that you want to tell the State Government that Central Government will take particular action under this Particular Section and the State Government will have to tell what they feel about it. Has it been done? Has it been done in the case of Punjab? Has, at any time, the Central Government consulted the Barnala Government on this? Did Barnala Government say 'no' it has never happened, then what is the answer. Actually, this was a dead letter. You never used this Act. The Prime Minister was trying to score a point against us which he always does. He always does this on technical grounds saying "All right. We are going to bring an amendment to this Act. Are you going to support it?" What is the Act? What is the section? What is the amendment? That, he never told. He never read the Act which was handed over to him. He was holding the Act like this, Actually, already the power has been given to the Central Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In the hope that we will not read it.....

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : In the hope perhaps that we may not know it. We knew such a provision is there in the Act and the Centre should have taken action. There is no question of the Central Government not having the executive powers. You are not having executive powers in a general way. You are taking executive power in respect of this particular activity, the terrorist activity. You have got all the powers to take action under this act. Under this Act, you can have your own Court; you can have your own notified special courts called designated Courts you can have your own prosecuting officers. All these have been mentioned in the Act. You can have your own police officers-officers of CRPF, BSF. They can be given powers

to arrest persons, to prosecute them before the Special Courts. But nothing has been done. Seven months before we passed this Act, I mean the Act came into force. No action has been taken so far. That only shows the Government was not serious about this Act at all. Today he says that we should amend this Act. Where is the need? What for? What is the amendment required in this? Why should you ask for another amendment? Because, he knew that when he talks of amendment, we are going to oppose. He can turn the table against us. That is a rhetoric that he should not indulge in. These are the facts which are known to everybody. My point is the Government has enough powers but nothing has been done so far. The Government has failed in this particular respect. The Central Government has to take full responsibility. There is no question of dismissing the Barnala Government. I have been hearing this from this morning. There is murmuring going on in certain sections that the Barnala Government should be dismissed because they failed. Barnala Government has done everything what you said. Where did they fail? You had sent an officer, the Director-General of Police. He has accepted him. You have sent the forces. He is accepting and acting according to the instructions given by the Central Government. This Government has already told this House so many times that we are fully satisfied with the Barnala Government. Certainly, now you cannot go back. You cannot now take the position that the Barnala Government is not cooperating with us. Barnala and the Central Government are one as far as this House is concerned. This has been said several times and that being the case, there is no question of blaming Barnala. It is only passing the buck. You have to take the fully responsibility and the responsibility has to be taken by the Home Minister. The Home Minister is a very good man, very honest man, very hard-working man. But it is not the question of honesty of hard-working. It is a question of handling of the portfolio, I am really surprised why, in the first instance, this portfolio was given to him, because

it is embarrassing for the prime Minister; it is embarrassing for Mr. Buta Singh to handle this portfolio. Does he not know this? Does he not know the implications? Today if he is taken away from the portfolio, what will be the effect in Punjab? All these should have been known to him. He was working all-right in the Agriculture Ministry. He was a very successful Minister. Certainly, he should have continued there. But having handled this Home portfolio, now he has failed. He has to take action. It is very embarrassing to the Prime Minister, I know. I would rather ask for the same reason, Mr. Buta Singh to tender his resignation, whatever the Prime Minister might say. He will not accept it. He will say "no, there is no case for your resignation". It is because of his goodness. He does not want to embarrass him. But the point is: What is your responsibility? You must resign. You take the full, moral and legal responsibility for what has happened in Punjab.

17.09 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

That is what I expect from you.

Sir, this morning the Prime Minister was mentioning about the force having been transferred to certain other place; at that particular place where the incident took place. there was to be a force, but that force was transferred to some other place where certain religions function, which was a very important function, was going to take place. I would like to ask this question. Are you so short of forces that you cannot send more forces? Where is the limit for you to send the force? If these terrorist activities go on, there can be no limit. You can recruit any number of persons, you can send more forces, you can withdraw forces from other borders...

AN HON. MEMBER : It was only a lame excuse.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : The Prime Minister also said that it was not a law and order question. Who said it was a law and order question? Certainly it has wider dimensions, but this incident is essentially a law and order question. According to you, you have solved the political problems. Then how can you say that it is not a law and order question? Of course, it has got wider ramifications, wider dimensions, because the Pakistan Government is encouraging the terrorists. The terrorists are crossing the border, getting the training there, coming back, committing murders and going back. That way, it has got certain international ramifications, wider dimensions. But essentially it is a law and order question. That should be remembered. This law and order question should be tackled. No bus should go without a police officer. Why should a bus ply without security? If there is a need and there is inadequate force you stop the buses. After all, the Heavens are not going to fall if you do not ply buses on the road. You ply only such buses where you can provide security force. Otherwise, there is no need; people need not travel. These are troubled times. They do not know whether they are going to some back home safely. If that is the case, why should you run a number of buses? Don't you think that the situation is such that you have to take all these precautions? No bus should go without a security. That is what Mr. Shripat Mishra has said. I entirely agree with him that the security arrangements should be tight.

The Prime Minister is also telling this House that the Centre is not going to take full responsibility because it has no direct responsibility for maintenance of law and order. That is wrong, because on the borders where we have the BSF, it is our direct responsibility. If it is inside the territory, of course, that is within the control of the police of the State, but on the borders where we have put the BSF, they are directly under our control, under our command, because it is from there that the terrorists are crossing the borders,

coming into Punjab, committing murders and going back. It is there that we have failed. It is not just a question of only shifting the responsibility on to the Punjab Government. I would, therefore, say that more forces should be developed and more men should be sent. Immediate action should be taken on the incident. Immediate political action should be taken, and 'political action' does not mean that you should dismiss the Barnala Government. I am against this. At the same time, I feel that Mr. Buta Singh should himself relinquish his office. He may be given some other portfolio if P. M. wants but the Home Ministry is such a thing in which he should not continue, even if the Prime Minister wants him to continue.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Arrah) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it is the saddest day today. How sad it is that in the land of the holiest of the holy, Guru Nanak Dev, who preached love and piety, who worked for the brotherhood of the entire mankind, brothers should kill brothers, that in the land of the Gurus, all the Sikh Gurus who laid down their lives so that brothers should live in peace and security, brothers should kill brothers, that in the land of Mahatma Gandhi who preached non-violence and in the end laid down his life so that brothers and brothers should live together in peace and love, violence hatred, killings should have stuck this land again. We have today lost 24 of our innocent, brothers who were killed cold bloodedly by our brothers themselves.

The House naturally has expressed unprecedented sense of indignation and anger and even demanded firm action on behalf of the Government. On this the whole House is one. I think that it calls for cool thinking. We should not act rashly and take a step which we may lament, regret later on. Coolly we should think about what should be done. What are the issues? The issues are the same. The House has debated it times without number. We are fighting the enemies within, a highly professional group of enemies. It has been proved that these enemies are supported,

409 *Dis. on St. made by* AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) *Dis. on St. made by* 410
Min. of Home Affairs *Min. of Home Affairs*
re : Situation arising *re : Situation arising*
out of Killings by *out of Killings by*
Terrorists in Punjab *Terrorists in Punjab*

abetted, helped by very highly professional group outside. The weapons they use, the strategy and tactics they adopt speak some of the highest professionalism in this matter. So, it is the enemy that we are fighting. The enemy within. Therefore, we should be prepared. Not that I am saying it casually because a war is going on inside the country, we should be prepared as in a war for many such incidents. We should not lose our cool and we should not lose our nerve.

I think the first point in this is that let us all assess and evaluate the situation that has developed. What is the political situation in Punjab and how to meet it?

Many members on the other side and some on this side also have said that the Government should act, and they should act firmly. A debate this morning went on as to whether the Government has the powers or not. What are the powers in the Constitution? I am glad Prof. Madhu Dandavate did not refer to the Constitution, he referred to the anti-terrorist or Prevention of Terrorism and Disturbances Act, Section 18 (1). He is right. Section (1) gives, I would say, more than an ordinary, even extraordinary powers to the Central Government. The Parliament has given, in order to meet this menace of terrorism, this menace of internal terrorism or rebellion that has taken place in the Punjab area of our country. That is true and the Government must use that. It is for the Home Minister to say how far that...*(Interruptions)* ...I don't agree that having armed himself with that power during this period, he has not acted in using that power. He may have done it, we may not know it. It is for him to say how he has used that power. But the fact is that, I entirely agree with Prof. Madhu Dandavate, that Act provides the powers in which the Government should act.

The Constitution—let there be no doubt about it—gives a very clear demarcation about the powers of the State and the Centre. The Opposition, more than anyone else, would be more jealous of securing

the power for the State, for themselves and would not like powers to be diluted. The power of law and order is entirely with the State and in emergency the proclamation of emergency where there is a war or there is a threat or there is internal rebellion or internal disturbance...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : The words are not 'internal disturbance' but 'armed rebellion'.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Yes the words used are 'armed rebellion'. I am saying what is the power that is given to the Centre even in that serious situation?

[*Translation*]

SHRI JAINUL BASHER (Ghazipur) : It is very much an armed rebellion.

[*English*]

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : This is what I am saying. Even in that situation it calls for a proclamation of emergency. Article 352 gives that power but what is the power that the Centre gets. That is the point I am arguing. When a proclamation is issued under Article 352 the power of the Union is to give direction to any State or the concerned State where the rebellion or disturbance has taken place as to the manner in which the executive power thereby is to be exercised by the State. This is the only power given.

Therefore, no direct executive power can be taken over even under proclamation of emergency and no emergency has been proclaimed. Even if it is a case for proclamation of emergency but no emergency has been declared. Therefore, in an ordinary situation it is true and I am glad that the Opposition did not press this Constitutional point.

Only under Article 356 when the Governor submits a report that the administration of the State cannot be carried on under the provisions of the Constitution the President may take over the administra-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

tion. So only under Article 356 the Centre has the power to take over the administration and President's rule is applied and direct powers given to the Centre.

The point I want to make is that let us understand what is the situation. Let us not be pushed around in taking up certain measures which may be undemocratic or against the spirit and letter of the Constitution because remember the whole House welcomed when the democratic methods were applied to the solution of Punjab, when the elections took place there the whole world proclaimed that this is an achievement which only India can do, namely, applying democratic methods to tackle a serious situation of terrorism and rebellion. So let us not dilute that.

The point is that you can take over the Government if you think it is necessary or if the Governor in the Constitutional terms advises but will it not be diluting the democratic process. Well we can do that if you think democratic process has come to its end or through democratic process we cannot go forward and tackle terrorism and the situation is deteriorating. It is deteriorating every day. There are no two opinions about that. But let us make a very hard assessment about the situation that the situation in Punjab cannot be tackled by the State Government or Barnala Government or any other Government. The situation has gone out of their hands. Let us not attribute any motives. There may be what Prof. Dandavate has said that even some of the Ministers in the Barnala government are acting against or have bad motives or are sabotaging the work of the Chief Minister. This may be true. It has been reported widely. But even then the Chief Minister is there. Probably he might have already come. There will be consultations with him and before taking any action very cool and calculated assessment may be made.

Here I would like to submit that it is a tradition of this House that on all critical

matters, this is the glory of Indian parliamentary democracy for which we have earned a name all over the world that on all critical and on all matters of national emergency the House is one. This is a matter of national emergency and we have the tradition in such matters, as Prof. Madhu Dandavate has referred to. On these matters there is no opposition, there are no sides, there are no parties. We have the enemies within. What is the target of that enemy? The target of that enemy is Parliament, the target of that enemy is unity of this country, the target of the enemy is the very foundation of the State. What is the foundation? Secularism, communal harmony, people of all religions living here peacefully and working together—that is our glory. Even today in the villages at the grass spot level, the communal virus has not affected the people, but it is also a fact that because of the activities of the terrorists and the killings of the innocent people, a situation of serious insecurity is being generated among large sections of the people in Punjab. But the fact remains that uptil now, there is no communal virus at the grass root level, that is the strength. And that is the attack of that enemy. The attack is that the whole of Punjab should be engulfed in communal struggle and virus and the people should leave Punjab and Sikhs from outside from Punjab should come and live in Punjab, so that Khalistan is created. This is the main target and that is why I say, the target is Parliament, the target is the country, the target is the very foundation and the unity and integrity of the country and for which the powerful forces inside and outside the country are collaborating and cooperating. When this is the scenario, we should not lose heart. Anger is justifiably there, but great nations do not lose nerve at any set back. It is a setback today, but we should not lose nerve. We should keep our perceptions clear what we have to do and what we have to do, let us discuss... (Interruptions).

We have demanded action, the whole House demands action of the Prime Minister. and the Home Minister. It is easy if you want to make a scapegoat of the Home Minister, you can

make it, but that is not going to solve the problem. Whosoever comes, whichever Government is there, that has to deliver the goods. The battle is on and we have yet to go a long way in evolving the strategy and fighting it. Therefore, firstly, we have to build and strengthen the morale of the people. Who are fighting this menace on the spot. All credit has been given to the Police Chief Rebeiro and all his band of people as also the para-military forces, CRPF, BSF, and others. More than that is the mobilization of the people. You have asked : How many people should make sacrifices and for how long so that the Government may act ? Everyone who has died has died as a martyr in the cause of unity of this country, and for communal harmony. We have to carry on this struggle. The Government, the people and the Parliament have to carry on this struggle till we are able to wipe out and eliminate terrorism from Punjab and other parts of the country. There is no other choice. That is the point that has been made and the Government must act, and in that the spirit of unity has been expressed here.

My first suggestion is that the opposition leaders and the Government must meet the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. Firstly, they must be one in assessment of the situation. Let us not speak with any discordant voice. First, let the Home Minister and the Prime Minister invite all the opposition leaders and they should meet and assess the situation first.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : How many times do we meet ?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Thousands times, if necessary. *(Interruptions)*

How do you say how many times ? I say every minute and every hour. Please do not make it a partisan issue. My humble opinion is that as long as the problem is there, the Opposition and the Government have to meet, is necessary every day. But my point is that they should meet now and arrive at a common assessment of the situation as it has emerged after yesterday's

ghastly killings, the state of affairs there, the state of law-enforcing machinery, the state of political situation there, yesterday's elections of SGPC, Shri Tohra's victory, the action that they have taken to remove the Task Force there, the inside position of the Akali Dal, they must assess all these things and then together they should suggest the plan of action. With whatever powers they have they can do that. The Prime Minister this morning said; "Suggest any more powers, we will take them and we will to it"

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The more powers they get the more they fail. How many more powers do you require ? They are thirsty for power.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT : Finally, I would like to conclude by saying that the situation is very serious; and it has become more serious in Punjab.

(Interruptions)

The expression of anger, indignation, shock and sadness by the House is more than justified. And now is the time for the Government to think and take appropriate measures in dealing with the situation, political measures as well as administrative measures so that they are able not only to overcome this problem despite all these temporary setbacks, but are also able to eliminate terrorism from this land altogether.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : The Home Minister should make the statement now.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I request you all to take your seats. Any time, the Prime Minister is going to interver.

(Interruptions)

415 *Dis. on St. made by
Min of Home Affairs
re : Situation arising
out of Killings by
Terrorists in Pujab*

DECEMBER 1, 1986

*Dis. on St. made by 416
Min. of Home Affairs
re : Situation arising
out of Killings by
Terrorists in Punjab*

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : It was said that at 5.30, he would make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am telling you. Please take your seats. Listen to me. First you take your seats. Then I will tell you. When we started this debate, hon. members demanded at that time that the Minister should make a statement. Then he said that he would give it after some time.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Not after some time He said that at 5.30 he would make the statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Okay. At 5.30. The members insisted that he should make a statement and then only the debate should continue. Then he made that statement at that time.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : How many hours do you take to get information ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Prime Minister is coming. Any time, he is going to intervene.

AN HON. MEMBER : Will he make a statement ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Whether he is going to make a statement or not, you can find out through his speech.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Sir, I am on a point of order. We have assembled here to discuss the Punjab problem not on a theoretical basis. We have expressed our anger and sentiments time without number. Now, we want to discuss about the action programme of the Home Minister. Unless he indicates the action programme before the House, how

do you expect the members to air their views ? Because once a member speaks, under the rules even if the Home Minister says something on which we have to express our own views, we are not entitled to express our views for a second time, under the rules. Mr. Madhu Dandavate has no right to speak for the second time, after the Minister gives his second statement. Therefore, unless his statement comes. I do not know how there can be an effective debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Even under Rule 193 when we were discussing, many Members spoke for the second time. But as such there is no rule to speak for the second time. As a matter of convention we are allowing people to seek clarifications and then the Minister gives his reply.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Mr. Deputy Speaker, he had said that a statement would be coming at 5.30 What about that promise of the Minister to give a statement at 5.30 ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is why, I enquire

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : You enquire and let us know.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Chaubeji, I have already enquired.

(Interruptions)

SHRI AMAL ROYPRADHAN : The Home Minister is there. Let him say as to why he cannot make a statement at 5.30. He should clarify that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is ready. Everything is ready. Prime Minister is coming and he will be making some observations. He is waiting for him.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : I want to know, whether he is going to make a statement or not because we are assured and the whole House was assured.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (S. BUTA SINGH) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, as the House will recall, this morning, it was decided by the hon. Speaker that I should make a statement at 4 O' clock. And when I came here at 4 'O' clock, I informed the hon. Speaker that we are still getting the information from the State Government and we were just trying to make the statement out of that information and it was just a draft statement that I read. According to rules that statement should have been given to the House. Translation should have been there. But, then at that time, at 4 'O' clock, I was requesting the hon. Speaker to give more time to prepare myself and then at that time, I did say at 5.30, I will be making a statement. Now that the discussion has started, naturally the hon. Members from both the sides wanted to know the concrete steps along with the information that I am getting. Therefore it may take some time. I am here. I am listening to the debate. The House is interested to know what concrete steps are being taken. Therefore, I request that while answering either myself, may be perhaps the hon. Prime Minister will definitely place before the House and if hon. Shri Madhu Dandavate wants to speak, I will have no objection.

SHRI NARAIN CHOUBEY : Sir, he is shifting from position to position. Why do you allow him to shift ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Everything, he will clarify. Then why are you insisting ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : In due course, he will be answering. Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, words fail me to describe the situation. We all are aggrieved and shocked at the cruelty of the incident and discussions like these, which we are having in this House from time to time. Actually, all of us have demanded concrete action and the Minister has assured that he will come with concrete facts. At the outset, I want to know, in the past, when we discussed, even after the Muktsar incident, when the whole House expressed agony, dissatisfaction at the way things were happening, many suggestions came. How did the Government act on those suggestions ? I want to know that, what suggestions were made by the Central Government to the Barnala Government to combat terrorism. I see a very peculiar psychology : when you cannot think of doing, you try to make more stringent laws. That is not the solution to the problem. *(Interruptions)*

In the morning also it was said, I want to know it now also : Has the opportunity that the whole nation got after the elections in Punjab been frittered away ? This is the most shocking incident : 24 people have been killed; there cannot be anything more inhuman than this. But what is more alarming is that after signing the Accord, in the name of the martyrdom of Longowal, people elected those who anyway say something about secularism; they are not communal, in that sense. What has happened in between, that we have lost that opportunity ? Or we are going to lose that opportunity.

Now there is a talk as to whether Centre should intervene or not. But the question is how to act together. There was a Government. It is not that only by the Centre the Army was sent to the Golden Temple. Even the Barnala Government sent police into the Golden Temple. And he earned the acclaim of the people. What happened thereafter ? Why, in spite of the fact that the terrorists were getting isolated. I am sorry, this is the feeling; I do not know what is the actual situation—the Barnala Government is getting isolated ?

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

Why is it? Government has to make an assessment. I want to know this.

Prof. Madhu Dandavate has spoken about posting Police in the buses. May be one policeman or two, or some wireless machine in the buses, or something like that. I do not know. Somebody said: "Don't ply buses." That is not the solution. It is a nervous reaction.

The point is: we have to make an assessment again. Why have you failed to carry these people with you, who showed maturity and did not allow themselves to be divided on communal lines? We are talking about it so much. Just now Mr. Bhagat has said: communal virus is not entrenched in the minds of the people. They are for the unity of the country. They are for communal harmony in the country. Then why do they not have that kind of confidence to stand up and fight? That is the point.

Another thing is happening: people also do not have any confidence in the Central Government. I have to know the reasons. We decided on certain things. How to bring about amity among people, how to encourage nationalist forces? For that, we wanted to use the Accord as a weapon. What happened to that? I believe it is a sin nowadays to talk about that Accord. It is a political question, not a law and order question.

Mr. Madhu Dandavate has spoken that in consultation with the State, you can take certain actions. There was a better option before, that is the Barnala Government. I want to know what actions did Central Government want Barnala Government to take. They have to tell us this: and whether the Barnala Government refused to comply? You have to tell us this.

Then, a demand has been made for the resignation of the Home Minister. I

would be happy to see that this Government is not there. It is not a personal failure. I want to know this, before joining them in demanding the resignation of Mr. Buta Singh: Madhav Ji said something. There is a Cabinet Committee, there is the Prime Minister. What action did they request the Home Minister to take, which he did not take? Then that will be his personal failure. Then I would join them in asking him to resign. We have to know all these things.

Mr. Barnala has said one sensible thing after this incident, viz. that foreign elements are active, to destabilize our nation. Who are they? A hundred times we have demanded of the Government to identify them. Why has Government not yet come out concretely, identifying these forces? We all know them.

So many times we demanded a white Paper on this. Why has that not come out? We also demanded—I can very well remember—that you should take certain other measures where people will be activated to combat terrorism. I can very well remember the CPI statement when Baba Darshan Singh Kanadia was shot dead. Their Secretary demanded, that they be given arms to defend themselves. We demanded formation of a vigilance Committee, and give them arms. What happened to that? Now the kind of thing which the terrorists just want to create is the fear psychosis and that is spreading and that will be a very terrible mistake if we fall into their trap. These are very important things.

So many times we asked about political mobilization of people—going there. How many of us had gone there? What action did you take, Mr. Home Minister, will you tell us from this House, from the precincts of this Parliament? What action did you take for calling political parties? But you are only talking about 249. This is not right approach. Even Police Commissioner Riberio has said that 249 is not suitable for Punjab. You have to seriously think about it.

421 *Dis. on St. made by* AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) *Dis. on St made by* 422
Min. of Home Affairs *Min. of Home Affairs*
re : Situation arising *re : Situation arising*
out of Killings by *out of Killings by*
Terrorists in Punjab *Terrorists in Punjab*

Now I would also not join those people who demanded action under Article 249 or dismissal. Barnala may be noted out. I donot know—maybe due to internal dissensions. That is another thing. But acting in a mindless manner is not really suitable for this. I would also join those people who demanded removal of Barnala government, if Barnala says that if anything criminal happens in the Golden Temple or other gurdwaras, we will not send the police and if he would not say certain things that are helpful for amity between people. But I am pained to say that we have missed a very good situation, that answer this Central government has to give. If they really take certain measure that are still required to save the situation, it would be in the country's interest. It is not a question of Mr. Buta Singh the whole country will decide whether this government will be there if they continue to lead the country to disaster.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI. RAJIV GANDHI) : Mr. Speaker Sir, this morning, I had mentioned some points. I heard an hon. member speaking just now. I do not think it is true to say that no political action has been taken; political action has been taken certainly by our party in Punjab and it is a continuing process; it has not stopped. Perhaps the Congress is one of the only national parties which is working at the grass-root level in Punjab even today.

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :shed more blood if you like...(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : What about CPI and CPM ?

AN HON. MEMBER : He is trying to score a point.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let me remind the hon. members that Congress has shed more blood in Punjab in the past six months than any other party.

(Interruption)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Let us have a list.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Yes, you can have a list.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Let us have a list.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We have it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please calm down. Let us do something.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I do not have the exact number with me but I have been writing condolence letters; I have been in touch with their families. Perhaps you, Sir, yourself being from that State, your home being there know the extent to which the Congress Party has been involved in this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We do not disagree with that, but you said that Congress is the only party. Why did you say "only" ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I said "perhaps".

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : You said Congress is the only party.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I said "perhaps". Perhaps you do not know the meaning of "perhaps".

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : The Prime Minister has got no knowledge whether other parties are working there or not.

SARI RAJIV GANDHI : We have lost office-bearer of the party, we have lost members at every level; and Home Minister informs me that approximately 400 members of the Congress Party had shed their blood in this. One of our members who is sitting in this House was shot in the neck. What do you mean the Congress has not shed blood ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Who said it ? We never said it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : We only objected to your saying that the Congress is the only party.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : All right. Let us have a competition in shedding blood.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We do not want a competition in shedding blood.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You are a much bigger party than ours. Let us have a competition in shedding blood.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We do not want a competition in shedding blood.

MR. SPEAKER : Let us do something positive.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It is a very strange way to begin, I must say. We are all waiting here to hear his statement on the serious situation.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : If you hear me out you will get the whole thing. If you are not even willing to hear me out, you will not get it.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We are anxious to hear, but the way he

began by saying that the Congress Party is the only party...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request through you the Prime Minister to avoid this partisan distribution of blood. We are not worried which party has lost how much blood. Indians have lost blood and that is what we are concerned with.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I appreciate what the hon Member said. I did not raise the question of Congress Party shedding blood. One of the Members from the Opposition got up and said, "Whose party has shed blood ? Let your party shed blood." That is why I responded.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We never said it. What do you mean by that ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : What I said was all right, let me come back where I started. Achariaji, sit down I will tell you where I started. I said that the Congress perhaps ..

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Please forget that. We do not want that controversy. For God's sake forget that.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I will come to all the points raised by you, including 18(1), 358 and everything else.

(Interruptions)

Do you want to hear me say something or you do not ?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : We want to hear.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Then please listen. I will first talk about the Congress Party. I will also talk about the other

parties if you give me an option. If you do not even let me say so, how will you hear what I have to say ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : All right. Let us start afresh.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I said that the "Congress Party"—and I will try and use the same words—"is perhaps the only national party which is active at the grassroot level—please hear—in Punjab, right across Punjab. Please hear.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Perhaps.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I did say, "perhaps".

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : The Congress Party, as an hon. Member had raised the question of shedding blood, has shed no less blood than any other party. It has not been behind anyone else in facing terrorism. Perhaps because of its size, it has confronted more terrorism than any other party and let us not be ambiguous about this. If any-one has put up a fight in Punjab, the Congress is part of that fight today. Let us be very clear about that.

There are also other parties—mostly Leftist parties—who have also stood in this battle.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Thank you.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I am not saying it for you. I am saying it because I feel that the leftist parties have worked. Unfortunately, there are also other elements which instead of fighting this evil of communalism have in fact exaggerated the evil of communalism because of the stand that they have taken. This morning I mentioned that the reasons why the forces were not available at that area were because they had to be diverted to another area because certain communal elements were holding some rallies or meetings or something or

the other. Now, if this battle has to be fought one cannot increase the problems for the law and order machinery. This must be something responsible that all of us do. All of us from here are parties in Punjab and are parties wherever the problem is taking place. Let us not make it a party issue. I do not want to make it a party issue. And, I did not start off by making it a party issue. Only because the mention was made that no political action was taken, I was saying, "Yes, we have been active politically." Now, "active politically" does not mean just talking to people here at the top. It means active at the grassroot level in Punjab. That is where it counts. And that is where it must be done, and like I said earlier, the Congress and certain leftist parties have been active and I think all these forces need commendation. And this House should commend their efforts and their work.

I have had very long discussion with the Chief Minister and the Governor of Punjab today. It will be premature of me to mention what we have talked about today. Perhaps, tomorrow or day after tomorrow I will be able to tell you more specifically what we have discussed and how much of that he is doing. They have initiated certain action. They told me this last night. And it will take 24 hours, perhaps, 48 hours for these things to fructify. And I hope, by tomorrow or day after we will be in a position to tell you more about what has happened and give you more specific details. It will not be prudent at this stage to give specific details on what action they are going to take.

This morning, a point was raised and again, I believe, by one of the Members about how the Central Government can take direct action. I believe, one of the Members this morning, mentioned about 258 (1). I believe that does not really give us the powers that are required. Again 18 (1) of the TADA was mentioned. I would like to read it.

"Any power exercisable by a State Government under this Act..."

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

Now this is important "Any power exercisable under this Act." It means, you go under this Act to look for the powers that this Act gives the State Government. This Act gives the powers under section 7 which is to designate a court, which is not relevant to the discussion we are having. It gives powers under section 9 (2) which is something about the jurisdiction of designated courts and the transfer of cases, which, again, is not directly relevant to our discussion. Then it gives powers under section 5 (3) (a) which provides for the arrests and trial of persons contravening any of the rules under this and not of other laws. So, you go to the rules under this. That becomes a sort of technical thing. It does not deal with terrorists in that form.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Have rules been framed under this Act ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Yes, certain rules have been framed. And if more are necessary, we will frame them. But we feel, a substantial amount of power is available under the rules that have been framed. Then there is a section 5(3) (d). It says :

"confer powers and impose duties as respects any matter upon the Central Government or officers and authorities of the Central Government or upon any State Government or officers and authorities of the State Government."

This, again, is not relevant in the sense of Central Government actually taking action. There is no specific substantive provision which allows us to take direct action. And the reason why it is not there is also very clear, because law and order has been treated as a State subject. And at the time of framing this and when we had discussions with the Members of the Opposition it was decided that we should not cross over into those powers and that is why, it does not go into those powers. So, the fact is that the Central Government really only has the power to dismiss a government. Before that there is no half-way fiddling around

that we can do or intervention that we can do. I think, this is fairly clear. But as the point was raised this morning by the Members, we are looking into how we can strengthen this Act. And perhaps, for the specific offence of terrorism we could have some intervention directly by the Centre.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : I want to raise a point and I want a reply from the Prime Minister. Under section 5 (2) you have the power. It says :

"Without prejudice to the generality of the powers conferred by sub-section (1), the rules may provide for, and may empower any authority to make orders providing for..."

Section 5(2) (a) (i) is very important.

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE : You have not got the rules.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : You have not got the rules.

18.00 hrs.

So far as the rules are concerned, you have got the rules to regulate the supply of arms, weapons, everything. Unless you have done it by the rules, how are you going to exercise the powers ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Are you reading 5(2) or which one you are referring to ?

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : I am saying that under 5(2) the entire power has been granted under the rules, for example, prohibiting or regulating the possession, use or disposal of explosives; inflammable substances corrosive and dangerous articles, arms and ammunitions.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : These are powers to make rules.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Have you made rules under 5(2) (n) ? If you have

429 *Dis. on St. made by* AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) *Dis. on St. made by* 430
Min. of Home Affairs *Min. of Home Affairs*
re: Situation arising *re: Situation arising*
out of Killings by *out of Killings by*
Terrorist, in Punjab *Terrorists in Punjab*

made rules under 5(2) (n), then either the State Government has the power to act under these rules or the Central Government.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : That is precisely what I am saying that we have so far not transgressed on what have traditionally been State Governments' powers.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Let me make my position clear. You say that so far as section 18 is concerned, section 18 confers power on the Central Government to act on those areas where under the Act the State Government has the power to act. In my view, the rule making power under 5(2) provides, for example, the power to...
(Interruption)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : No, Sir. Let me correct what I said...
(Interruptions)... Let me say again precisely what I said. What I said was that section 18 (1)—if I understand, the Member is referring to section 18 (1) and saying that because of 18(1) we can go to 5(2) and under 5(2) the Central Government will get all the power—Section 18(1) only gives powers to make rules under the rules of this Act. 18(1) gives us powers to work under the rules of this Act.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : What I am trying to point out is that under section 18(1) of the Act, any power exercisable by the State Government under this Act may be exercised by the Central Government, and the point that you are trying to make is that certain powers are not available to the State Government under this Act and, therefore, these powers are not available even to you.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : No, no. That is totally not what I meant. If that is what I said; then there is something wrong.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : Then I will submit that if the powers are available, then what is important is under the rule making power you have got the power...
(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let me explain again...
(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot allow a running debate.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Section 5(1) gives all the powers.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let me explain.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Please read 5(1) yourself.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Please try and understand what I am saying...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Let the discussion not be too technical. The basic political fact is that the State Government in Punjab never refused to cooperate with the Central Government.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : What makes you think so ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Why did Central Government and State Government together fail ? That is the question

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let me be very clear. The Central Government does not run any State Government, not even Punjab State Government, not any Congress State Government.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : He did not say so. He said that the State Government of Punjab never refused to cooperate with the Government of India. That is what he meant.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : You allow him to reply to the point raised.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I am surprised how the hon. Member professes to know what transpires between the Central Government and the Government of Punjab...

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let me try and explain.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We know that the Barnala Government stays because of the support of the Central Government.

MR. SPEAKER : That is all right.

[Translation]

Be seated and let the business continue.

[English]

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We are unnecessarily digressing from the point.

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Ramachandra, please be seated.*

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Mr. Prime Minister, all your difficulties will be solved if you read only 5(1) and 5(2).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I will read 5(1).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : They give all the powers that you require. You need not exercise them in this House, you can do it outside. But the powers are there.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Mr. Dandavate, I will try and explain to you what I have understood. More than that I cannot do.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I will follow whatever I can follow.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I will read 18(1) first because this is where we are starting from.

You want to go from 18 (1) to 5(1).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : I think it is better you go from 5(1) to 18(1),

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : No, because 5(1) gives nothing to the Centre.

SHRI AMAL DATTA : Powers are given by 5(1).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : 5(1) gives you power to make rules.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : 5(1)—
“The Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazettee, make such rules as appear to it necessary or expedient for the prevention of, and for coping with, terrorist acts and disruptive activities.”

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I believe we do not as Central Government get substantive powers that give us power to arrest, investigate, have a trial, hold custody or to prosecute. That cannot be given to the Central Government under this thing. This is what I have understood.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right. Mr. Dinesh, you do not have the floor.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I think this is not an argument we should have here. I will ask the hon. Law Minister to call the members and they can discuss this in detail with him.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed. You can have discussion with the Law Minister.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I would request the hon. Members this is our understanding of the law. I will ask the Law Minister to call the hon. Members over to his room and to discuss this point in great depth.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : But do not ask the Minister of State for Law,

433 *Dis. on St. made by* AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) *Dts. on St. made by* 434
Min. of Home Affairs *Min. of Home Affairs*
re : Situation arising *re : Situation arising*
out of Killings by *out of Killings by*
Terrorists in Punjab *Terrorists in Punjab*

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : We are discussing such a serious subject and that they can think of is frivolities.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : He made bungling in the past. That is why I have said so.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The starting point should be the accord and not 18 (1).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I will talk about the accord if you want me to talk about the accord.

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right. Whatever you want to talk, please talk.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : I will just say one word about the accord. At no time has the Central Government gone back from the accord. No time have we deviated from the spirit or the letter of the accord and if any one wants to discuss with me, I am willing to discuss it in my room at any time. I do not want to drag the whole House into this discussion. I have already had one discussion with the Opposition leaders when this point came up and when I pointed out how I read the clauses, I think they understood that we have not deviated from it. If there is still some problem, I am willing to discuss it again.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : You want Assam accord also now ?

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing doing I have not allowed Mr. Dinesh Goswami.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : That is over now.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Dinesh, will you please take your seat now ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : The legal point they can discuss with the Law Minister. There has been no deviation on the accord on our part and we would like to complete that accord now. We will complete it the first chance that we are given. At the moment you may be aware that we are stuck on the Chandigarh aspect because the Punjab Government was not willing to do certain things that the Commission said should be done. We are stuck on the canal because the Punjab Government is not constructing the canal.

SHRI ACHARIA BASUDEB : It is being constructed.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Very slowly. The headline for the canal was 15th August, 1986. There was no canal on 15th August, 1986. Eradi Commission should have given the report. But again the proceedings of the Commission are being slowed down. We are not slowing them down. The Central Government is not deviating, has not deviated and will not deviate from the accord. And this goes not only for the Punjab accord but also for the Assam accord. I want to be very clear about that. Let me also add at this stage that our discussion at the moment which is really about the violence and terrorism, I do not think, is going to be effective at this stage by the accord being implemented or being slower or being faster. Let us not mix the two things up.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Let us not mix it up. Try and talk seriously about things. If you want to pick party point, I will pick up party point and I will tear you to shreds. So let us not pick points.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Let him choose his own canvas, Sir.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Then I will have to point you all with the same brush.

435 Dis. on St. made by
Min. of Home Affairs
re : Situation arising
out of Killings by
Terrorists in Punjab

DECEMBER 1, 1986

Dis. on St. made by 436
Min. of Home Affairs
re : Situation arising
out of Killings by
Terrorists in Punjab

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Does not matter.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : You might come out red. (Interruptions). That is a nice strong colour.

Sir, let us wait a few days. Let us watch what action the Punjab Government takes and let me reassure the House that this Government knows its responsibilities and will not shirk those responsibilities. This Government will not allow any action that will allow this country to be torn to shreds or to be broken up and whatever is required to counter that, we will be ready to do, to counter that.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : We are hearing the same thing again and again.

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA PRATAP NARAIN SINGH : Mr. Speaker, Sir; we are very thankful to the Prime Minister for having clarified one thing that the debate in this House and the passing of the Anti-Terrorist Act was a waste of time of this House as it cannot be utilised to curb terrorist activities in Punjab. For that, the Law Ministry and the Home Ministry should be taken to task. Was it a waste of time of Parliament ?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI : Sir, may I respond to that ? I would say, it is totally wrong to say that the Anti-Terrorist Act was a waste of time of this House. This House decided at that time that it was not going to change the definition of powers between the Centre and the States. If this House today decides, 'Yes, we want a change in those powers,' of course, we will change the Act.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.

(Interruptions)**

[Translation]

*SHRI A. C. SHANMUGAM (Vellore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are once again discussing in this House on the violence and the dastardly killings of the innocent people in Punjab by the terrorists. Sir, it is high time that we should put an end to the terrorists' criminal activities in Punjab and other parts of our country. In this direction, whatever strong action the Centre and the hon. Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, propose to take, the Tamil Nadu Government and our Chief Minister, Dr. M G. Ramachandran, are prepared to stand behind them.

Sir, India is the greatest democratic country in the world. But we are very sorry to note that in this great democratic country violence and killings by the terrorists are increasing day by day. The Centre should come down with heavy hands and put an end to these uncivilised activities once for all. It is because of these activities we lost our beloved ex-Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Shri Lalit Maken, MP, and the retired General Vaidya were murdered some months back. Many innocent persons are being killed every day. On 2nd October, in the Gandhi Smadhi, an attempt was made on the life of the Prime Minister and the President. Yesterday, 25 innocent bus passengers were shot dead in Punjab. It is a very gruesome killing.

Sir, this House should ponder over the present turmoiling situation in the country. If this situation continues, people will lose faith in the democracy and the Government in power. I would like to remind the House that the terrorists in Punjab are not the real enemies. The real enemies are the Pakistanis. Our hon. Prime Minister has been trying to have good neighbourly relations with Pakistan. But we do not find the same gesture from the other side. The activities of the terrorists mainly emanate from Pakistan. The terrorists are given training in Pakistan

**Not recorded.

*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

unabatedly. Batch by batch they have been coming to our country in a surreptitious way and they create law and order situation and kill the innocent people. The arms and ammunitions and other modern sophisticated weapons are smuggled into our country from Pakistan. These weapons are used by the terrorists.

Sir, under the present circumstances, it is rather difficult to continue our good neighbourly relations with Pakistan. On one side Pakistan has been buying modern sophisticated weapons from the Western countries and on the other side, they have been trying to create chaos and confusion in India and help the terrorists in their heinous activities. What is the way out for this chaotic condition in our country? I would like to know from the Government whether Pakistan is really friendly to us or not. We should know this fact first. Hereafter, we should not keep quiet if Pakistan continues to indulge in these activities. Our country and the Government should withdraw all relations with Pakistan. Sir, we invited Pakistan in SAARC and treated them well as our sincere guests. But with all this, if they continue to incite terrorists and help them to commit violence and murder in our country, we should not hesitate to withdraw all our relations with Pakistan forthwith. We should also warn Pakistan for indulging in such activities.

Sir, we have discussed many times in this august House about the terrorists activities in the country, particularly in Punjab. We have discussed this burning issue for more than six times in this House. This House has made many amendments to the existing Acts and also passed many Acts so that the Centre can deal with the terrorists activities by taking stringent measures. But no fruitful results have yielded so far. But on the other violence is increasing day by day. Yesterday, 25 people have been shot dead in a cold-blooded manner by the terrorists and they escaped in scooters. Some months back, they shot dead the retired General,

Shri Vaidya, and the terrorists escaped on a motor-cycle. But our police and paramilitary personnel have not been able to apprehend the criminals. Will the Government give statistics as to how many terrorists have been arrested so far? The Government should bring about such a tight security condition that nobody can go scot free after committing a crime. The problem of Punjab is not an ordinary one. With the present ordinary police personnel having ordinary rifles and weapons, we cannot combat the terrorists activities in the country.

Sir, under Article 259 of the Constitution, the Centre can take action against those who indulge in terrorist activities in any part of the country. We have already passed the National Security Act. We have also enacted Anti-Terrorists Act about a year ago. Even with all these Acts, the Centre is not able to do anything in controlling the terrorists activities. With the existing Acts, we are not able to take strong action against the terrorists. It is a most unfortunate situation. I do not understand how for the Centre is going in order to take away the powers from the State Governments. Sir, here the Punjab problem is not to be viewed as the problem of Barnala Government. Whatever manner the Government may decide to take action against these activities, the people of this country what that peace should prevail all over the country and the terrorists activities should be put an end to once for all, thereby discussion of this nature will not come up before this house hereafter. Terrorism in any corner of the country, should be nipped in the bud. We should not allow this to grow at any cost.

In conclusion, Sir, I may submit that to combat terrorism completely in the country, whatever, stern action the Centre is prepared to take, the Government of Tamil Nadu and the Chief Minister, Dr. M. G. Ramachandran will not hesitate to rally behind the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Bahraich): Hon. Speaker, Sir, at the outset, I would like to thank you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this discussion. I think, ever since the problem of terrorism and violence began in some parts of the country, this is for the first time that though the press reports mention the death of 26 persons at the hand of the extremists, the hearts of 76 crores or our countrymen are bleeding. This is so because they are not only feeling the agony of the people living in that part of the State or those who are related to the families of the killed but also because this problem seems to have engulfed the entire country there by putting a question mark on the very unity and integrity of the country?

I was just listening to the speech of the Hon. Prime Minister. The Hon. Prime Minister has said that the Central Government does not get substantive power or direct rights from the laws to deal with such elements in spite of all the anti-terrorist Acts. I would go a step further and say that even if these Acts empower the Centre to act, I am of the view that the jurisdiction of the State Governments should not be transgressed if the spirit of the Constitution is to be respected. The spirit of the Constitution and the provisions made thereunder should be respected. But it is the responsibility of the Central Government to see whether the State Government is fulfilling its constitutional obligations; it is successful in ensuring security of the life and property of its citizens? Is that Government fulfilling the responsibility which the Constitution of this country and the laws enacted thereunder have entrusted to it. If we arrive at a conclusion that the Government is fulfilling these obligations, then certainly it should be allowed to do whatever it is doing. But a feeling of confusion or indecisiveness should not be there. When we start discussing the point whether or not we have that power, one thing that becomes quite certain is that there is a need to take action against the terrorists. I would say that the Chief Minister of a State or an officer or a district cannot wash their hands

off or the Central Government cannot absolve itself of the responsibility merely by saying that the responsibility lies with the police officer under whose jurisdiction the people were taken off the bus and gunned down. The Constitution places the responsibility relating to the maintenance of law and order on the State Government but whether or not the State Government is fulfilling this constitutional obligation is for the Central Government to see as provided under Constitution of this country.

Today, the question before us is whether we are fulfilling that constitutional responsibility or not? Sir, the question is not confined to the killing of 26 persons. We will have to go into the background in which of this House was created? This is not first the highest Parliamentary institution of this country. Think of the circumstances, in which the present House came into being? Every citizen of this country was concerned about the extremism when this House came into existing. This extremism was born in the country a few years back. That was the time when our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi fell not to the bullets of the extremists but to the ideology of the extremism. That was the time when our leader could not remain a silent spectator to those happenings and toured the entire country. I was just going through the speeches of the late Prime Minister in the Parliament Library. I did not come across a single speech of December 1984 wherein the Anandpur Sahib Resolution was not termed as the document for the country's disintegration and where unity was not stressed. Sir, Shrimati Indira Gandhi has set a tradition and we had made a promise to the countrymen. That tradition is that when the question of unity and the integrity of the country comes, when the question of fighting the communal forces and the forces of disintegration comes, we can lay down our lives but cannot compromise with the communal forces. This is what we had promised to the people of this country and today the entire country is highly concerned about it. Sir, I am saying so because murder of one innocent person

441. *Dis. on St. made by* AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) *Dis. on St. made by* 442
Min. of Home Affairs *Min. of Home Affairs*
re : Situation arising *re : Situation arising*
out of Killings by *out of Killings by*
Terrorists in Punjab *Terrorists in Punjab*

is as much tragic as is the killing of 26 persons. If more than one innocent person are killed, it is just a matter of statistics only. When even a single innocent person is killed in any part of the country, his death in itself is a tragedy. The loss of that one life is an indication, is a symptom of the malaise from which we are suffering. What is this malaise after all.

Sir, this malaise is quite old. This is not today's creation nor it came into being after independence; it is far more old. The people who want to mix up religion with politics and want to exploit communalism for their political ends, had succeeded in dividing the country earlier too. If we fail to check this trend this time; if we continue to allow the mixing up of religion with politics and allow these elements to get the better of us, these problem would continue to shake us. Today, we are concerned with the choked atmosphere in the country. But sir, this cause of concern should not begin only with the death of 26 persons. This concern should have arisen in us the day when the elements playing communal politics raised their heads, the day the communal elements were given credibility or respectability, the day they were given honour anywhere. I am saying so because this problem is not of recent origin. Earlier also, the country had witnessed partition at the hands of these communal forces and we must remember that the people, the races, the nations which do not remember the lessons of their history, the history repeats itself. We should remember the lessons from history and if we remember this then we will find that no amount of compromises or appeasement would satisfy them. Any compromise or appeasement is always bound to strengthen the communal forces.

Sir, through you, I want to remind this august House—I am open to correction by the several senior Members sitting here if I happen to put the year wrongly—that it was, perhaps, in 1928 or in 1916 (*Interruptions*). It was in the year 1916 that an agreement was reached between Tilak and Jinnah wherein all conditions put

by Muslim League, including separate electorate and other concessions sought by the Muslim League, were accepted. A nationalist of the stature of Tilak, whose good intentions were beyond any doubt had said in Lucknow that they had found a lasting solution to the problem of communalism in India but history later proved that the agreement of 1916 which was claimed to be a permanent solution to the problem of communalism, was not in fact a solution. On the contrary, the seeds of division of the country on communal basis were sown on that day. Any compromise with such forces or any effort of appeasement does not satisfy them. It is just possible that such forces may lie low for sometime to gain strength, to gain credibility or to gain more respect.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to give a quotation. One of the pioneers of our freedom struggle, Shri Motilal Nehru said in one of his speeches:—

“Whatever be the higher concept of religion, the from that it has taken in our day to day life is that of fundamentalism, intransigence, intolerance, narrowmindedness, selfishness and lack of many a quality essential for building a healthy society. Its main thrust is to show hatred towards one who does not have a faith in it In the end, a remedy has been suggested—its alliance with politics has done good to none. The religion is on the path of degeneration and politics is at its lowest ebb. Their divorce from each other is the only remedy.”

This remedy was suggested at a time when that grievous injury to the country had not been inflicted, which later on came in the form of partition of the country. Our leader had sensed this danger right then.

Sir, we talk of national ideals, national unity, secularism, and safeguarding the unity and integrity of the country but I fail to understand as to why do we not identif

[Shri Arif Mohammad Khan]

the forces of disruption after all. Why do we not identify these forces which want to disintegrate the country? There are parties in this House itself who have officially resolved—India Muslim League is one of them—that the Indian secularism is a fraud. The Akali Dal resolution also speaks on the same lines. How such a thing can be acceptable in a country where several religions are being followed. Secularism means that the political and constitutional status of the people shall not be determined on the basis of religion. All shall have equal status. In what way secularism is being used in a country where the very concept of secularism was to bestow rights on all?

Today, you go through the newspapers. Reading of newspapers make you feel as if we are not a nation, we are a big confederation of different religious groups working at cross purposes. Here a particular group remains constantly engaged in getting special rights for it and how other groups can be deprived of these special rights. As long as they continue to work with this spirit, as long as the concept of providing equal rights continues to be used for securing special rights and for creating inequalities in the society, this problem will continue. Sir, I have already said that it needs to be seen that after all which are the forces which are against the unity? I would like to narrate a small episode from Mahabharata. The very first day Pandavas and Kauravas went for schooling, the lesson given to them was

Satyamvad Dharmam Char

When their teacher Dronacharya asked Dharmraja Yudhishtira to repeat his lesson, he said that he did not remember the lesson. He was rebuked for this. Who was at number two in the Kaurvas?

AN HON. MEMBER : Duryodhana.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN :
When Duryodhana was asked—

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH : You could remember the name of Yudhishtara but forgot the name of Duryodhana.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN :
I can remember the name of Yudhishtara and the name of Duryodhana has been left for you to remember.

When Duryodhana was asked, he immediately repeated the lesson. Yudhishtara was given more time and was asked to narrate the lesson next day. He could not do that next day also and except him, all the pupils narrated their lesson. The most significant thing is that Duryodhana narrated that lesson but Yudhishtara could not. During his last days Dharamraj Yudhishtara told that it took his whole life to learn the first day's lesson i. e.

Satyamvad Dharmam Char

tought by his teacher. It is not enough to just repeat the words *Satyamvad Dharmam Char*. The lesson should be deemed to have been learned when a person actually starts speaking the truth and follows the path shown by the religion.

Sir, by this I mean that everyday we express our concern for national unity and integrity but it appears that like Duryodhana, we want to repeat just again and again that national unity and integrity should be maintained. We do not understand what we are saying. Actually we should adopt it as our way of life. If we want to protect the unity and integrity of our country we shall have to identify those anti-national forces which are posing threat to our national unity and integrity. Today we are discussing about Punjab situation. Sir, earlier I spoke about the constitutional rights and responsibility. Can we escape this moral responsibility that the present Punjab Government is the creation of the accord which was signed by us with Akali Dal. Not only for Central assistance but, as has been pointed out by the Hon. Prime Minister, for political action also, the present Punjab Government

445 Dis. on St. made by AGRAHAYANA 10, 1908 (SAKA) Dis. on St. made by 446
 Min. of Home Affairs Min. of Home Affairs
 re : Situation arising re : Situation arising
 out of Killings by out of Killings by
 Terrorists in Punjab Terrorists in Punjab

is surviving with our support. The former Chief Minister of Punjab, who is the present Member of the Rajya Sabha, had also pointed out in his statement about four months back that the Government in Punjab is not a constitutional Government but a Panthic Government. The Punjab Government has collected money which will be spent especially on the migrants who have migrated from other parts of the country to Punjab. The Punjab Government has taken administrative decisions to provide jobs to those who migrate to Punjab from other parts of the country. I do not want to level charges on the Chief Minister but I would like to ask the Central Government whether it has any information in its files as to who was the person who led the Akali Dal agitation to burn copies of the Constitution in front of the Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh. Has the Government any information that the residences of some of the Ministers of Punjab Government are not only being used for plotting murders of officers and important people but the criminals, after committing crimes, are also given shelter there. I do not want to speak against any one but I want to say that it is possible that whom we have installed and want to use as a weapon to combat terrorism, may be a protector of the terrorists and we may be thinking wrongly that we can use him against terrorism. In this connection I also want to say that Shri Khushwant Singh, the former Member of the Rajya Sabha, whose views we know on Punjab and other issues and who is not anti-Akali Dal, has delivered a lecture in Punjab. I would like to quote here :—

[English]

“The emergence of extremism and Jarnali Singh Bhindranwala. I do not think it is necessary to go back and examine whose creation he was, who built him up, who allowed him inside the temple or who suffered him to remain there to the end. But one conclusion we cannot escape, that is, he did serve the purpose of the Akalis. They suffered his presence in the

temple, they did not condemn him for what he said nor what his gunmen did. As a matter of fact, once when I told Sant Longowal *Eh Shobha nihin dinda; eh jo naphrath di gallen karda hai gurdwaray vich baith kay.*”

[Translation]

I think the reply given to this statement is very interesting which should come before this august House. When Shri Khushwant Singh said that it did not look nice that he preached hatred from Gurudwara, I will read out here as to what Sant Longowal had said on this :—

[English]

“He kept quiet for a while before he replied *Eh to sada danda hai, aur lathi.*”

[Translation]

Sir, if we want to remain the victim of any illusion, we can but it is a fact that the extremists and terrorists, who are indulging in violence, are definitely getting political protection from somewhere. Someone is using them as his tools and is trying to dismember and disintegrate the country.

Sir, long ago Allama Iqbal had said—

*Ujaada hai tameeze millato aain nein
 koumon ko,*

*Mere ehle watan kai dil main kuchh
 phikre watan bhi hai*

There is need to create such feelings. Allama Iqbal says that many communities have been ruined because they confined themselves only to community consciousness and a feeling of separatism considering that they owed allegiance to their religion, community or area. If we want to save ourselves from ruination then we shall have to learn a lesson that we do not have any other alternative.

In such a condition I would like to say one thing more. The Government functions with the help of officers and good will. It

[Shri Arif Mohammad Khan]

is not possible that Sardar Buta Singh may present himself where the extremists are shooting down the innocent people. What is required is that the extremists should have that fear in their minds, while killing the people, that the punishment for the crime which they are committing will not be reduced in any case and the hands of law will reach them.

Sir, when we repeatedly say that some political problems are also linked with if we tone down the barbarity of the criminal act. So far as the political problem is concerned, the Central Government has signed the Punjab Accord with Akali Dal and the common man of the country knows that you have found a political solution to the problem. He is not concerned with the number accords you sign; but he wants that the Government should take the responsibility to protect the life and property of every citizen whether he belongs to Punjab or any other State. It is a constitutional responsibility of the Government and the Government should fulfil it. It will be possible only when the Government takes strong action to fulfil its responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER : It has been repeatedly said in the House that a mistake was committed in 1947. We did not foresee the impending legal complications. I appeal time and again to one and all that we should unite to end this communalism. Only then things will improve. We have to fight unitedly the communalism which may be outside or inside the gurudwaras, temples or mosques. If we do it unitedly there will be none to condemn others. We will all become united and we will achieve our goal.

Now tell me what am I to do ? It is already 6.30 p.m. (*Interruptions*)

That is what I am asking you. Whatever you say that will be done. If you want to sit late, how much more time you want ?

AN HON. MEMBER : As much as you like.

MR. SPEAKER : I will allot as much time as you say.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : The Punjab problem has been discussed here several times. You allot five minutes each to the Members of this side. No one will speak from that side.

MR. SPEAKER : As you like. I will allot five minutes to each or as much as you like.

All you should get one thing done. You should get this evil uprooted from within and without. We should take such a step unitedly so that it may not recur and all may get relieved of it.

[*English*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Actually, Sir, my friend Shri Arif Mohammad Khan has spoken some basic truths home truths. The struggle against communalism cannot be considered to be just a law and order problem. It is a political and social question and there has to be a comprehensive struggle by those people who consider themselves to be really secular.

Sir, he has gone into history. I am also tempted—but there is no time—to tell as to how this whole problem of Punjab was generated. It is no use going into that because it cannot be remedied. Perhaps I will recall because he mentioned—without mentioning his name—a former Chief Minister of Punjab who is now a member of Rajya Sabha. I remember the time when he was the Chief Minister.

This problem of terrorism of extremists in Punjab was one thousand times less serious than it is today. But there were certain political reasons that the Chief

Minister had to resign. And when he resigned the Congress Party was still enjoying a comfortable majority in the Legislature. Any other person could have been chosen from that party from amongst themselves to take over the Chief ministership, instead of that, they preferred to go to President's rule without the Governor's report. Some of us were apprehensive in the situation that we are now confronted with, in the course of which twenty-six people have been butchered mercilessly. I must say that our terrorists, highly trained as they are, professionalised that they are, are particularly cold-blooded in their brutality. The kind of action that they have perpetrated...

MR. SPEAKER : Much more that that:

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Much more or less, I do not know; all terrorists are like that. Some people thought that perhaps something that happened in Mukatsar could not be repeated again. I should think that was happened yesterday in Hoshiarpur district may not be the last such episode and we should be mentally and psychologically be prepared for it, but we cannot give such sermons to the people who are receiving the bullets in their bodies.

The Prime Minister from whom we were expecting to hear something more specific, more concrete and more positive about how we are going to face the situation has disappointed us. Let me tell you frankly Not because certain things may be there which he does not want to divulge to us, or because the State Government according to him is going to take some action, or has already initiated some action, so the House need not be told about it just now. I do not mind even that if those actions are really going to be taken seriously and are going to be effective. The House need not be told; I do not mind that so long as the advance information does not go to the terrorists. It may not come to us latter. We do not want to be told that everything was leaked out; they got to know before-

hand and therefore we failed to make the action effective. That has also happened in the past.

But, if a Prime Minister is not aware, or is not informed, or is ill-informed, or wrongly informed about the Acts that this Parliament has passed, then it is an alarming state of affairs. What were we being told? We were being told that the Central Government, by and large, could not do much than it has done because it has no powers to act. It is true that under the Constitution, law and order is a State subject. It is also true that under Article 258A of the Constitution, a provision has been made for exemption in cases where it is necessary and it is also true - I am not quoting that now, because there is no time and it is such a lengthy section—that Section 5(2) (a), (b), (c) etc. of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985, which we passed last year is very clear. It says :

“Without prejudice to the generality of the power conferred by sub-section (1), the rules may provide for, and may empower any authority (being the Central Government or a State Government or the Administrator of a Union Territory...) to make orders providing for, all or any of the following matter...”

That includes :

“(n) Prohibiting or regulating the possession, use or disposal of explosives, inflammable substances, corrosive and dangerous articles, arms and ammunitions...etc.”

(t) the entry into and search of, any place whatsoever reasonably suspected of being used for harbouring terrorists or disruptionists or for manufacturing or storing anything for use for purpose of terrorist acts of disruptive activities.”

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

So many more things are there in detail. These rules have to be made under Section 5(2) and under these rules all authorities which include the Central authorities also can be empowered to carry out any of these things. So, the inescapable conclusion we are left with, as communicated by the Central Government, is that the Barnala Government has failed to do these things. Were they advised? There is no bar to advise being given by the Centre. The State Government may not accept the advise. I want to know this. Did you ever advise them that such rules should be made and the Barnala Government refused to do it? In that case, did the Centre ever consider that it would be necessary to make such rules empowering the Central Government itself to act in this way? We do not know. You are not telling us all these things. And all along we have been told that both the Governments are acting in close cooperation with each other. That is why, I am compelled to say that if Mr. Barnala is to go now... Of course, he may be voted out in his own Assembly. That is a different matter. I think the balance of force will change very rapidly for the worse now in the Punjab, after yesterday's SGPC's election results, unfortunately. And it may be on the 18th December when they are going to move a no-confidence motion in the Punjab Assembly, Mr. Barnala may be voted out. I hope, you are anticipating such a situation. Because then two things can happen. Either he can be replaced by a nominee of the majority which votes him out and we know as to who are the possible candidates

AN HON. MEMBER : May be Shri Balwant Singh.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Shri Balwant Singh's name is also being bandied about. There is Prakash Singh Badal himself Amarinder Singh is there. There are so many people. But, is it going to be an improvement on the present situation? The Central Government has to think beforehand, prepare itself, anticipate the

development of this crisis and decide how they are going to act. If he is not voted out, that is a different matter. What I am saying is that if he is voted out we have to accept it. Otherwise, if Mr. Barnala is to go, is to be pushed out, is to be dismissed, then there is no reason why the Home Minister should remain. If the Home Minister is to remain, there is no reason why Mr. Barnala should go. I hope Mr. Buta Singh will not take amiss all these things I am saying, because he is a very good friend of mine.

SHRI RANA VIR SINGH : Giving your friendly advice ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What if I were he? Luckily, fortunately, I am not Shri Buta Singh. If I were in his shoes, I would really think that possibly it would be best for me just now in this situation to offer my resignation. That is why I had suggested to him last time indirectly, at the time when that incident at Raj Ghat took place on 2nd October. And at that time he stated here in this House that he would be the last man to run away from the field of battle and that he was prepared to give all his blood and so on. I admire his sentiment. But it is not a question of running away and it is not a question of giving your blood. If all of us who are sitting here give all our blood, still we may not be save the Punjab. I do not know.

My point is that, politically we have reached a very critical and crucial position where the Home Minister is in a very unenviable, I should say, in a very delicate kind of position. I do not want to spell it out more because it is not fair on Buta Singh. I say, it is not fair on Buta Singh to make him continue in that particular office because of the equation of forces. Even, let me say because of the community to which he belongs. Don't you see the complications that are crused? You are dealing with the Punjab; you are dealing with a particular community of the people. I think it is best for him in his own interest.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV : Mr. Gupta, it is not fair.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : If it is unfair, let it be unfair. You may think that it is unfair. I am saying so with all my best intentions for him, Not for you.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : Out of love for him. He is in a very difficult position.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You cannot go on like that. You cannot go on passing the whole buck on to Barnala. Is he to be blamed for every thing ? As Shri Arif said, it is the Central Government which has been supporting this Barnala Government. They have virtually brought it into existence and pledged their support to it. There is no better choice at the moment. And they, we have been told that they are working in close collaboration, cooperation, understanding and all that. Then, how can you now ? Few choose now, to say that the villain of the piece is the Barnala Government for its in efficiency, for its weakness, for its vacillation, for its duplicity and everything. Then, how does the Central Government—at least in the Home Ministry—avoid, how can it avoid, how can it escape, its share of the responsibility ? Therefore, I do not think, I suppose that the Prime Minister will agree to our suggestions, that is a different matter. (Interruptions) Yes, Sir, I am finishing. According to you direction, that one should not take much time. Now even Badal is saying somewhere that why doesn't the Government start talking to us also ? We are here. We are willing to talk. Why don't the Government talk to us ? I think the Government should never talk to people unless they categorically give up these policies, these politics of secessionism and terrorism and violence. They have to categorically give it up and declare that they will have nothing to do with these things. Then only some questions can arise of talking or having a dialogue with them. Without that, it is impossible.

Then, Sir, I think Mr. Barnala's own slogan which he gave of Panthic unity has

proved to be his undoing in the end. It is this slogan of Panthic unity which more than anything else has rallied all those forces against him in this election. Panthic unity is a very-very wrong slogan and a disruptive slogan to give. I am sorry, Mr. Barnala thought that by giving this slogan, he would be able to rally some more Sikh votes on the side of his nominee in this SGPC election. It has precisely the opposite effect by feeding more these extremists' views and opinions. So, I would still say that you should not go ahead under any pressure to impose President's rule in a hurry because you have done it once before. I mentioned it. Therefore, I am very wary about this because in the present circumstances, as far as I understand the situation, the imposition of President's rule, that is direct rule by the Centre, will only contribute to further aggravation of the hostility of the entire sikh community towards the Central Government. There is a fact. There is a hard fact of the matter and Barnala is repudiated by them more and more everyday because they consider him to be a creature of the Centre. That is the position the Centre holds now in the eyes of practically the entire community, especially after the Operation Bule Star took place. Unfortunately, we supported Operation Blue Star. We also did not anticipate, perhaps properly what the fall out was going to be as far as the reaction of people who are being instigated on extremists' slogans or religious slogans specially now to a man I should say—except for a handful of people that community is against us, against you, against the rest of the country, against the Central Government. Therefore, please think very carefully about the implications of President's rule. You cannot suppress an entire State and its people by force of arms; who are our own people; who are our own brothers and sisters; an integral part of our nation and our country; who have been misguided now and led astray. We have to act, not only in terms of law and order, but politically also, as to what, should be done and what can be done. Those things also, I think require some deeper consultation at political level. Everything cannot be talked and spelt out here in the House. I hope the Prime Minister

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

has given some sort of an assurance that further consultations will be held with everybody concerned including the opposition of course, to work out some parameters, not only technical, but political things.

About the administrative matters, many suggestions have been made. I hope the Minister will reply to some of them. What is the difficulty now, tell me, about providing armed escorts for these. Have you not got enough personnel? Somebody suggested that the number of bus services can be reduced. These are very elementary things. Why people are allowed to go round in these buses without the armed escort? It is not a question of inter-State buses as Mr. Dandavate referred. Neither in the case of Muktsar nor in the yesterday's case, but they were travelling from point to point within the State of Punjab. (Interruptions) What is PEPUSU? There is no such thing a PEPUSU now.

19.00 hrs.

Therefore, these things should be done : Army escorts should be provided. You have also to get ready now, after Mr. Tohra's victory, to consider what you are going to do—because these gurdwaras now under his guidance everywhere, will become strong-holds once again of terrorist activity and accumulation of arms and weapons, and all that. Don't have any illusions about it. Tohra being elected Chairman, of this means that every gurdwara will become a centre of these terrorist, insurgent activities, and collection of arms. What are you going to do? What are you going to do? You have to decide, you have to make up your mind. You cannot allow these places of worship to be misused and abused in this way, for purposes which have nothing to do with religion.

So, I hope these concrete things will be worked out, immediately, in anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr Gupta, please...

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What else am I to say, Sir? You yourself are always expressing your anguish and your desire, deep-felt desire that everybody should fight communalism. Everybody is trying to fight communalism in his own way. Some do it by issuing statements and making speeches. Some silly fools do it by shedding their blood. They could save their lives by sitting at home, and not risking and going out in the streets and in the maidan. It all depends on how you look at it. But let us at least make a more concerted and united effort to mobilize people. There are plenty of good-hearted people in the Punjab who have got a sound common-sense, who have to be mobilized, who are prepared to resist the terrorists if they are given arms. (Interruptions) Why can't you think of some new method, some new ways? You cannot go on in the same old ways, and let the Punjab be burnt to ashes.

That is all I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER : Now the position seems to be this : my staff also is very eager to get to far-away places—it is there—due to some *bandh*, this and that. (Interruptions) Something is there. Something is there.

SHRI DINES GOSWAMI (Guwahati) : Sir, if you can give me 4 or 5 minutes...

MR. SPEAKER : If this is the kind of four minutes...I have got other Members also. How to do it? We will do it tomorrow then. No Half-an-Hour discussion now.

We now adjourn.

19.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday,
December 2, 1986/Agrahayana 11
1908 (Saka).