

12.05 hrs.

**COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF  
SCHEDULED CASTES AND  
SCHEDULED TRIBES**

**Fifteenth to Seventeenth Reports**

*[English]*

SHRI RATILAL KALIDAS VARMA (Dhandhuka): I beg to present the following Reports:-

- (1) Fifteenth report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on the Ministry of Civil Aviation on "Reservation for and Employment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Airports Authority of India (AAI)".
- (2) Sixteenth Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Ministry of Finance (Department of Disinvestment), Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises (Department of Public Enterprises) and Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Department of Personnel and Training) on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Twenty-second Report (13th Lok Sabha) of the Committee on "Fair Employment Policy for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Public and Private Sector—a review of position following globalization and other reform measures."
- (3) Seventeenth Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes on the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) on "Reservation for and Employment of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in North Eastern Railway (NER)".

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Varma, I hope you are better now.

12.06

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT**

**Government's failure to maintain internal security  
and in particular to deal with alarming growth  
of terrorist menace in the country.**

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: I have received notice for Adjournment Motion. This is the time to mention it.

*...(Interruptions)**[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH (Maharajan), Bihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, hon'ble Advani ji wanted to say something. *...(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to listen to him. I am waiting for him to come. I am committed to that.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (Panskura): I have a request to make, not a point of order. Hon. Shri Advani can speak the way he likes. But other Members should also be allowed to speak. After his speech, the House should not be hijacked. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: The trouble is even the Speaker has no right of audience here.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: We want an assurance. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: My only request to all the sides is that let us have the Question Hour everyday. This is not disrespect to any leader, far less to the Leader of the Opposition for whom I have personal regards. I am making this appeal to all sections of the House.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: What is happening? Hon. Members, please sit down.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Goyal, What has happened to you? What is troubling you? Please sit down.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: This is my appeal. It is entirely for the hon. Members to respond to my humble appeal. So many questions are raised during the Question Hour. I am not stopping any issue to be raised.

Please tell me which issue I have not allowed to be raised since I occupied the Chair. I am only requesting all of you. As you know, there are only two constraints, viz., constraint of time and constraint of rule. Even then sometimes I am ignoring the rules because I try to accommodate everybody.

Now, I have to place the text of Adjournment Motion before the House. The Leader of the Opposition.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar): Sir, are you speaking of Adjournment Motion to be taken up now?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I have to get the leave of the House.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, let the Adjournment Motion be taken up at 2 o' clock. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: After taking leave of the House, I will take up other matters.

I have to inform the House that that I have received four notices of adjournment motion from Sarvashri Braja Kishore Tripathy, Prabhunath Singh, L.K. Advani and Subodh Mohite regarding the failure of the Government to maintain internal security and in particular to deal with the alarming growth of terrorist menace in the country.

I have given my consent to Shri L.K. Advani, who has secured first place in the ballot, to move the motion in the following form"-

"Failure of the Government to maintain internal security and in particular to deal with alarming growth of terrorist menace in the country".

Shri L.K. Advani may now ask for leave of the House.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, is it now or at 2 o' clock?

MR. SPEAKER: Now, you move for admission only. The debate will start later on. But you have to ask for leave of the House.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, I seek leave of the House for moving the adjournment motion regarding failure of the Government to maintain internal security and in particular to deal with alarming growth of terrorist menace in the country. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is this happening? Is the leave opposed?

Those who are in favour of leave being granted for moving the adjournment motion may rise in their places.

*Several Hon. Members rose.*

MR. SPEAKER: I find the number is more than the requisite number.

So, leave is granted. Under Rule 61, the adjournment motion is to be taken up at 16.00 hours or at an earlier hour. Under Rule 62 not less than two hours and 30 minutes are allotted for its discussion. The discussion on the motion may be taken up at 2 p.m. I think the House agrees.

Yes, Shri L.K. Advani.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you had granted permission for debate on internal security yesterday under rule 193 but it was deleted from the agenda because it was stated that the hon'ble member who moved that, was not present at that time. My point of order is that what happened to the debate which was permitted under rule 193?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I did not say. He has agreed to not to press it that day. Let us see.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: What will you do in this regard? You had postponed that for today.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: After this Adjournment Motion is discussed, discussion under rule 193 does not come.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I am on a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: There is no business before the House. So, there cannot be any point of order without a discussion.

...*(Interruptions)*

12.08 hrs

### SUBMISSION BY MEMBERS

**Re: Conviction and arrest of Shri Shibu Soren**

*[English]*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar): Sir this morning when this issue was sought to be raised by some of my other colleagues – I also raised my hand- you said that the issue should be taken up at 12 noon, and not during Question Hour. I would say that personally I am also inclined to agree that the Question Hour goes on as usual. If there are. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear you later on. Please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear your side later on. Please sit down. Shri Rupchand Pal, this is not right. I will also hear other side also.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: If there is a provision in the rules that on occasions. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: If there is a provision in the rules that on occasions that a Member may move for suspension of Question Hour, that is provided in order to see that when there are extraordinary situations. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: What is happening?

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: He is quoting the rule. Why are you objecting to it?

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, I have seen the Indian Parliament from 1970 as a Member. I have seen even the earlier years as a journalist. I can say that what happened yesterday is unprecedented in the history of Parliament. ...*(Interruptions)* If you do not realize it, you are doing great harm to the whole political system. ...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the first time in the Indian political history has a Member of the Council of Ministers been found guilty and convicted for murder. ...*(Interruptions)* From the court, he was taken straight to the Tihar Jail. Yet they seem to think that it is ordinary and there is nothing extraordinary. ...*(Interruptions)* You should feel more ashamed than myself. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SANTOSH GANGWAR (Bareilly): Sir, please ask them to listen. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: What more can I do?

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: If the ruling party thinks that this is ordinary, this is not extraordinary, I only feel sorry. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, there is not even a notice for the suspension of Question Hour.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have not given.

SHRI SANTOSH GANGWAR: I have given the notice.

MR. SPEAKER: No. You have not given.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: This is not Question hour. He has given the notice.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no notice for suspension of Question Hour.

SHRI SANTOSH GANGWAR: I have given.

MR. SPEAKER: He has given it for the mention of it after Question Hour. No. I cannot accept. This is the report.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, you have permitted me now. This is not Question Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: I have permitted you. That is different. There is no notice, no Motion for suspension of Question Hour.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: This is not the Question Hour. This is after the Question Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: About that, I have permitted you. It was said that there is a provision. Yes, I know that there is a provision,

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I know that.

MR. SPEAKER: Nobody took recourse to that.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: It was referred to that. They say that there is nothing extraordinary.

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH (Maharajanji, Bihar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had given a notice to adjourn the Question Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: You have not given today.

*...(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Regarding Adjournment Motion, I have already admitted. I have received your notice.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: It is now more than two-and-a-half years that this Government has been in office. *...(Interruptions)* I remember that when Dr. Manmohan Singh formed his Council of Ministers and announced the names, at that time itself an important issue raised by the Opposition referred to the credentials of those Ministers. For the first time, it is remarked like this. Till now, we have been hearing of criminalization of politics. But now we have seen criminalization of the Council of Ministers of the Government. *...(Interruptions)* The reply at that time used to be that it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister to select his team. He has exercised his prerogative to select his team.

Now, Sir, in this particular case, the person who was convicted yesterday has been sent to jail. The moment a Non-Bailable Warrant was issued against him, he was made to resign. At that time we were told—at least this is what I know—that the case related to some riots in Jharkhand. I did not know at that time that the case in which he was accused of murder was also going

on. I am sure that the Government must be knowing it, the Prime Minister must be knowing it because this is a case which has been lodged by the CBI. It is the CBI that has done it. Now, here is this person convicted! In the eyes of political analysts, the UPA Government has brought disgrace upon itself.

The whole political system has been maligned and disgraced only because, in the exercise of this prerogative, perhaps, the Prime Minister did not exercise the necessary vigilance and caution. So, my request is that the Prime Minister must come to the House and offer an explanation as to what happened when he was appointed for the second time and when the CBI case was instituted against him. It may have been much earlier and the CBI case is not an ordinary case. It is a case in which there are components of blackmail, kidnapping and murder. All these aspects are there. *...(Interruptions)*

Sir, my point is that the Prime Minister owes an apology to the nation and an explanation to the Parliament. Therefore, the Prime Minister must come here and explain as to what are the fact of this case, how did he exercise his prerogative, what has happened exactly and unless the Parliament is reassured on this, he will not be doing justice to the whole matter.

MR. SPEAKER: India's politics also requires that the House should function everyday properly.

Shri Dasmunsi.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the Government. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us hear him.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please go to your seat.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us hear what he has to say.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, on behalf of the Government, in response to the comments made by the distinguished Leader of the Opposition Advaniji, I have to inform you that in this House we had the opportunity

[Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi]

to witness two Ministers in Council of Ministers being charge-sheeted, one while we were sitting on the other side and another while are sitting on the Treasury Benches. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we want the Prime Minister's reply. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, if they do like this, this is not correct. Let them not threaten us. ...*(Interruptions)* If they are not afraid of hearing me, let them not do like this. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: He is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. How can you dictate to him?

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, why are they afraid of listening to me?. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded. Any Member speaking without my permission will not go on record.

...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I am not a jurist to interpret the criminal law. But in my lay knowledge of law, I can say that any crime which is committed either to murder an individual or a community, both are same. I have the privilege to see a Council of Ministers in which the distinguished Leader of the Opposition was there in which when he took the oath of office he had the CBI investigation going on against him for the heinous charge of communal riot. ...*(Interruptions)* At that time, the then Prime Minister Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee laid the standard that it is his discretion to choose his Council of Ministers and said that unless anybody is convicted he is not a criminal. Accordingly, our Prime Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Harin Pathak, please don't provoke me to dig out everything, then it will be most embarrassing for you. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: This is not right. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that one should be prepared to listen to others also. Please take your seat.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, our Prime Minister not only took the resignation but made it abundantly clear that anybody who is in the Government if they are convicted of any charge, they have to leave the Government. It is very clear. But in the legal jurisprudence, till a trial is on everybody has a right to defend himself before the court of law and till the end of that, nobody is guilty in the eyes of law. When Advaniji had the tenacity to carry on as the Deputy Prime Minister of the country in spite of having been charged by the CBI for indulging in communal riots in the country and for not killing one but motivating the rioters to kill thousands and thousands of people in the nation and demolishing the mosque, it is most unfortunate to see Advaniji raising this issue. It is really amazing to me. I would like to know in what capacity and with what moral authority he is sermonizing the House. If it had been raised by any other Member, I could understand that.

Sir, Advaniji is still facing the charge, still he is not free from the charge. So, it is better that he does not give advice to us. Our Prime Minister has taken a very clear stand on this matter and so he does not need to give an apology to the House or to the nation. On the other hand, he has proved how transparent he and his Council of Ministers are.

Therefore, he should not try to take a competent lawyer with him to defend his cases because he is charged with the case of dividing the nation, to kill not one but thousands of people. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us go one by one. I will call one by one. Let him speak, he is your partner.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I will call you also.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: You have given the ruling just now that I will be given an opportunity to speak after the speech of the leader of opposition. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: It will be given after this issue. What is this?

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion which is going on. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: No one want to hear.

[*English*]

I will allow you to speak. Be brief.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Your hon. Minister has spoken on behalf of the Government, I take it. Now you are also trying to say something, I do not take that. Is this the way the House will function? No.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion which is going on has been raised by hon. Advaniji I am partially agreed with what Priya Ranjan Dasmunsiji has said. He said that it is the privilege of the Prime Minister and undoubtedly it is the privilege of the Prime Minister to include any person in the cabinet. Secondly, it is in the law that a person can remain in the cabinet unless he has been found guilty. We have no objection to it also. I would like to raise only one issue and it is the matter, which was related to Shibu Soren. I do not want to refer the name of anyone...\*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: This will not go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Sir, I am not mentioning the name of anyone...\*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: This is not true. No that will not go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: As C.B.I. has investigated the matter. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I have called him. I have allowed him to speak.

[*Translation*]

Please speak what ever you want to say.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: CBI has investigated this matter. CBI comes under Prime Minister. Hon'ble Prime Minister must have been aware of all the things as to what is fact or not. Even it is quite possible that CBI must have informed about the final status of Shibu Soren case. Mr. Speaker, Sir in such a situation I would like to say that it may be a political conspiracy.

For example we had been convicted and went to jail, there are more people in the government like that, it is being talked about. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down, he is authorized to speak.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: No one can speak against us, I tell you, please listen. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: You, tell me, what should I do. Please sit down. I will give an opportunity to your leader also.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: You are violating my order by speaking from there. I will issue a notice of privilege against you. Violation of the Chair's direction or order is a breach of privilege. It applies to all sides. Please speak.

...(*Interruptions*)

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a prisoner raise a slogan-Jab tak jail mein chana rehega, Tab tak aana-jana bana rehega, this slogan is famous in jail. I would like to tell you that this is the slogan of a prisoner. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: This is not subject now. Leave all the things.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: There are some ministers in the Government who often go to the jail. ...\*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Delete that name.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: In this situation, I would like to say that the tainted ministers should be expelled from the Government and Prime Ministerji. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Devendraji what is this.

*[English]*

I will call you.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Basu Deb Acharia.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, I will call you.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You do not have to provoke him.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: I will conclude within a minute, I would like to say, that perhaps it is for the first time in the country that a person has been sentenced or sent to jail while holding the office of a minister.\* ... This is my only submission to you.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Delete that portion.

Now, Shri Basu Deb Acharia.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Sir, the Court has convicted yesterday Shri Shibu Soren who was a Cabinet Minister in the UPA Government. ...*(Interruptions)* The Prime Minister asked him to tender his resignation and he immediately resigned as he has been convicted. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): How do you know?. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: It has come in newspapers and everyone knows. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

MR. SPEAKER: What is the matter? Is it question-answer session?

*[English]*

You are going on putting questions to him.

*[Translation]*

What is the matter? You are doing this being a senior member.

*[English]*

You were a Minister also. It cannot be one-way traffic; you will speak and you will not allow others to speak.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: When BJP raised the question of morality, raised the question of the continuance of tainted Ministers, and raised the question of the Minister involving criminal cases, I am rather surprised. Sir, the then Deputy Prime Minister and the leader of BJP continued in the NDA Government for six long years. He was charge sheeted for the demolition of Babri Masjid on 6th December, 1992. After demolition of Babri Masjid, many innocent people were killed because of the action of BJP. Under the leadership of Shri L.K. Advani, the then Deputy Prime Minister in the NDA Government, Babri Masjid was demolished. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except Shri basu Deb Acharia's observation.

...*(Interruptions)\**

---

\*Not recorded.

---

\*Not recorded.

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: After the demolition of Babri Masjid, hundreds of innocent people were killed. Who are responsible? They are responsible. The three Ministers who were charge sheeted continued in the Government. We raise this issue on the floor of this House but they continued for six long years. Today, they are raising the question of morality and they are raising the question of tainted Ministers. They have no right to raise this question.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Mohan Singh.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You are not Shri Mohan Singh. Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Mohan Singh ji you speak.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that moral standards are continuously on decline in public life and such people are occupying high posts against whom. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except Shri Mohan Singh's observation.

...(Interruptions)\*

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: It is true that it is the first case in the history of this country that court had to punish a minister of cabinet rank. The punishment would be known on 30th of November. When journalists asked the Prime Minister after completion of one year in office, PM said that coalition governments have some limitations due to which tainted politicians are made Ministers. Now it is clear that Prime Minister has publicly accepted that it is his compulsion to induct tainted members as Ministers. My second submission is that those people do not have moral authority to raise this issue who are chargesheeted by CBI and against whom cases are pending in courts. I request all the parties whether ruling or opposition to follow moral standards in public life and high posts should not be offered to those against whom cases are pending

in courts irrespective of the party to which they belong. Because it is very unfortunate that many Members of this House are in jail and some are threatening to commit suicide. Public has a negative opinion about us whether we are in the ruling side or in the opposition. Therefore, we should come together to prepare a model code of conduct. I think that the case of Shibu Soren is a message for us. Sir, you should call an all-party meeting to prepare a model code of conduct.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Devendra Prasad Yadav, I would call you on your issue separately. But if you want to say anything on this ongoing issue, you may do so.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to say something on this?

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sri, I am surprised to listen because Hon. Members very often have discussion in the House about tainted ministers. There is a party in this country whose character has been exposed when its leaders were charge sheeted by CBI. ...(Interruptions) They do not have any moral authority. ...(Interruptions) Only those who have moral authority may speak on the issue of Shri Shibu Soren. BJP has no moral authority because three of its leaders remained ministers even after being charge sheeted. ...(Interruptions) We do not support your version of morality. ...(Interruptions) We continuously raised questions against your tainted character. ...(Interruptions) When Babri Masjid was demolished millions of people became insecure. That incident broke the chord of communal harmony, weakened the secular principles and many parts of the country faced communal riots. The country would not become weak from external aggression but from internal threats. The country is becoming weak due to them because they want to divide it on religious lines. Therefore, they do not have any moral authority to speak on the issue of Shri Shibu Soren.

[English]

The law will take its own course.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (Panskura): Sir, I only wish my colleagues listen to me. I have a very bad throat.

\*Not recorded.



[Shri Gurudas Dasgupta]

I agree with Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi-ji that till a man is not convicted, he is considered to be innocent. I agree with him. That is a legal position. But there is a question of morality also in the public life, and the morality of public life enjoins upon me to tell the House that we are unhappy with the situation. We are extremely unhappy with the situation that has occurred. It has given an opportunity and a weapon in the hands of your political opponents to pin down the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Not mine! I have no opponent.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Not you, Sir, it is on the other side. You are above all of us in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope you treat that.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: But Sir, I am saying that devil should not quote from the scriptures. ...*(Interruptions)* That is my simple statement. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: It applies to you also.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Yes, it applies to me also. This is the problem inherent of impatience and intolerance. ...*(Interruptions)*

Sir, I can only say this.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope you can imagine my problem.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Yes, while saying so that devils should not quote from the scriptures, I only remind that there had been occasions in the past where a charge-sheeted person in a criminal case had occupied the exalted position of Home Minister of this country. Therefore, if politics has been polluted, at least, my hon. Friend Mr. Advani cannot claim immunity from that. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please go on. Your statement will be recorded and nothing else.

...*(Interruptions)\**

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record anything except the speech of Mr. Gurudas Dasgupta.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: You see this. ...*(Interruptions)*

\*Not recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. Order please. Let there be order in the House. What is this going on? Mr. Kharabela Swain, please take your seat.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: The point is, if Parliament has to function, there has to be freedom of speech within Parliament also. I want Mr. Advani to respond to me. Freedom of speech should be guaranteed in Parliament.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He has directly asked me to respond to it. I would say that in my entire public life, there had been occasions when there had been movements of different nature and if a movement somehow becomes very strong, then at the end of it, the police and the investigation authorities frame charges against so many leaders of that movement. I am sure the Communist Party. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: What type of movement?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I know what type of movement. Movement is a movement. Sir, a movement is a movement. The charges framed are always criminal. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: No, listen to him. What is this going on? Mr. Acharia, please sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He had asked me to reply. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: What are you doing? I do not understand this. Please sit down.

Do not record anything. Nothing will be recorded.

...*(Interruptions)\**

MR. SPEAKER: I have permitted Mr. Advani to respond.

...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. You have asked him to respond, and he is responding.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Yoy have asked me to respond.

*[Translation]*

I have heard these off repeated things many times. Therefore, I want to clarify it again that I have been a part of many such movement after which. ...*(Interruptions)*

\*Not recorded.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: I appeal to you all to please sit down.

*...(Interruptions)**[Translation]*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He has sought clarification from me. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly take you seats.

*...(Interruptions)**[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will be recorded.

*...(Interruptions)\**

MR. SPEAKER: I am requesting all hon. Members that a sensitive issue has been raised. Although I had made a request at that time, the Question Hour could not be held. Let us respond to each others' issue in a dignified manner. I am appealing to you all. How can this method of interrupting others continue? Therefore, Mr. Dasgupta, you had requested the Leader of the Opposition to respond. He is responding. Let us listen to him.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Nobody is obliged to speak to suit the others' wishes. Everybody will speak what he wants to speak.

If it is unparliamentary, if it is derogatory, I am there to control that. It is my job. You are not there to control anybody else. But this is what is happening in this House. There is no intention to listen to each other. How can there be a debate or a dialogue?

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You give that rule. I will ask him to get out immediately.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Advaniji, please conclude quickly. I am giving opportunity to all.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: This is totally outside the rule that is happening now.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I have not completed.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that you have not finished. You asked him to respond and he is responding. What can I do? You cannot object.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Let us have the decency to listen to each other.

*[Translation]*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, till date I have been ignoring this issue, but since the issue has been raised today in this manner, I want to clarify that I have never felt guilty that I was very active in Ayodhya movement. *...(Interruptions)* I felt sorry because. *...(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

Sir, this is not fair. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I am very sorry to say this.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Athawale, I am going to name you. You have to go. You are not even in your seat. You are deliberately disturbing me and the House.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE (Pandharpur): No, sir. I am not.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you are. I am so agonized.

*...(Interruptions)*


---

\*Not recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: I am making so many appeals. Can we not behave as serious persons with some responsibility? Who is benefiting by this? Who is benefiting?

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: That is your misconception that by disturbing, they are benefiting and that is why you are disturbing.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Please give some lessons to your Members.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It applies to all sides. Why is there this impatience not to hear each other?

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will do it now. It is enough. Mr. Athawale, I am going to do that.

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, kindly pardon the hon. Member.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I am going to ask you to leave.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, please do not do that.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I am appealing to you. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Advaniji, please conclude.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, I will conclude by saying this. ...

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, Sir I am proud to be a part of Shri Ran Janambhumi movement but I am sorry, for the demolition of mosque that day in 1992. ...(Interruptions)

MD. SALIM: (Kolkata-North East): Then why do not you represent in court. ...(Interruptions) If it is so then fight it out. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: What are you doing? What is this? I am very sorry. It seems you have no respect for the chair. I am very sorry.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Acharia, I am very sorry.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you do not want me, I will go away. If you do not want me to be in the Chair, I will go away without any regret. I cannot preside over the liquidation of the entire system of parliamentary democracy. I do not want to remain here. If you do not want me, please tell me. I will go away immediately. I will not take even a second. But I cannot allow, I cannot see, I cannot tolerate it any longer. Please. It is not a matter of amusement to any.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am requesting all hon. Members, particularly the leaders to cooperate.

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir I would conclude by saying that I am proud to be a part of Ram Janambhoomi movement of Ayodhya but I am extremely sorry for the demolition of the mosque. I have said it before the Liberhan Commission also that I do not have a hand in the demolition directly or indirectly. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, Shri A. Krishnaswamy.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I have not concluded. I request you to please give me two more minutes to speak. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, through you, I would like to convey to the distinguished Leaders of the House that in the eyes of the law whether you kill a Private Secretary – according to the observations of the court – or kill so many people through the movement are the same. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: If you disturb, then I will not call you.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, now it is clearly proved on the floor of the House that Shri Advani takes pride in the demolition of Babri Masjid. *...(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, what is this? *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Advani, your views on this issue are on record, and you have said about it.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA: Mr. Advani, you have said it.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Advani, you have made your position clear, and you have expressed your regret on that issue.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, I have said it before the Liberhan Commission also. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is on record.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps, they did not listen to you carefully. I am listening to you carefully.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: But the intervention of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs or what he is saying now is a deliberate. ...\*

MR. SPEAKER: That word will be deleted. It will be deleted.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I am only saying that. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Dasgupta, please conclude.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I am only saying that that there are movements in the history of the world that have been applauded by history like the movement led by Mahatma Gandhi or the movement led by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But there are also movements in the history led by Hitler, which have been blacklisted as one of the black chapters in the history of international political life. Mr. Advani will go down in the history as a. ...\*

MR. SPEAKER: No, please delete it.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have expunged it. It is expunged.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have expunged it. I also do not approve of such statements.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have expunged it.

*...(Interruptions)*

12.47<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> hrs.

*(At this stage, Shri Harin Pathak and some other hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have expunged it then and there itself.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till 2 p.m.

12.48 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Fourteen of the Clock.*

---

\*Not recorded.

---

\*Not recorded.

14.00 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha reassembled at  
Fourteen of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

[*Translation*]

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our all members are very sad. The kind of comment Shri Dasguptaji has made in this august House in gross violation of the dignity and decorum. ...(*Interruptions*) of House is unprecedented. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur): We also. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: Please, this is a question of our sentiments. I respect you. ...(*Interruptions*) Such... words have never been used from our side against any leader. They have used such derogatory words. The entire House should condemn this incident. If laxity is shown to a person, other are likely to follow suit and any person including Hon'ble Members could be targeted. I demand that the concerned Member should be called, he should regret and apologize and the statement should be withdrawn, otherwise it will be difficult for us to sit in this House. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What are you talking?

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, I appreciate your sentiments. You will please recall that I had immediately expunged all these words.

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: We are thankful to you for that.

MR. SPEAKER: I had immediately expunged, and I am also sorry that such strong words are being used. This will not help us in any way. Since they are derogatory, I have immediately deleted them. Therefore, I will request all of you to let us have a debate of a very high level.

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: He should withdraw that word.

MR. SPEAKER: That is entirely for him; he is here.

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: Our sentiments are hurt. If it is only deleted, then nobody will listen to us. Do not push us to the wall where we have no option but to speak. Do not push us to the wall.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot compel any hon. Member to do or not to do anything. But it is entirely for him to do what he thinks fit. In the context of proper running of the House, I will make a request to him to consider the same.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (Panskura): Let us not threaten each other. I am in the Parliament from 1985. I am associated with Mr. Advani in Rajya Sabha for more than 15 years. I hold him in high esteem. I do not know what his assessment about me is, but I hold him in high esteem. The point is, I had used a word which I should not have used; I agree. But I should also say that Mr. Advani had used a word..\* which is unparliamentary.

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: He said that after you have used that word.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not correct. That has also been expunged. Now, he has withdrawn it. He has expressed his regret.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Mr. Advani should also withdraw that word. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He has expressed his regrets.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, Mr. Advani should also withdraw that word.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI (Garhwal): He made a clear statement and immediately after that, you have distorted it. He said that it was a ...\*

MR. SPEAKER: This cannot go on like this. You have to do that outside.

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B. C. KHANDURI: You can recall what Mr Advani said.

MR. SPEAKER: He has said that, he should not have used that word.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: My point is that Mr. Advani is not coming out and I am sorry for that. He

\*Not recorded.

\*Not recorded.

should have said that he should not have used that word. ... .. is an unparliamentary word just as the word... Both words are unparliamentary. I am sorry that I should not have used it, but Mr. Advani should say that he should not have used it.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I leave it to him.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: There is a difference between the words used. It was a blatant untruth, if he wants it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: It will add to your stature, Advaniji.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I do not want to add to my stature.

MR. SPEAKER: I want.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have heard these comments so often and also because he said that I should personally reply to him. I replied very clearly that I am proud of my association with the movement, but I am extremely sorry about the demolition. I have said that a hundred times. Therefore, when he said, he was proud that it was demolished', as I said, it was not correct.

MR. SPEAKER: It was 'not correct'.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Anyway, I do not want to do anything further. He has regretted what he said. So, let the matter be treated as closed.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. This is the spirit in which we should work. That chapter is over now.

Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav.

*[Translation]*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to raise a issue in this House which is very sensitive and of national importance. The weekly police report was presented in 2006 in which strategy to combat and tackle terrorism was presented. In context of the said report, two senior officers of ADG (Railway) level, presented their programme in the conference of senior police officers at 12.30 hrs. on the second day on 25th November, 2006 at Lucknow.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the State Police?

*[Translation]*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: They said it about the country. This is not related to State. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Why do you intervene. I am only asking. He is a very experienced Member.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: The news item titled "Emarate Saraiya, dehshat-gardon ka mahfuj maskan" published in daily Hindustan Express (Urdu) on 28th November, 2006 is very objectionable. This will ... not only in West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Jharkhand. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: All are hon. and responsible Members.

*[Translation]*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. Not only the people of West Bengal, Orissa, Jharkhand but crores of people all over India have been misled through this news. A wrong message has been conveyed to the nation by this news. An atmosphere of fear and insecurity has been created among minority community.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: You send it to the Home Minister.

*[Translation]*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: I demand from the Minister of Home Affairs that the persons who have indulged in such a false propaganda vitiating the atmosphere have done an act which tantamounts to damaging the secular fabric of the country. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You should keep some patience. Are you not ready to give anyone the opportunity to speak?

*[English]*

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) B.C. KHANDURI: Mr. Speaker, he should give reference of what he is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him end and then we shall see that. You cannot all the time intervene.

[Mr. Speaker]

Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, please conclude.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: The way you are behaving it is impossible to conduct the House.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: What is happening?

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to speak with your permission. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You should speak in brief.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, I am ready to accept your instructions. You give me only one minute's time.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you standing, Shri Ram Kripal Yadav?

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a feeling of insecurity has been prevailing among crores of people belonging to minorities who keep faith in the secular structure of Indian constitution. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: But you have to say where it has been published.

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You mention a paper, without naming the paper.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: We have mentioned the name of daily newspaper Hindustan

Express. This is the same Imar it-e saria, Phulwari Sharif which was founded under the Chairmanship of Maulana Abul Kalam jee in the year 1921. This institution has been engaged in different social, religious and public welfare activities. His Excellency, President A.P.J. Abdul Kalam had visited this institution in the year 2005 and the local MP Shri Ram Kripal Yadav was also present there. Shri Ram Kripal Yadav have made available Rs. 35 lakh from MPLADS fund for constructing the hospital. The name of this hospital is Sazzad and not only Muslims but patients from Hindu Community are also treated here. ...(Interruptions) I want to say that as questions has been raised on the strategy regarding tackling terrorism discussed on second day of police week, 2006 by two senior officers, ADG Railway and Uttar Pradesh Police, I want to bring only the title of the Report to your cognizance, not the details. The title is:

[English]

Scenario of terrorism in India—Gradually whole of India affected now. Terrorist activities notices in places where there is a sizeable Muslim population. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I agree. That is most undesirable thing which should not be said against any particular community.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: What is going on?. ...(Interruptions)

They are pointing finger at the entire community. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is going on? Please take your seat.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Spread of terrorism; reason for terrorism in India; study Sharmjeevi Express Bomb Blast, 2005; detailed investigations brought to light a small place named Fulwari Sharif near Patna. ...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted. Give it to the hon. Home Minister.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: The basic of spirit of Secular Indian Constitution has been violated. ... (Interruptions) Social and religious feelings, unity, integrity and sovereignty of the country have been challenged under a planned conspiracy, so I demand from the hon. minister of Home Affairs that action should be taken against the officer having malafide intention out to harm the communal harmony, brotherhood and internal security of the country. This should be investigated by Central agency, CBI so that the feeling of insecurity among crores of people could be removed. ... (Interruptions) Guilty officers should be penalized.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Shahnawaz Hussain, do not take names. Otherwise, I will not allow you.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: It's all right. Please sit down.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed you. Give it to the hon. Home Minister.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna): have also given the notice.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Do not bully me.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: I have also given the notice.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You go on shouting.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN (Bhagalpur): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you. We have given bytes on T.V. speaking from here as I have been authorized by my party. I went to the lobby. ...\*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You have to give me proper notice.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I want notice.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: ...\*

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please delete it.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: I have given the notice. It is a matter about my Parliamentary constituency. ... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You won't get opportunity right now. You will get that tomorrow at 12 o' clock.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: You give me an opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: This notice is not meant for this.

...(Interruptions)

---

\*Not recorded.



SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: You listen to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I won't.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Ram Kripal Yadav, would you sit down or not?

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I have commit to him because earlier he could not speak. He wanted to raise the matter.

...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: Sir, please give me just one minute to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: You won't get even half a minute. The time for this notice is over. I won't give you time now.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV: Such type of comments are being made. ...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record one word of him.

...(Interruptions)\*

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: I will give you time tomorrow. I will allow you just after the question hour. You table the notice.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. Hon. Leader of the Opposition has to move an Adjournment Motion on an important matter.

[Translation]

SHRI ILYAS AZMI (Shahabad): You allowed every Party leader to speak. You also allow me.

MR. SPEAKER: That matter is over.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: Will our party not speak. Don't we deserve respect?

MR. SPEAKER: You do and we respect you a lot.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: This is the way we are respected.

MR. SPEAKER: How do we shall respect you. We are saying it so.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: We walk out in protest for not getting a chance to speak.

14.17 hrs.

[SHRI ILYAS AZMI then left the House]

...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We have bad luck.

14.19 hrs.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT—Contd.

**Government's failure to maintain internal security and in particular to deal with alarming growth of terrorist menace in the country**

[Translation]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI (Gandhinagar): Sir, I beg to move "that the House be adjourned".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, India got independence in 1947. It has been 59 years since we got independence. Since then, India had to fought four wars with its neighbours. If we add Kargil to it, then it become five. Out of which four are with Pakistan and one with China. But this fact should be recognized that the terrorism prevailing in India for the last 20-25 years is mainly sponsored by our neighbour with whom we have also fought wars. So far, the losses we have suffered due to terrorism are more than those suffered during four-five wars. In this way, about 70 thousand person have been killed so far, out of which 10 thousand are our security personnel. So many people were not killed even in those four-five wars. It is right that after the war of 1971, Pakistan got to understand that it can't fight with India directly. They have their own conceived notions from the beginning till date and these

\*Not recorded.

notions have been proved to be baseless one by one. They incurred such heavy loss in the war of 1971 that they not only were defeated badly but also lost a large part of territory in form of Bangladesh. The war was not so big. Not only this, we had their 94 thousand prisoners of war. When their Prime Minister visited Shimla he had the foremost thinking that he should get back his 94 thousand prisoners and if it doesn't take place it will be difficult for him to return to his country. I am mentioning this thing as I think that they changed their strategy after that. After changing the strategy, they adopted, what people call 'low cost war' and make terrorism a part of their state policy. I got to know the 'low' of low cost war when I was in the Government. Since the start of Terrorism we need to spend Rs. 730 crore per year to fight this "proxy war" and they spend only Rs. 24 crore per year. This is the difference because we don't know where they will attack in the direct war, we know as to where we would be attacked and who will attack but we don't know anything here. In this proxy war of 'low cost war' the attacking country knows but the country to be attacked does not know anything and therefore we have to make arrangement at every place. I have seen it with my own eyes. I admit that this war which started by the end of the seventies and the beginning of eighties is continuing till today. I was in the Government during the end of seventies and also for six years during the previous Government. Before joining the Government and on the said two occasions when I was in the Government, I have directly experienced the changing security environment and security scenario in the country.

I recall when I was the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in Morarji Bhai Government, I got an opportunity to visit Karachi which is my birth place. When I went to Pakistan, there was military rule there. Military men escorted all the politicians and military squads and motorcade trailed them. There might have been a couple of constables or a Pakistani officer with me. When I returned from Pakistan, I got heavy security cover. The politicians are provided a heavy security cover and when innocent persons are killed in the event of a terrorist incident, I feel embarrassment that I have a heavy security

*[English]*

Only because I am a privileged person.

*[Translation]*

That embarrassment still haunts me till today. It is on account of this embarrassment that when the

incumbent Minister of Home Affairs took charge, I wrote him the first letter asking for the withdrawal of my security as I do not want security but he did not accede to my request. I can understand it. If I were in his place I would also not have granted such a request.

*[English]*

Basically, it is a sense of embarrassment. I am merely trying to point out the security environment change that has come about.

*[Translation]*

My complaints against the present Government is that given this change in the contemporary security scenario, it still feels that the existing laws are sufficient to tackle the situation. The entire world does not buy this view. The UN security council has advised the entire world to formulate new laws because terrorism is a new phenomenon for the entire world that it had never witnessed earlier. We have experienced the war and 'Defence of India Rules' etc. are in existence to face such a situation. However, this is a normal situation. And yet the existing laws are not sufficient to tackle it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Sub-judice case regarding Bombay bomb explosion has been hotly discussed these days. The Minister of Law and the Minister of Home Affairs are present here. Sibalji is also sitting here. I would like to ask them that when the incident of serial bomb explosions had occurred in Bombay in 1993, several persons were arrested in that connection. The court cases have been going on against them and now after so many years the verdict is going to be delivered. Yesterday only, a particular criminal was pronounced guilty on whom several comments are being made. However, without going into that matter I would only like to submit that many people have been found guilty. If there were no laws like TADA, would it have been possible? Is it possible under the common laws of the country? I have witnessed that earlier there were many criminals who used to go scot free. They often adopted unfair means to get themselves acquitted. It was not our Government which enacted TADA, rather it was by the Congress Government and all of a sudden they got it scrapped. It was scrapped on the ground that it is used against a particular community, however, I do not agree with their view. I accept that if TADA or any other draconian law is formulated, it is often abuse. I will not deny this fact. I know that I have addressed major anti TADA conferences. We had

[Shri L.K. Advani]

organized such a conference in Ahmedabad. Prior to this TADA was used against the farmers agitation and the farmers were arrested under this law. I had gone to address one such rally.

[English]

Any Law can be abuse. Even the best of laws have been abused.

[Translation]

There are good laws in the country, however, these are also abused. Recently, we have formulated a law to protect women from domestic violence. It is a good law, however, it is also abused. It is not justified to repeal any law merely on the ground that it is abused. TADA was repealed by the Congress Government. POTA was formulated by our Government because we felt that the advice of the UN security council is justified because democratic countries all over the world normally do not have such laws. It is true that the countries under the dictatorship rule have such laws. Despite that democratic countries like U.K., America, Germany have formulated such special laws. That is why we also formulated POTA. When we felt that the then major opposition party is not in its favour, we convened a joint session of the Parliament and got POTA passed. The moment Congress Party came to power it repealed 'POTA'. *Prima-facie* opinion was that

[English]

We should be able to overcome this problem of terrorism. That was the principal thing.

[Translation]

I allege that the present Government has no perspective regarding the war against terrorism. I do not know whether discussion has been held in this regard or not.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the present Government had recently convened a conference of DGPS and IGPs of all the States. In that conference DIB, (Director Intelligence Bureau) Shri Narsimha had given a statement in which he said.

[English]

This law is inadequate. It needs more teeth.

[Translation]

I do not remember any occasion during the last 60 years when any DIB has ever given any such statement in the presence of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): Whatever he is saying is not correct. DIB has not said like this. Whatever has been reported in newspapers is not correct.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I did not come across his contradiction, though I have seen your contradiction.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am stating it in the House.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: You are contradicting it now, has not given any such statement.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: It is not that it is wrong because contradiction has not been given in the newspapers. It cannot be said.

[English]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I think it is something that had happened for the first time in the history of the country where publicly he has said it.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Every word of that Conference is recorded. We have the video tapes and the audio tapes. It is not there. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have gone by what I have in my hand that is what he said.

MR. SPEAKER: You have said that there is no contradiction. Now there is a contradiction.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: But the contradiction is coming after seven days. He has not contradicted it. It is the Minister who has contradicted it.

I am referring to POTA and TADA. If TADA had not been there, quite a few of them would have gone scot free.

[Translation]

When one person was held guilty in the court it was told about him that he had personally parked that jeep in Javeri Bazar which was laden with RDX and on account of which 74 persons were killed.

[*English*]

The doing was of one person.

[*Translation*]

In this way, all are facing separate cases. I would like to appeal the Government even today that it should at least consult those persons who deal with this problem. The Government should seek the advice of legal experts as to whether.

[*English*]

Under the present law, really speaking, terrorists can be booked and terrorists can be brought home?

[*Translation*]

Common laws are already in place. Despite foreign funding to terrorism and its dangerous presence in the country it is being discussed in several countries as well as ours that the capital punishment should be abolished.

[*English*]

UK does not have capital punishment. In our country it is a common perception that capital punishment is needed here as a deterrent.

[*Translation*]

Many persons question its relevance. They have every right to express their views, I honour their sentiments and may also participate in that discussion.

[*English*]

I would definitely say that if a deterrent law is needed, it is needed more for a terrorist than for an ordinary murderer.

[*Translation*]

A person accused of murder gets acquitted because the prosecution fails to bring evidence against him. The campaign for his retrial was launched and success was achieved in it and after that he was penalized. He was found guilty of raping and murdering the girl. There is no demand for clemency in this regard. The crime was

committed against one person. Rape and murder of a girl is a heinous crime. Therefore, those who demanded retrial have done a good job and the court's verdict that on the basis of the present evidence.

[*English*]

He is guilty and he should be sentenced to death. He should be hanged until he is dead.

[*Translation*]

I appreciate both. But compare it with the demand of clemency for Afzal. He has not committed crime against one particular person. He has committed crime against the Parliament, against the entire country and the democracy. After that the demand of clemency is being put very strongly and a Chief Minister of the Congress Party has strongly advocated it and one former Chief Minister has said that he does not agree with it. The Government is silent over this issue. It is not taking any decision, though decision should be taken. The demand of clemency for General Vaid's assassins was also made. As per my information, within 15 hours of the decision for execution, the Government endorsed that execution should be carried out.

THE MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF EARTH SCIENCES (SHRI KAPIL SIBAL): Why they had not penalized the killers of our former Prime Minister? Beside that, why they took terrorists to Kandhar and released them over there ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Kandhar issue has been raised many a time. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Kapil Sibal, you can speak when your turn comes.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will not have it recorded in future.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: You take the permission of the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Swain ji please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He is a Minister. So, he can interrupt at any time. He is not an ordinary Member. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: I am not interrupting. I am just informing the House.

*[Translation]*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He is still interrupting. ...*(Interruptions)* I am saying that terrorism has increased, but our Minister of Home Affairs will refute my contention and say that he has given us figures to substantiate his claim. Sir, it appears from the figures, that terrorism has been checked. After going through these figures anybody would feel that the situations is very good. But that day I was astonished when I met two key witnesses in the Conference of IGPs and DGPs of all the States of the country. There were two such witnesses who were ready to express their point of view. One of them was D.I.B. about whose report it was said after ten days that it was not right and the second one is the hon. Minister of Home Affairs himself whose speech is with me. If I quote from his speech, he would deny having said any such things. He said:-

*[English]*

"Some Let operatives are also being trained specifically for sabotage of oil installations. There are plans to occupy some inhabited islands and use them as basis for launching operations on the Indian Post."

This is what the hon. Minister of Home Affairs said.

*[Translation]*

Is that an ordinary statement?

*[English]*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have said it in the DGPs' Conference and not in the public meeting.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: It was said in the DGPs' Conference and in IGPs' Conference in a speech which was circulated to the Press. I have got it from the press. I have not got it from anyone else. It was published in the whole country. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Shri Advaniji, you know it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I know everything. Therefore, I was surprised.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You have been a Presiding Officer; you have been a Minister and you know it that if you want to make any statement on the floor of the House, you have to take the responsibility. You cannot say that because it has appeared in the newspapers, you can rely upon it. Here is a person who is standing up before you and the entire House and saying that certain statements which are attributed to me are not made. I am saying that the IB Director has not made certain statement. Hon. Prime Minister has not made certain Statement. You shall have to rely on me rather than the newspapers. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, it is a very difficult situation. I can understand that something. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am not denying it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: You are not denying. That is very good. This is exactly what I want. After all, these are the copies which I have received. One, which was originally drafted and the other which was subsequently amended by you. ...*(Interruptions)* So much so that the word 'terrorist' and the word 'enemy' have been replaced by mischief monger, by the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You have access to his draft also.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, this is the mentality. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (Panskura): Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Shri Gurudas Dasgupta, I am not yielding. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Singh, you are shouting too much.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I am raising a point of order. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You are not there to decide. Even if I wrongly decide, you have to accept it.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Whenever a Member is quoting from a document or from a report, he has to authenticate it.

Secondly, it is very dangerous that whatever he wanted to say, which means draft and whatever he has actually said, both the copies are in the hands of Shri L.K. Adani. This is also a sign of lack of security in your system. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (Puri): This is the age of Right to Information. Everything including the draft we can obtain. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please note that any interruption without my permission will not be recorded.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Shri Dasgupta is only endorsing me that under this Government even security is unsafe. One does not know. But so far as these documents are concerned, there is nothing secret about it. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Even Shri Advani is also a security hazard. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: So far as the country is concerned, for its security I am willing to undertake any hazard. Now, the situation is that there is no point in denying anything, particularly after the Right to Information law has been enacted.

MR. SPEAKER: That law is there.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have pay a heavy price all these days. I have talked about fatalities and the cost involved. Terrorism has caused heavy loss during the last 20-25 years and the most evident is the ouster of all Kashmiri pandits from the Kashmir valley.

[*English*]

It is safe. It is absolutely clean.

[*Translation*]

When we were in power, we tried our best to create an atmosphere conducive to their return, but it did not materialise. Now, what efforts are being made by the present Government? Please give me information in this regard. That day, a decision was taken to give a compensation of Rs. 7 lakh to each the Gujarat riot victims. I would definitely like to know whether the Government has taken a similar decision in respect of the Kashmir pandits as well, who were ousted years ago, and many of whom were also killed? If compensation is being given to the Gujarat riot victims it should be given equally to the members of both the communities killed and this should not be a particular community specific decision. I also understand that political instability in all the States is a serious matter be it in North-Eastern States, Eastern States, Jammu & Kashmir or Punjab (where normalcy has been restored) or in naxalite affected states. I have heard it from somewhere. I have not directly interacted with anybody, but the Police officers of Andhra Pradesh who have to deal with naxalite problems. ...(*Interruptions*)\*

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: That cannot go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Advani ji, what others have said somewhere else cannot go on record. You know that very well.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Should I name people?

MR. SPEAKER: No. Even you cannot name anyone that way.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: When I say something, I would not say it lightly.

MR. SPEAKER: I know that but the rules do not permit it.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I do not want to name anyone. Otherwise his position would become difficult. ...(*Interruptions*) It is a mess.

\*Not recorded.

[Shri L.K. Advani]

*[Translation]*

I had warned the Government at that time itself, that if would be a blunder on the part of the Government if it assured Naxalites that the Government was ready to talk to them without asking them to surrender their arms. Same thing can be said about ULFA, but I will not say anything, because I can not take anybody's name, nor I want to do so. But on the whole I am worried. I do not know what talks were held with Nepali Maoist leader, Prachandji. But I know this much that the proposal to build a red corridor from Pashupati to Tiruputi should not get any support. We should be extremely cautious in this regard.

Just now it was said that the biggest problem is that of terrorism. But some days back, the Prime Minister said that the biggest problem is that of naxalism. The Prime Minister had himself said that. After the incident of Mumbai the Prime Minister immediately issued a statement and blamed Pakistan for it. After putting blame on Pakistan, it was contended by the officers of Maharashtra that they were having evidence in respect of the seven train blasts.

*[English]*

It was like a warlike operation.

*[Translation]*

Within five minutes serial blasts took place in seven different trains and two hundred people were killed.

*[English]*

it was really amazing!

*[Translation]*

After that, it was said that there was evidence which would be handed over to Pakistan, and would be presented before the world. After some days, there was confusion the evidences were either weak or there was something else. But our credibility in the world got affected due to this episode. But it proved to be more effective when Prime Minister gave a statement in Havana that

*[English]*

Pakistan itself is a victim of aggression and victim of terrorism.

*[Translation]*

I would like to inform the House that when we were in Government for 6 years, we made a lot of efforts during early years to convince the whole world that cross border terrorism was a very serious problem for us. People used to listen with interest but were not convinced that any of our neighbour was involved in this. The situation changed after 9/11 and they started believing it after 9/11. when our Prime Minister went to address the U.S. Congress at that time, he urged them not to believe that distance from the rest of world protect their country from terrorism. He said that they can't remain unaffected for long. Then one day 9/11 happened and after that they became very receptive and gradually the people of the entire world began accepting that the main reason of dispute between India and Pakistan was actually not Kashmir but terrorism. Pakistan says that Kashmir is biggest problem. If the problem of Kashmir is sorted out then many problems will be solved, the relations will become normal. Now the whole world has come to accept that if there is any major problem then it is cross border terrorism. I feel that after this statement that.

*[English]*

Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorism.

*[Translation]*

They are not aggressors. They are the aggressed. The people of the world got astonished to hear that. They through that these people were blowing hot and cold in the same breath. I am not saying that there can not be individual victims. Any individual can feel like killing if provoked. It happens here also, but

*[English]*

That does not make the state a victim of terrorism. The state continue to provoke terrorism.

*[Translation]*

I do not want to quote Shri Pranab Mukherjee. He has stated that Pakistan has not stopped supporting terrorism. He has said that.

I only know that when NDA was in Government, during all the 6 years we had a two dimensional policy regarding Pakistan.

[*English*]

It was a two-pronged effort.

[*Translation*]

Firstly, honest efforts were made to establish normal relations with Pakistan. It was our policy to bring normalcy and for this purpose our Prime Minister went to Lahore in a bus. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI KRISHNA TIRATH (Karol Bagh): That's why Kargil happened. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Leave it, you will not be able to speak right now. Kindly speak at your own turn.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: The Prime Minister visited Pakistan riding in a bus and met their Prime Minister in Lahore and Kargil the same time. I really don't know how much the Prime Minister knew about it, but yes it happened. In spite of this, since our policy was to bring normalcy, hence, we invited General Musharraf to India for Agra Summit when he became President. The subject of our concern was terrorism and when he came to Agra he took the stand that there was nothing like terrorism in Jammu-Kashmir and Punjab and in fact this problem did not exist in India. He said that whatever was happening in Jammu-Kashmir was a part of an independence struggle. It was a fight for independence and one not can help if the blood of some innocent persons is shed. Then we said that their would not be any agreement because our policy has two parts, one to make honest attempts to bring normalcy in relations between India and Pakistan and secondly not to make any compromise regarding terrorism. The result of his not being ready to make any compromise regarding terrorism was that no joint statement was issued in Agra and he went back. I know that he left in a bad mood. But I feel that had he not adopted that stubborn attitude, the joint statement which was issued after January, 2004 SAARC conference in Islamabad could have been issued earlier. Prime Minister Vajpayeeji and Pakistan President General Musharraf issued a joint statement against terrorism and in that statement Pakistan stated that Pakistan will not allow its partland, any thereof or land in Pakistan's possession to be used for terrorism. They gave this public statement. Thereafter discussions took place and these discussions were held in different phases. I do not want to go into its details. I would only like to say that this public statement that Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorism,

is a kind of certificate. Which they had never ever imagined they would get but our country's Prime Minister gave them such a certificate. I feel that by making such a statement we made our stand weaker against terrorism.

SHRIMATI KRISHNA TIRATH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is making wrong statement. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: It does not affect him. This is a monopoly not of one side. This is happening from both sides. Nobody should do that.

There is a system of requesting for yielding or taking the permission from the chair or raising a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Who thinks about that and who follows that?

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker Sir, the hon. Home Minister does a favour to the country by laying the statement given by him in IGP, DGP conference and also the statement given by the DIG, the we will not have this misunderstanding which we have today. As per his view that was aired today.

[*English*]

"The critical infrastructure faces a serious threat from terrorists. Installation of the oil and natural gas sector, defence, communication and IT Sector are vulnerable".

[*Translation*]

He has said this in his statement. Why does he give all his statements to the reporters? He should give it to Parliament also. He should lay DIG's statement in Parliament.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have sent the statement to the hon. Speaker. I have also given him the CD.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the hon. Minister is saying that he has handed over his statement to you. I would like to mention all the incidents that have



[Shri L.K. Advani]

taken place recently? A terrorist is caught, be it Afzal or Madani. The political parties come forward to advocate his case, and pass a resolution in the assembly that he should be released on parole. Madani is the person against whom a case is under adjudication regarding the incident that took place in Coimbatore when I was going there to participate in election campaign and in which 54 local people were killed. Things are being said in his defence. I do not want to talk about all the facilities that are being provided to him. It is an altogether different story as to what facilities are being provided to various people in jails in different parts of the country. On the whole it gives a message that we are not concerned about terrorism. We are more worried about vote banks. This message is causing a lot of harm that we are not even worried about our security forces. He has said one more thing.

[English]

According to the reports in the press, namely, that the security forces, who battle against terrorists are subsequently subjected to all kinds of harassment both at the hands of the official authorities as well as non official authorities.

[Translation]

Thereafter several allegations are levelled on them, hence

[English]

The law needs to be properly changed.

[Translation]

They have recommended this.

[English]

Apart from the fact that the law in this regard needs teeth, he also suggested. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am sorry, I have to say this thing. He had been the Home Minister. He is quoting the DGPs's conference.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I did not quote anyone else except these two.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Before he became the Home Minister, the media was not allowed to cover it and he is discussing selectively whatever was discussed there, picking a sentence from one speech and then quoting it. This is not really helping the country to provide a proper security. At least, I do not expect this from him.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: It is a vote bank policy and nothing else.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I was surprised when I read your speech in the press. I would have delivered the speech of that kind because if there is knowledge with the Government. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You are not only referring to my speech but also referring to the speech delivered by the highest police officer in the country, and in a selective manner you are picking a word if you cannot pick up a sentence, and you are commenting on it. That kind of Conference was always secret before you became the Home Minister, and you allowed the Press to cover it. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Not the deliberations of the Conference, and only the initial speeches, the inaugural speeches were covered, and nothing else. I have not referred to any other speech. I have not referred to the speech of any IGP or DGP. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: What will they discuss? You are selectively quoting it on the floor of the House where they cannot come and defend themselves. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I know that your Ministry contradicted the reference to Indo-US nuclear deal. I saw that also. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am not expecting the former Home Minister to quote the deliberations of the Conference which was attended by DGs. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: All of you are very senior Members.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: He has made a mistake and just to cover up that he is blaning me. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (Balasore): What is so secret about it?. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: He is very senior and competent leader. Please take your seat.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Advani ji, you have taken 38 minutes.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Sir, I am about to conclude.

[*Translation*]

I have dealt with all the remaining issues. I would also like to state that if we do not pay attention towards the increasing crisis of illegal infiltration on the eastern border of the country, then it will cause much damage to our country. There are may factors pertaining to this but there is one factor on which decision has already been taken.

[*English*]

Let us have a national register of citizens. Let it be obligatory for every citizen of the country to carry citizen identity card with them. Let this identity card be a multi-purpose identity card which could serve even the electoral purpose as well as the security purpose.

[*Translation*]

And then we will control this.

[*English*]

During our time, necessary amendments in the law were also made. Legislation was undertaken. The Citizens Act was amended. The Tata Consultancy Services was engaged in this task. They took a long time. They

---

\*Not recorded.

completed their work. Many years ago when the job of identity card was undertaken it was always said:

[*Translation*]

How will it be possible in a country having population of hundred crores to one hundred and twenty five crores. It would be very difficult.

[*English*]

But after the development in information technology, everyone is convinced that it is feasible, it is possible and it will take some time but there should be no half-heartedness about it. I would like to know from the Government, from the Home Minister as to what is the development made in the last two and a half years after this Government came to power because this is an important matter.

Furthermore, I would say that or approach to the Bangladesh Government also should be vigilant and cautious. We have been very particular about Pakistan. Similarly, if there are any training camps there – maybe ISI is also taking its own interest there – our negotiation with Bangladesh should always point out to them what is happening from that side.

Furthermore, I would say that one of the important factors which was achieved by the January, 2004 Joint Statement was that there was an understanding that the infrastructure for terrorism that Pakistan has built up on its side over the years be dismantled. I can say to the best of my knowledge that infrastructure has not been dismantled. Therefore, instead of relating our relations to Pakistan on the basis of one or two individual terrorist incidents, let us relate it to whether or not they are willing to dismantle the infrastructure that they have built up there. This would be my submission.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the House do now adjourn."

15.00 hrs.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI): Mr. Speaker, sir, on behalf of the Government, I strongly oppose the Adjournment Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I have been hearing Advaniji on a number of occasions. I think, all of us today expect from him

[Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi]

something new, a sort of light in the House so that the Government could be enlightened if there are any shortcomings. But we are utterly disappointed and frustrated to not find anything new. Every time, when Advani-ji gets up, he suffers from the crisis of confidence on himself. It could be the reflection of his party's internal affairs; I am not going to comment on that.

In every Session, I feel. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: They listened to your leader quietly. Kindly listen to him.

...*(Interruptions)*

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: The House can not function like that.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HARIN PATHAK: (Ahmedabad): If you call the name of his party. Then he will realize. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: You speak taken you are given opportunity.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except Mr. Dasmunsi. Nothing will be recorded without my permission.

...*(Interruptions)\**

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are in possession of all the records of Parliament as the custodian of the House. In the last occasion, when the NDA was in power, even get one Adjournment Motion, we had to cry and cry and cry and got lost. Thanks for your wisdom, your understanding and your new trend to accommodate all sections of the House in major debates. I feel, almost in every Session, there should be an Adjournment Motion. I myself question as to why on the same issue there should be an Adjournment Motion.

The issue was to discuss the internal security. The Members of the BJP first gave a notice under Rule 193 and then suddenly, making departure from all traditions, they converted it to make an Adjournment Motion. Genuinely, my will wishers in the Media say, and it is very correct also that because every time one has to justify that Advani-ji is the leader of the BJP party, and therefore, without Adjournment Motion, it cannot justify. If it is a discussion under Rule 193, others will speak; but

if it is an Adjournment Motion, the leader will speak. That is why, Advani-ji, for your crisis of confidence, if you have brought it to yourself, I have nothing to say.

But, Sir, I would like to say that Advani-ji confined his whole debate just to Police Conference. It was not against the Government; it was not against what is going on in the country. He was very upset about the DGP Conference. If you carefully see, half of his speech was focused on what the DGP say and what the DGP did not say in the conference. It was his main issue. ...*(Interruptions)* I am saying 'DGP' and not the 'BJP'

Sir, Advani-ji has been not only the distinguished Home Minister of our country, he is also one of the tallest leaders of the country to understand the nuances of the Home Minister, nuances of the Police Conference, where each one is asked to give his apprehension. Finally, at the political level, the Minister makes an assessment as to how we should approach. While an IGP speaks or a DGP speaks, he speaks with confidence that his view should be taken as his view dealing the Administration. These are not the views of the Government. The views of the Government are decided in terms of policy. Advani-ji had to conduct such meetings. I am not demanding that those minutes should be tabled on the Table of the House. That would be a very sad end of the day to run the Administration. I would not inspire or encourage even our Home Minister to do so. I hope, he would not table every proceeding of the Police Conference just on the demand of some parties; it would not be proper. Right to information may demand it, but it is not fair.

Sir, I come back to the main issue. If we carefully read out Advani-ji's Motion, it is "Failure of the Government to maintain internal security, in particular and deal with the alarming growth of terrorist menace in the country." Advani-ji very tactfully avoided to refer the document, which has been made public by the Home Ministry. He took this document, I saw it. But he tried to avoid it, not to refer a single page of it. He engaged his whole time on the DGP statement or the statement in the Media, and not the official statement of the Government as to what is inside. If he reads from the inside document, starting from Jammu and Kashmir to all the States, it will be amply justified that the UPA Government has sufficiently controlled the matter, more than Advani-ji's POTA.

That is why, perhaps, he tried to avoid this document. I am not going to the figures. I do not glorify that during Mr. Advani's time, thousand innocents had been killed and during Mr. Shivraj Patil's time only 500 people were killed and that is why there is a big blast. No, I am not saying that. I am only saying the perspective he began with regarding the security scenario of the country.

\*Not recorded.

Yes, who does not know that India is a target? Who does not know that India's growth prosperity is a target? Who does not know if there is any biggest target against India that is to destroy the secular fabric of the country? He must still compliment us that in spite of the attempt of all kinds of terrorist activities in the country, in spite of the gravest provocation, if anything we have achieved today — I am not talking of myself — it is that the country socially and politically got united in the secular fabric order. Not a single occasion it had happened.

Why did they shift? Advaniji you know better. Why they sifted from Jammu and Kashmiri to Ayodhya temple? Why they shifted to Banaras Sankat Mochan temple? Why they shifted to Bangalore institute of Science Conference? Why they shifted to big installations where industrial growth and scientific capabilities are there? Why? It is because, their motive is that let us terrorise the whole world by saying do not come to India; do not invest here. Since democratic order is going on, let us make attempt to divide the country in terms of religion.

I am thankful to the media. The media may criticize the Government right and left. The media may criticize the Opposition right and left. But whenever any terrorist onslaught has taken place, either in Bombay blast or in Melegaon or in Banaras, it is the Indian media which largely maintained the order so that the society is not divided. That is the greatest thing of this country, and that is the greatest thing of this country's unity.

I would like to come back to the main issue now. This document will take a lot of time. I will not cite. Advaniji made the beginning with Kargil. We were denied to discuss Kargil even for a day in this House when NDA was in office. We were denied even for a day, even for a Short Duration Discussion, in spite of the Kargil Review Committee's Report was tabled. Remember, the Kargil Review Committee was not a report under the Inquiry Commission Act. The Government had not got the guts at that time to appoint an inquiry commission under the Commission of Inquires Act. It was simply a Review Committee. The Government did not allow to discuss even the Review Committee's Report, and the whole thing emanates from that.

We know the way carelessly the then Government allowed the lapses one after another in the front, to allow the militants to come, the militants to harbour, to allow the militants to plan to capture all parts of the Valley, and days in and out, allowed the shifting of the Pandits

one after another. The Kashmiri Pandits started leaving their home. They started coming to Delhi. It was at that backdrop, they felt one Lahore trip of Prime Minister may settle everything. After the Lahore trip, what was the aftermath, which I do not like to say?

Now how did they handle Kargil? The Kargil Review Committee said it was because of the intelligence failure of the Government and the Government did not act in spite of the required information in the possession of the Government. That is why, Kargil war took place. It was not our Report. It was your Report. How nicely they got the certificate? I would just read it. The Kargil report said that the country's jawans laid their lives because they were not being equipped in time and country faced the disaster for want of response form the Government on the intelligence back up.

After that, hilariously they campaigned throughout the country saying who won the 'Kargil war. Then, I quote from *call to Honour*. How this Government was feeling so warm in dealing with Kargil? Who gave this certificate? The Kargil Review Committee gave the certificate against the Government. Do you know what type of wonderful certification they got?

I quote from page 299:

"On 4 January 2000, Strobe Talbott wrote me a letter in which he very sincerely shared his views. 'During Kargil, India held fast to the moral high ground throughout the crisis, in the face of enormous provocation and resisted the temptation to take retaliatory steps which would at best have cost India its unprecedented international support.' That was not all. During the Bangkok Asian Regional Forum Meet on 27 July 2000, I met Madeleine Albright, again. Unlike 1998, she greeted me with great warmth, and I got the appropriate hug and kiss on my cheeks. She was graceful and complimentary. 'Jaswant, it was a masterly handling of the Kargil crisis. You did not put a foot wrong.' "

That was your legacy. That was your credential that you felt, whether the countrymen thank you or not, whether your report thanks you or not, if somebody hugs and kisses that you did the right thing at the right moment, that is your certificate. We do not carry this certificate. We carry the certificate of the masses. You see how we deal with it.

[Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi]

I do not know why Shri Advaniji every time tried to carry some word in his speech which is a louder message. It is the RSS' interpretation – I have been reading the article – that the message must be subtle, very quiet and wider meaning should be carried by the wise person. In the discussion during the last Adjournment Motion on the Doda massacrers, Shri Advaniji began to say that Doda is a religious cleansing. You may recall. I cannot quote. It is here with me.

Then in his Sankalp Yatra before the Parliament starts, the main campaign was not Sankalp for the poor people, not Sankalp for hard-hit farmers but the Sankalp or the main slogan of the Sankalp Yatra was—

[Translation]

Hang Afzal. ...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

Who prevented his hanging? Shri Advaniji is a most responsible leader. He knows that the sentence was passed by the Supreme Court where the Government cannot go to appeal. He knows that the constitution gives the authority to the of family of a citizen to pray for clemency and it goes to be disposed of at the desk of the President of India who cannot be debated in the House, who cannot be questioned at all in the House. But he picked up that "Doba was a religious cleansing, it did not catch my eyes, and did not compensate the damage that I have done by going to Pakistan and talking of Jinnah. So, now, I take a Sankalp that Afzal should be hanged. If I shout more, if that slogan of 'Hang Afzal' is not enough, then, possibly, another kind of polarization will take place." This is the crisis of this country in this security scenario. One should understand our UPA perspective is first take the people into confidence irrespective of the religion. People are the greater defence of any system than the arms together or the law. This is our perspective. Our perspective is in the name of fighting terrorism do not polarize the society. She rightly said polarizing the society in this country, in this democracy cannot achieve anything. How will a mere law help?

Shri Advaniji, can you tell and convince the House? You were the Deputy Prime Minister. POTA was on, in ordinance form. POTA was in function. Could you prevent the attack on Parliament by the suicide squad? ...*(Interruptions)* Yes, POTA as ordinance was there. I say that POTA, not as an Act, as an ordinance, was there. During the period when it was an ordinance, our Parliament was hit. When it was in the form of an Act, the Raghunath temple was hit. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I know that. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: When it was an Act, the Akshardham temple was hit. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: It does not prevent murders. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: I am not saying that. I am saying that you tried POTA itself and after having tried POTA both in terms of an ordinance and an Act, could you prevent the increase in the terrorists in this country? Every time you had to come and say 'I am strengthening my system'. You are now telling the Government that – you just change the law and the whole problem will be solved.

I know what happened in Gujarat in the name of POTA. The misuse was not only an exception but the misuse was rampant. I know. The whole target of POTA was to show to the whole world that in this country a particular community or a particular religion is doing all these things and book them in the law so that the other side could be polarized. It was never the intention of the Government otherwise. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI UDAY SINGH (Punea): This has started with you. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Uday Singh, do not do that.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: No, it is not. ...*(Interruptions)* I tell you. You are talking of POTA.

MR. SPEAKER: What are you doing? This is not the way to behave in the House.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, this is not fair. ...*(Interruptions)* Shri Advani cited examples of various countries of the world. I do not question his wisdom. USA is USA; Germany is Germany, but India is India. We should deal with our country as our situation demands; we should deal with our country to see how to keep the society together; and we should deal with our country according to our Constitution. We should not deal with our country according to what X, Y or Z does. Our system is quite different. We are a pluralist society, and we cannot afford to accept it there is tension and doubt in any quarter. Therefore, I do not say that no law should be made. Yes, law is there, and we are dealing with it.

I would tell you that come what may the provocation from BJP and come what may the provocation from Shri Advani, our Government is competent to deal it with the existing law. No POTA will be there in the scheme of things, and I want to make it abundantly clear. You experimented with the law, and you failed. Shri Vajpayee said that "I knew that the Parliament could be attacked." Even then you could not handle it. Therefore, this scenario of the country has not suddenly originated when the UPA Government came to power. The UPA carried the burden that you left.

The UPA has thought of a three-pronged approach. Firstly, take the people into confidence irrespective of their religion and community. Secondly, raise the confidence in them to such a height that they consider fighting terrorism as not the job only of police and the Army, but the job of every section and every community of people. Therefore, I found that even before any political party gave a statement – when the Bombay blast took place – it is the religious leader of the Muslim community of Bombay who condemned it aggressively, and denounced it forthright and said that this should not be tolerated. This is what is needed to keep the country together. Only after that comes the law and the judiciary. But you, from the very beginning, see that maybe somebody is there. This apprehension of somebody can be an eye of a police officer, but that apprehension should not be a reflection of a political party. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record it.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I know that there is election in Punjab, and there is bound to be aberration. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. This is not the time for you to speak.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will call you later. Nothing has been recorded.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, I repeat the popular quote of Shri Advani. It is such a popular quote

of Shri Advani that I cannot avoid my temptation to quote it whenever I take part in a debate. Shri Advani said – when they were in the Government – in the Parliament in his reply:

"The only answer that satisfactorily addresses this query is that Pakistan itself is a product of the indefensible Two-nation Theory, itself a theocratic State with an extremely tenuous tradition of democracy – is unable to reconcile itself with the reality of a secular, democratic, self-confident and steadily progressing India."

Shri Advani himself said it in the House. But there is confusion within Shri Advani that when I visit Pakistan, I should glorify the Two-nation Theory master Jinnah, and when I come back I should try to convince my counterpart that it was for my consumption and for other purpose. I would like to tell you that the Two-nation Theory creator was not merely Jinnah. Shri Advani, you also have tried to find out yourself as to who did it in this country. You are much senior than me. At the end of the day, it was not achieved and Mahatma Gandhi was killed or assassinated.

Today, if you try to give us lecture about all these matters, then it does not yield any results. The Two-nation Theory is over, and that stage is over. But if anybody tries to foment the society – within India – to make two sides of the world, our Government will not tolerate it. Let us make it very clear. Therefore, we shall fight terrorism with all the strength that we have—with the people; with the Government; and by maintaining the true spirit of the Constitution for a secular India. It is like that. During the naxalite days, everyday, a student leader from the Presidency College used to come with a bomb and used to blast the streets. In those incidents, when one police constable and the Vice-Chancellor were dead, we never said that so and so was a Chakraborty or Bandopadhyay or a Hindu and, therefore, the Hindu community was supporting that fellow. Today, when a Muslim person is caught with a bomb, you say that he is from LeT or he is so and so; yes, they are. But you cannot suddenly carry a campaign that because of vote-bank politics, Government 'A' or Government 'B' is appealing them. No, it is a slanderous campaign. I want to tell you Advaniji that this sort of slanderous campaign is not helping in any way in strengthening our internal security. This sort of slanderous campaign is raising doubts everyday in the minds of the community.

[Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi]

When Vajpayeeji was the Prime Minister, I referred to what has happened in Gujarat in this House. Harin Panda and all those things, he may not say here; he may talk about Harin Pathak in Ahmedabad. What has happened? Shabana Azmi and I went there. One Muslim *fakir* said: "I have nothing to convey to you and to Rashtrapathiji. All I wish to convey through you is to please allow us to live, and take away our voting rights." What could be more slanderous for the Indian democracy? Have you heard the slogans? You were the Deputy Prime Minister then. Did you go and console them? No, you did not do that.

The menace of terrorism is there in the country, but the Government alone cannot fight it. The Government can fight this menace after taking the people into confidence. We are progressing in that direction inch by inch. When Soniaji visited the temple in Benaras, the head priest of that temple said: "I am so overwhelmed by the fact that both Hindus and Muslims came together to condemn the incident that occurred in Benaras." When Bismillah Khan Sahib was alive, he also said:

[*Translation*]

No one can divide Hindus and Muslims in Benaras.

[*English*]

These people are the real strength of India who help in fighting terrorism. Through these sort of messages, we can fight terrorism. Terrorism cannot be fought by laws like POTA.

[*Translation*]

He may say anything. This is our approach. ...(*Interruptions*). The approach of U.P.A. is different from him. They create an environment as if they are the sole protector of Lord Rama and of entire Hindu Society, as if our mothers did not put a Tilak on our foreheads on the occasion of our birthday and hymns were not chanted on the occasion of our marriage. As if they only know all these things? It is not so. Vedic hymns were chanted on the occasion of marriage of my father and I also got my head tonsured. It is not only they who does all these things? Do not think so. They should realize that Bismillah Khan's Shehnai is still thought most auspicious on the occasion of a Hindu marriage and they and we, all feel proud to wear Lucknavi chicken Kurta of Wajid Ali Shah

style while attending marriages. This is the culture of India and it is all inclusive.

[*English*]

Sir, I come back to the issue of Afzal. A campaign has been built from day one about Afzal who is to be hanged. It was said that the Government was not allowing him to be hanged. There are eminent lawyers from both the sides. I want to know whether the hanging order is executed by the Parliament or by the Government. Yes, Advaniji could have said that the attack on Parliament was a serious thing and, therefore, that fellow was to be hanged. Why is it being delayed? On many occasions, you go to Rashtrapathi Bhavan for giving memoranda. Why do you not go one day and enquire as to how much more time is needed.

Rajiv Gandhiji was the Prime Minister of India.

[*Translation*]

SHRI LAL MUNI CHOUBEY (Buxar): When the matter of Shahbano was raised. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is not graceful on your part.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I would not allow this.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: After Rajiv Gandhi's assassination, when the case ended, the conspirators who were involved were given death sentences. All the papers including the clemency petition and other things came to the desk of the Home Ministry in May 2004, when you were the Home Minister and Deputy Prime Minister. Unfortunately, Advaniji, Afzal figures in your mind prominently, but till you left the office after the elections, you forgot that the country's own Prime Minister was killed and his matter should also be referred to the Rashtrapathi Bhavan. You kept in the cold storage till the last day of your office. Look who is talking now! This is why I say, Advaniji, you tried to send a message in a subtle manner that if you shout for Afzal's hanging it would carry conviction with a particular camp. But you would not say a single word on Rajiv Gandhi's assassins about whom papers were lying with you and you conveniently forgot to send them to Rashtrapathi Bhavan

till the last day of your office. We did not demand in the House.

[*Translation*]

Advaniji, tell us when they would be executed? We did not raise this issue and we thought you are dutiful and you would do your duty. But you did not do your duty and said nothing in this regard. But you started raising the demand of giving death sentence to Afzal on the very first day of this session. Can Parliament execute anybody?

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN (Bhagalpur): Shri Gulam Nabi Azad ji has said this.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: He did not say this.

[*English*]

These kinds of orchestrations do not help the internal security situation to be strengthened. They can only weaken the internal security of the country.

My appeal to the entire House and especially to the distinguished Leader of the Opposition is that you should give constructive advice to the Home Minister. He will listen to you. Invite him and tell him, 'Shivrajji! I would like to have a cup of tea with you. I forgot to do it then. You kindly do it now. What I did then proved to be wrong. So, you do not do that. You do this.' It is mutual. You are the Leader of the Opposition and you were the Home Minister. We shall try to learn from you. But do not try to give this kind of quotes and speak this jargon which not only not strengthen the internal security but will create a suspicion and doubt among people that a section of the Parliament still doubts the *bona fides* of a section of the people of the country. That would not strengthen the internal security situation. As far as police is concerned, the hon. Minister of Home will reply, he is competent to reply.

I only say that we are fighting terrorism successfully. That is why the investment climate has not gone down. It is going up and up. Every dignitary feels free to come to India. Tourism in Jammu and Kashmir has gone up five times to what it was in NDA regime. The international tourists are now in a mood that they shall tour India and go back come what may. That is a plus point for the country. That has happened as a result of the will of the people of this country.

We are not afraid of terrorists. That is why we have achieved all this in such a short span of time. We do not lay tall claims that we have finished terrorism. We do not claim that we have stopped every terrorist. On the one

hand peace process is on with sovereignty and integrity of the country in mind and on the other, the menace of terrorism is being fought in all possible ways taking the people into confidence.

Therefore, lock stock and barrel I oppose this Adjournment Motion which is nothing but an attempt to polarize the society.

SHRI BAJU BAN RIYAN (Tripura East): Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion.

We were to debate this Motion under Rule 193 yesterday. Today, we are discussing it under Adjournment Motion. I do not find any difference in these two motions but for the fact that the Government can be censured by the Opposition through the process of Adjournment Motion.

I have seen the documents supplied to us yesterday by the Ministry of Home Affairs. Statistics of terrorists killed, security forces killed, extremists killed, etc., under the NDA regime and the UPA regime are all given in those papers. These figures show that there is a declining trend.

Terrorism activities have declined. We should believe this document. In comparison to the NDA regime, terrorism activities have declined in the UPA region. They are trying to censure this Government but I do not think the security position has deteriorated in the last two or three years.

I believe that terrorism in Jammu & Kashmir, North-East, naxalite-affected States, and where communal violence have taken place should be taken as a challenge as it is danger to the internal security and law and order situation of the country. I am from North-East region. I have seen in my constituency two main extremist groups—National Liberation of Tripura and All Tripura Tiger Forces. Both these organizations have been declared as 'unlawful associations' under the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, 1967. but they are still operating. My experience is that, main parties of this House, both the Ruling and the Opposition, are indulging with these extremist forces. If we see the last three or four elections for the State Assembly of Tripura and Parliament, you would see that they have acted in collaboration with the extremist forces, just to get electoral mileage, nothing more. They should give answer to this.

I firmly believe that we have come to parliament to represent the people of our country. We are the representatives of the individual political parties also. We had been nominated by the political parties. All the political parties have some ideology. I think, those who are the main parties here are not interested to contain these terrorist activities in the country. Otherwise, the position



[Shri Bajju Ban Riyan]

of our country would have improved. If we see the economic position of our country in the county, the economic position of the so-called downtrodden people, people belonging to the Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes, the OBCs and the Minorities, we can see that their economic position is very bad. Even after 60 years of independence, those who are residing in these areas are deprived of good roads, no economic activities, no source of income, etc.

If you see as to who were in naxalism and extremism, you would find that most of them are identified as the people from the Scheduled Tribes or from a particular minority community. But most of them are from the Scheduled Tribes. Naxalism menace is there in Andhra Pradesh, some parts of Maharashtra, some parts of BJP – ruled Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh, and so on. If we see these areas where the naxalite activities are strong and active, you would find that there is no economic activity in those areas.

There are no roads; there are no industries and there are no factories. Unemployment is growing among them. So, Sir, through you, I would request that we, the political parties, should campaign against terrorism, terrorist groups, naxalite groups, etc. ideologically. Otherwise, having only police force or paramilitary force or sophisticated arms, etc. will not solve the problem. We may have to do it, just to fight them, but those misguided people helping the terrorist groups or naxalite groups should be made to understand that we cannot prosper in this way, and that we should work together and we should try to develop our country.

We have many development activities throughout the country. We have many programmes organized in the States like the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and others; they should be fully utilized so that that area can be developed for the overall development of the country as a whole.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the matter of internal Security has been discussed in almost all the sessions of both the Houses. Today, when Advaniji was speaking in support of his adjournment motion, I was finding out the reasons that forced him to have discussion on this issue through an adjournment motion. Generally, he repeated the same things that he had been saying for the last two and half years. He revealed only one thing that he has written a memoir on the historical visit of General Parvez Musharraf to Agara. His book is in both Hindi and English versions. I have read Hindi version of 'Agnipath'. In it he has stated that Shri Vajpayee Ji and Musharraf Sahab had agreed on some points for improving Indo-Pak relations but due to the pressure put by a particular person the joint declaration could not be reached and made public. Today, Shri Advaniji revealed

that he was the person towards whom Musharraf Sahab has indicated. Today, a document was published by the Ministry of Home Affairs that was circulated to the Members for their perusal. I wanted some response from Advaniji on the errors in the document but he said nothing on it. He only referred to that and closed the matter. But, it is, really, true that an atmosphere of panic of terrorism was created among the common men, the intellectuals and sensible persons on that day when the statement referring to the Minister for Home Affairs was published on the front page of each newspaper of India, that news item carried a very serious threat perception that the atomic centre, the power centre and the research centres of the country were on the target of terrorists from the day Indo-U.S. atomic treaty was signed. So this critical news was published in the newspapers of India but what steps the Government is taking to prevent this. I think the Minister of Home Affairs may have had some intention in stating this in that meeting. We should ponder over how to find out the ways to check it. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I said this in the context of the statement given by Shri Advaniji. When this was reported in media, it was refuted the very next day. I would like to make it clear at this time that I am not in possession of any such statement that refers to the increased possibility of attack due to Indo American treaty. However, I have sent a copy of that C.D. to the Hon'ble Speaker and he may return it today or tomorrow.

[English]

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY (Puri): It can be ...

MR. SPEAKER: He is giving clarification. He has yielded to the Minister.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: If you are making that kind of a statement, you may move a breach of privilege and I will reply to it. You are making a very-very tall statement. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You do not take notice of that. That is not recorded.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: It is stooping too low. I have not made that kind of statement. If everybody stands up and repeats the same thing, we are circulating a wrong statement, which is not going to help us to concentrate our attention on policies and programmes which we should adopt in order to deal with this kind of matter. It will just deviate our attention from the main point to the issues which are not real, not based on facts and which are not going to help us. That is the only thing that I would like to say. Every Member gets up and says this. Am I expected to say that I have not made this statement?

\*Not recorded.

15.43

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: You may contradict it but that was the subject of our initial notice. We gave our Adjournment Motion notice on this issue. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You authenticate it and give it and then face the consequences also. I know how to deal with it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please address to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, every sitting of the House has its own decorum. Now, as the news has been published in the newspapers and hon. Minister of Home Affairs is refuting it then we should take his statement in that perspective. But we wanted to discuss this issue in a different way that such things which are absolutely misleading and create an atmosphere of fear in the country, have been publicized by the media widely. Has media of this country become so irresponsible that they publicize such information so widely which is totally unauthenticated and unofficial? This is not a simple case. What are the views of the Ministry of Home Affairs in this regard? I think that an internal discussion on this issue must take place in such a situation. What should be the role of media in this country on the issue of internal security is required to be debated because we cannot allow things to happen in this uncontrolled way on the pretext of freedom of press which may pose a threat to our internal security. I want to present these things in a different way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, in all our neighbouring countries, terrorist organizations are sprouting up against us. This is a welcome news for us that the Maoist organizations active in Nepal now want to play active role in the democratic process. They have decided to surrender their arms and ammunitions, abjure violence and play an active role in the mainstream democratic process as is being practised in India. Such news is being published in newspapers that they will be a party in the real democracy. This is a good indication for India's internal security. We must think over it that the way chosen by the Maoists of Nepal is going to make an impact over the naxalites active in India because they were not only getting arms from them but also ideological support from them. We will have to see the impact of such changes on these naxal outfits. Because as per the documents that we have in our hand the naxalite activities and incidents have reduced in all naxalite affected States except Chhattisgarh.

The State Government had evolved an action plan in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs for tackling the naxalites in Chhattisgarh. As recorded in the documents, it has been found that after the implementation of the action plan there has been steep rise in the killing of the innocent people and security personnel. I want to submit that when such experiments are done by the Government then they must be subjected to periodic revision also. I think that it is not a wise step to continue with an experiment which has failed to tackle a situation. So, wise people always go on changing their strategy to fight with their opponents. I feel that in the backdrop of the changed environment in Nepal it is high time to change our approach towards the naxal outfits active in India. The Government of India has said and we have also expressed that until they lay down their arms no talks will take place with them. In Andhra Pradesh talks with them were initiated but somehow it failed due to some reasons. But, now I think that another opportunity has come before us for holding talks with them. In this matter if we begin talks with them without any prejudices then it can yield some concrete results.

As far as State sponsored terrorism is concerned some decline has been noticed in it. It has happened because we have fenced our borders falling with Bangladesh and Pakistan at large scale. There is about 750 kilometers of such land near Meghalaya where fencing has not been done and around 400 to 500 kilometers long borders falling with Pakistan could neither be fenced nor any flood light could be installed there. I would like to say to the Minister of Home Affairs that this should be completed earliest. Recently in October the Prime Minister has also given a statement that he wants to eliminate State sponsored terrorism with the cooperation of Pakistan. But in 2004 the Government of Pakistan had promised to eliminate all terrorist camps operating from its soil. Our Prime Minister has rightly said that until Pakistan adheres to its promise made in the year 2004 we will not keep any relations with them. I think that it is a statement reflecting the stand of India and Government of India should adhere to it. But this document says that still infiltration is taking place from Pakistan despite fencing, there is no decline in it rather it is increasing continuously. There is a need to think over it that in spite of increase in infiltration from Pakistan why our approach towards Pakistan on the issue of terrorism has become liberal. The Government of India must deliberate over it again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Government of India should strictly adhere to the statement given by the Prime Minister of India on 16th October, 2006 that until Pakistan eliminates all terrorist camps operating from its soil officially the Government of India will not keep and relation with it. I urge that the Government of India should stick to its stand taken in this regard.

[Shri Mohan Singh]

Sir, recently a few days ago an incident happened in Malegaon. Also two month ago series of bomb blasts took place in Mumbai but still Mumbai police is clueless and could not find out who were responsible for it. Mumbai police changes its statement daily. After repeatedly changing statement of the Mumbai Police I strongly condemn the attitude of the Mumbai Police towards a particular community. Hon. Lal Krishan Advani was saying that laws are not strict enough to tackle it. I would like to tell him that the Government of Maharashtra has enacted a very strict law as desired by him and is implementing it. This law is more strict than POTA and TADA. The result of it is that in all over Maharashtra the statistics indicate that more than 5 thousand people of a particular community have been detained in the jail without any charge. This is causing resentment in a particular community.

Sir, a few days ago a person of our State landed at Mumbai airport. Dadar Police arrested him and treated him inhumanly for more than 24 hours. He told them that he is not a terrorist. My family has played an active role in the national movement and one of my own brother is a Member of Rajya Sabha. What sign of being a terrorist you are finding in me? Then the Dadar Police of Maharashtra said that you wear a round cap and round pyjama like terrorists. This is a very sad thing. I would like to say to the Minister of Home Affairs in this regard that if you will not be cautious then as our friend and Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was mentioning that if we start calling people terrorist of a particular religion then I think it will virtually be impossible to eliminate terrorism from the society. Any person of a particular community may be terrorist but the whole community cannot be labelled as terrorist. If such impressions have been formed by the Maharashtra Police because of its own thinking and they behave in such a way then I do not think it proper. If this happens, then the truth towards which they were pointing may prove right.

Sir, in this region of South East Asia a new change is taking place. I thought that the terrorism sponsored by our neighbouring countries in India found its largest hub in Afghanistan. Keeping this fact in view we leave no stone unturned to provide all the possible assistance to Afghanistan for development work and establishment of democratic form of governance there. What is being reported by the international media is that Taliban has regrouped itself in accordance with its suitability and it possesses state of the art weapons. The weapons

possessed by it are as much sophisticated as that of the army. As per the estimate of FBI the terrorist outfits have to incur from 3 to 5 lakh US dollars to carry out a terrorist attack like 9/11. As per the figure of Lashkar-e-Taiba itself, the assets possessed by it amount to 300 crore dollar. Wherefrom are these terrorist outfits receiving such a large amount? India is also cooperating in the international campaign against terrorism. My request is that India should make efforts to ensure that the flow of alms to such organisation should not come from some of the international organisations which basically operate with the external funding. Such an initiative should be taken by India. I would like to say that illiteracy, backwardness and the lack of source of income are the three major reasons of all the problems, whether it is terrorism, naxalism or extremism. If India wants to tackle all these problems, it will have to take all these things into account, only then can India succeed in eliminating terrorism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Ministry of Home Affairs has stated in its document that it wants to modernize paramilitary forces. It wants to strengthen the intelligence agencies of States' police. There is one police constable on every 750 persons and that's why they found themselves unable to tackle the internal law and order problems. The statements of Prime Minister, Minister of Home Affairs and DG's are published in the newspapers but why could not the information regarding terrorist outfits, naxalite groups and extremist groups reach the Government of India and State Government? We are required to brood over all these things. Our first priority should be how to strengthen and modernize our intelligence agencies so that prior information of an incident to be carried out may be received. The cases of perpetrators of terrorist activities should be disposed of forthwith and they should be brought to book, so that trepidation of administrative machinery, may be created in the minds of anti-social elements.

Opposing the adjournment motion, with these few words I conclude my speech.

**SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV (Jhanjharpur):**  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the adjournment on internal security is before the House. With what purpose has hon. Leader of Opposition brought this adjournment motion? I think, he is not speaking of the failure of UPA Government but of his own regime whether it is the issue of POTA, TADA or the matters of Kashmiri Pandits. What was the purpose of the Leader of Opposition? He has defeated the basic purpose of bringing adjournment motion

in his own speech. I have listened to his speech very attentively. He did not mention about the incident of Red Fort nor of Akshardham nor of terrorists attack on Parliament. He took only the portion of vote bank. Only the vote bank is being talked about. Who is laying the vote bank politics? None of the democratic countries has witnessed a procession organized for getting someone hanged. Awarding death sentence is the job of the court and only the person who has been sentenced to death is authorized to appeal to HE Mr. President of India against the sentence. Such is the provision in the criminal jurisprudence. I have never heard about the incidents of organizing procession for getting someone hanged in any of the democratic countries. It is an astonishing incident. India is the largest democracy. Who is playing the vote bank politics on the execution of Afzal? Who wants to divide this country? Who tries to communalise the situation is also a crime. A circumstance was created in which Afzal was sentenced. It is also a crime to cash on a situation and to exploit the sentiments of a particular community.

16.00 hrs.

Today, before discussing the issue of internal security, the definition of crime is required to be changed. That's why I want to say we will not be in a position to do justice to this issue before understanding the hidden mentality of raising this issue. We need to pay attention to it. Otherwise, justice cannot be done to it. Justice cannot be done to debates on the issue of internal security as there is no religion, no caste and no community of terrorists. Their only aim is to spread violence by triggering the terrorist, criminal and other activities, so today we have to adopt an appropriate view about terrorism. Who went to Kandhar to set the persons free and who jeopardized our internal security. This has become a million dollars question for us as to who went to Kabul and set the terrorists free. He was not an ordinary person who escorted the notorious terrorist as guest to the native land to set him free. Such incident had never happened earlier.

During fifty eight years of independence no government would have acted so impudently. We are discussing terrorism and internal security. I know who went to Kandhar, who was that Minister but I do not want to mention his name. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not disturb.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Today he is not the Members of this House. At that time also, I opposed this incident. You know that I opposed each and every thing in this respect. I have never compromised with any principle and that may be seen in the record of the House. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri D.P. Yadav, please address the chair.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Please see the proceedings of the House. You are new in this House and you do not know about the proceedings of the House. Please go through the proceeding of year 2000 and see what I have said. ...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not disturb.

...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Except Shri D.P. Yadav's speed nothing will go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

[*Translation*]

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: I am addressing only to you but it will have to take into account that the people of the country never fought with each other. This is the first fundamentalist party which has caused fight among people of the country. There should be no fight in the name of community. We have to fight with terrorists sponsored by external forces. Internal security can never be strengthened if the people of the country fight with each other. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI UDAY SINGH (Purnea): This is wrong, such things are not happening in this country. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: It is happening. After all why should an issue be raised. You can see their activity, you are seeing it here in the House. What can be more than this that I am speaking with your

\*Not recorded.

[Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav]

permission, this is their double standard. They are double standard people, their conduct, character and face changes within no time. They change whenever tide is on their side. It must have been noticed initially, as was said that it is propriety right of the Prime Minister to include someone into his Cabinet but that thing has been twisted here. They have changed the direction of the issue and have created a separate issue for discussion. They argue from any side, whichever suits them. That is why terrorism in the country today. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Lajuji, leader of your party is speaking.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, terrorism is not the only problem, in fact naxalism, increasing terrorist violence in North Eastern States. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You speak when your turn comes.

*[English]*

Nothing is going on record.

...*(Interruptions)\**

*[Translation]*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Your job is to create rumour. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: We are not allowing you to speak. How would you be allowed, I am not yielding as to how you are giving a chance to speak.

*[English]*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing should be recorded.

*[Translation]*

Nothing is going on record. Lajuji's remarks would also not be recorded.

...*(Interruptions)\**

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, terrorism is not the only problem. I was telling, I was speaking on the issue and they keep interrupting. Increasing problem of Naxalism and terrorist violence in North-Eastern States is like a challenge. We are also facing this problem. To incite communalism and riots, to invoke conflict between two communities, to end brotherhood, to destroy peace also jeopardizes internal security. There is no fear of international security from outside enemy. There is danger to internal security from fundamentalists powers. Only for this purpose, so many security forces, STF and other forces are deployed. Internal security is a challenge for us today. Whether it is Kashmir or Assam, Nagaland or Manipur, there are about eight to ten states where there is a lot of terrorism. I think there are a dozen of states affected with this kind of naxalism and internal security is challenged there. Thereby soldiers of our army and security forces and innocent people are killed. I think that naxalism or extremism is there to such a large extent in these States it has become challenge for us. Economical disparity and social exploitation are the main reasons for this. I would like to say that there should be a debate on its main reason. There is economic disparity to a large extent because some people live luxuriously and their number is two to five percent and the remaining people are hardly able to meet their both ends. The economic disparity and the disparity of economy have risen so much that people take A.K. 47 in their hands. I look upon it in view of development. Until the disparity of economy is removed permanent solution of internal security cannot be made. That's why I am saying about social atrocity and those people who are responsible for it. The entire game of social atrocities, discrimination between each other, dividing people into lower and higher category, division of country into castes and communities is played for the sake of power and politics. ...*(Interruptions)* If we have to strengthen internal security, our Government and the people of our country will have to think about it. The people will have to think how to safeguard the internal security? To maintain internal security is not the duty of Army and police today. This is our responsibility and the responsibility of all people. As long as we do politics in the name of temple-mosque, caste, religion, territory, it is natural that our people will fight with each other, sense of revenge will take fire and it will again endanger our internal security. So BJP should stop making vote bank in the name of internal security. ...*(Interruptions)*

---

\*Not recorded.

Today we need to establish strong unity in the country. We all need to establish strong national unity in the country. The stronger communal harmony in the country the more we shall be able to overcome terrorism.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is one more member of your party who wants to speak. Please conclude now.

SHRI DEVENDRA PRASAD YADAV: Sir, I would conclude soon. I want to put forth some basic facts. Our country cannot be made weak by outside attack. I want to say about it. Country will be weakened from the attack inside, whether by riot, conflict or communal tension. If fraternity is weakened, if society is attacked, the country will be weakened. Internal security will become weak. The stronger the communal harmony, the better way we shall be able to give befitting answer to the enemy countries and the terrorist activities across the border will be defeated. We can defeat cross border terrorism provided we make communal harmony and national unity strong in the country. Internal security is an issue connected with national security. Today where are attacks made, when is our internal security in danger? It is when our historical heritage is attacked. No one has right to demolish our historical monuments whether it is Parliament House, Akshardham, Red Fort, Taj Mahal of Agra or Babri Masjid of Ayodhya. No one has right to destroy history by way of Hajrat Bal Dargah, or Charare Shariff. ...(*Interruptions*)

If we demolish one, another will automatically fall down and this will endanger our internal security. This is historical heritage of our country. This is glory of our country. None should be given any right in any circumstances to destroy this history and cultural heritage. For this, a law has been enacted. The Minister of Home Affairs was just saying that no historical building will be destroyed after freedom. But the members who were chargesheeted for three and six years were crying bitterly. Whether demolishing a mosque is not a crime? They have been charge sheeted by CBI. Whether it is not a crime? I do not want to name the people, but I must say that it comes in the category of crime. Please do not favour crime. One thousand people died because of this. Here Mr. Shibu Soren is accused of a murder of a person. ...(*Interruptions*) They should be punished according to law.

In the month of July, there occurred incidents of bomb blast in Mumbai. Like that at other places many barbaric incidents and terrorist activities took place. The

country should deal with the fanatic and communal forces severely. There is no place for violence in our democratic system. We should take steps with full earnestness to defeat the intentions of such destructive forces. Combined reserve forces of States Intelligence Bureau or other intelligence agencies should be strengthened and modernized at the earliest and firm steps should be taken to check such incidents.

I strongly oppose their motion.

[*English*]

SHRI A. KRISHNASWAMY (Sriperambudur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Adjournment Motion.

At the very outset, I would like to say that the BJP has no moral right to move this Adjournment Motion. Terrorism was at the peak when BJP was in power. I will not say that there are no terrorist incidents when the UPA Government is in power. But while comparing the BJP Government, terrorist incidents are very less and the internal security of this country is very safe under the UPA Government headed by our hon. Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh.

This Adjournment Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition is to maintain the vote bank of Hindus. The BJP always wants Hindu-Muslim Division to secure the Hindu votes. When the BJP Government was there, we could not forget the fact that Maulana Masood Azhar was handed over to the terrorists in Kabul who then moved on to Islamabad. One of the root causes of creating so much of terrorism in this country is due to Maulana Masood Azhar.

Secondly, in the case of Afzal, who is convicted to death sentence, as a convict, he has got all the rights to file a mercy petition before the hon. President. In due course, it will be decided by the hon. President.

I want to remind the BJP Members that when the BJP Government was in power, there were 20 more mercy petitions pending before the hon. President. But the BJP is knowingly raising the issue of Afzal on the floor of the House saying that Afzal should be hanged immediately. Why? I say that the BJP wants to send a signal to the Hindus for vote bank politics. The BJP is

[Shri A. Krishnaswamy]

trying to fish in troubled waters to promote Hindu-Muslim divide. We cannot forget the Gujarat riots, the Godhra train incident and the attack on Parliament. To control the terrorist activities, the BJP had brought forward a special Act called the POTA. I ask the Members this question. Were they able to control terrorism and maintain internal security through the POTA? But, instead of controlling terrorism and maintaining internal security, they victimized their political opponents. The POTA was used to victimize their political opponents.

Sir, the BJP Government failed on the internal security front when they were in power. They failed to maintain law and order through the special Act like POTA. That is why they failed to come back to power in 2004. So, I will request my hon. friends of the BJP not to bring the Adjournment Motions often. Let them keep quiet till 2009. Let the elections come. We will face it and with the support of the people we will face the challenges before this country.

Therefore, with these few words, I oppose this Adjournment Motion on behalf of DMK.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SUBODH MOHITE (Ramtek): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have listened the speech of Advaniji very attentively. I also listened the Government's stand in this regard. We used to say that our basic need is food, clothing and shelter. Now I feel that they have become secondary in present time as now the prime question is how to save our life. If we are able to save our life then only we will live in house, take food and wear clothes. It means that security problem has become very serious.

I listened Dasmuniji's speech attentively. That is only a political speech. That speech only detailed about the work done or not done by Advaniji during his tenure. There was no mention of Afzal case. His speech has no mention of legal strategy diplomatic strategy, and preventive measures relating to security. It is just a political speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if the House wants to curb terrorism and everybody says so then, it's fine. Everybody wants end of terrorism but then why issue is being politicized. If we all want that there should be an iron hand.

[*English*]

There should be no mercy. Why should there be mercy? Why should it be politicized?

[*Translation*]

What is the reality? I will conclude within 3-4 minutes. I want to know the reality. I understand that the Government's stand is not correct. It is a contradictory and conflicted stand. If we want to treat terrorism as a special problem, then why did they repeal special POTA law enforced by NDA Government? That law had special courts, special decisions and special provisions. I simply ask the Government that if we want to treat terrorism as a special problem, then why this special Act was repealed? On one hand hon'ble Prime Minister says

[*English*]

There is no need for any special law.

[*Translation*]

Our existing law is self sufficient enough to teach a lesson to the criminal. This is Prime Minister's statement and not mine. I would request hon'ble, Prime Minister that if his stand is that the present law is sufficient, then the case that has been concluded, its decision is yet to be implemented. Our law is competent enough to deal with pending cases. That is another issue, but in this case, the judgement has been given and its implementation is to be done, if it is pending, then how can we talk about judgement?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is said that the matter relating to Afzal's mercy appeal has been referred to the President. I am not at all agree with this view. Hence we can not speak anything in this case. This is not true. You please let me know what role cabinet has played in this matter? What role you have played in the cabinet? What is the opinion of the Congress Party in respect of Afzal's matter? You, please, tell us as to what is the view point and what is the angle of UPA Government in this case? You make your stand clear as to whether he deserves death sentence or not? You should have an angle in this matter, but you are not ready to speak even a single word on this matter. Why is this indecisiveness on your part? My next question is that how long the President can keep a matter pending with him? Can he keep it pending till the end of his tenure? With a view to defer the hanging?

[*English*]

What is the legal provision? Please tell us.  
...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do not disturb. Please sit down.

*[Translation]*

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI LALU PRASAD): Mr. Deputy speaker, Sir, I want to say whether we can discuss in this House an issue involving his excellency, the President? Hon. Members is saying that the President should be asked to. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUBODH MOHITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying this. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (Thane): We are not speaking against the President. We are speaking against the Cabinet. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it has not been said against the President. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI LALU PRASAD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, these people are continuously speaking the same things. Please exclude it from Proceedings. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not disturb.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Subodh Mohite.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUBODH MOHITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have no complaints against his Excellency, the President and it will never be. My point is that what is the legal provision in this regard, what is the role of the Government, what is the decision of the Cabinet and what is the decision of the party, it should be made clear. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Goyal, you please go to your seat.

...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUBODH MOHITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the statement of hon'ble Prime Minister is that

*[English]*

The present law is all right. There is no need for any other law, the present law is all right. Then, why is there a delay?. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

Then, why is there a delay in this case? If they can go to the President to get the position explained in the matter of officers of Profit then why can't they go to him to get the position clear in the matter of Afzal?. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nothing else will go on record, except the submission by Shri Subodh Mohite.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI SUBODH MOHITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, whatever I am speaking here, I am having all the necessary documents to substantiate the same. If anybody is interested, I can give it to him. Hon. Home Minister is sitting here. I respect him a lot. There was a time when everyone wanted and all of us had made-up our mind to declare Pakistan a terrorist-nation at the global level. But what is the situation today? Today there is terrorism in India and there is terrorism in Pakistan also and this Government is to be blamed for the same.

*[English]*

Let us have a common strategy and then you joined hands with Pakistan.

*[Translation]*

Once we used to call Pakistan a state which sponsors terrorism but today we are saying that India and Pakistan both are facing the problem of terrorism, they are also having this problem in Pakistan like we have in India. It means that terrorism is coming from any third place. Recently a Secretary level talks were held with Pakistan. My question to hon. Home Minister is that what demands

\*Not recorded.



[Shri Subodh Mohite]

you raised during the said Secretary level talks? What evidences you have given to Pakistan about Mumbai Bomb Blast? What role Pakistan played in all the episodes and what action Pakistan has taken on all of our demands?

I want to mention in short that we are falling into trap of Pakistan which was called a terrorist state one day and today we are changing our view point towards it.

Pakistan has been given clean chit, whether it is incident of Mumbai bomb blast of 1993. I would like to draw the attention of the House towards three things. I have got a press clipping with me. Some time back when Advaniji was speaking in the House, the Minister of Home Affairs told him not to quote press clippings. Advaniji had quoted from a press clipping appeared eight days back.

[English]

This is the statement of IGP or DGP or whosoever it may be.

[Translation]

He did not ask him that if he wanted to contradict him. Why did he not do so one day earlier? I will not go into that. The things which I am quoting.

[English]

These are the Press clippings of eminent papers.

[Translation]

I do not know whether it is true or not. If it is true then it is all right, if not true why have you not taken any action. this question also comes to fore.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you are present here. You represent a community, it is surprising the way Prime Minister made a statement in the conference of Chief Ministers

[English]

"Do not cut out Muslims"

[Translation]

I would like to read out a line from that speech. It has been said their:-

[English]

"Fundamental human rights of the citizen, particularly of the minority community should be of core concern."

This was the Press clipping of *The Hindustan Times* dated 6th September.

[Translation]

I want to say that Prime Minister makes a statement that minority and Muslim community are fundamental concern. What does it mean, the straight meaning is that

[English]

fundamental right of the other community is of less importance. This is the straight meaning. ...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

This is the straight meaning. The Prime Minister of the country can make such a statement against majority. His statement is against the emotions of majority, that simply means he wants to stifle their voices and you accuse us of being against minorities.

I have another press clipping with me. I am making my point clear. This is from 'Time of India' this clipping is more interesting. It has been stated there,

[English]

Muslims would not be harassed.

[Translation]

I do not know what instructions Prime Minister can give to a police officer. But a statement has been made in which it has been stated that

[English]

fifteen years ago. Sikhs have been seen with suspicion.

[Translation]

Look, this is a very serious matter. It means fifteen years ago Sikhs were also looked upon with suspicion.

That means a wrong outlook was adopted towards them. I want to ask the Prime Minister that you say 15 years ago the demand of Khalistan, attack on Golden Temple and assassination of Indira Gandhi were the incidents which government the approach of the country towards Sikhs, the then view point of the country was wrong, will he clarify that? I want to say that if Sikhs were taken with wrong point of view at that point of time, it was not correct, it should not have happened. I will not go into all that. But you please tell me if in this attack

[*English*]

majority of the people are from one community,

[*Translation*]

then should we not take that community with such point of view.

A demand have made to Shivraj Patil Saheb in the other House that list of all terrorists who have been identified and located should be declared. My demand is not that. I demand that you not only declare that but display their names and photographs in every villages and Police Stations. You have to take help from every agency to nab the terrorists, the perpetrators. If you do not take such stand and think that this will lead a division in society, it is not correct, it is a very serious matter.

I want to say one last thing more. One statement of Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs is there which is very interesting. They said that the country is facing a threat, be alert. They have said that our religious places are under threat. Thereafter the said places of economic importance, nuclear installations are also under threat, people are also under threat. Do you want to absolve yourself of responsibility by giving such statement? What is your responsibility? Your responsibility rests upon your preparedness. Instead of disclosing now your preparedness you are saying there is danger, be aware. Later on you will say we have warned you in advance. This issue is more serious than that, this is what I feel.

Last thing I would like to say that you are sponsoring this angle of minority and majority. I quoted two examples of hon'ble Prime Minister. Hon'ble Dasmunsi had made his first point about POTA and second about expediting the matter with the President and he said that we brought POTA, ordinance about which was in existence. Despite that the Parliament was attacked. This is ridiculous. If a

leader of his stature says such thing then it is ridiculous because no law can prevent an external attack. The law of the land is not for checking attack but about handing out punishment.

[*English*]

Law of the land is to give punishment and not to prevent an attack. This is the law of the land.

[*Translation*]

Ordinance was in existence, so this attack should not have happened, I can not digest this logic. If some one explode a bomb in an aeroplane tomorrow and you say that your law has not stopped him. The law is not there to stop him, law is there to set example before the world by giving punishment to local accomplices of terrorists. Therefore, this thing can not be justified.

Second thing he mentioned in his speech that why do not you expedite the matter with His Excellency President. I urge upon you that we will take up this matter but as a government you have a role to play, you should expedite this matter as the whole nation is waiting with eagerness for hanging of Afzal.

The police officers who have done commendable job should be rewarded. RSS headquarters is located at Nagpur. The officers who have done good job should be commended. I praise the Police Commissioner of Nagpur who has thwarted such a major terrorist attack. His name is SPS Yadav. He should be recommended by the Parliament for Police award.

[*English*]

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, while participating in the debate on this Adjournment Motion, I charge this Government for its major failure in maintaining law and order; it has failed in dealing with internal security.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. Members, please maintain silence in the House.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you have to hold any meeting kindly do it outside.

*[English]*

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Sir, I do not want to speak on the details of the terrorist attacks and other related matters, which the country has witnessed in the recent past. But I would like to apprise the House of the extent, the country has suffered so far.

About 19,000 civilians and security personnel have been killed by the terrorists in India since 1994. The country has lost over 75,000 of its citizens both civilian and security personnel in the last two decades, to terrorism. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE: Mr. Deputy speaker Sir, Home Minister is not present here, State Minister is also not here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Cabinet Minister is sitting here.

*[English]*

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Sir, the critics say that we are not reacting to the loss of people because we have many; we only react to the loss of territory. This impression of the outsiders is very much painful and insulting. Perhaps the long struggle against terrorism has made us weary and fatalistic. Now, the internal security problems in the country are much more grave and alarming.

The hon. Prime Minister has rightly stressed on greater alertness to combat the threat of terrorism, staring at the face of the country. It is timely in the context of recent development in the country.

Sir, virtually he has declared war on terror. But nobody quite believes that our Prime Minister, with all his good intention, has the power and clout to bring about any significant change.

I would like to know this from the hon. Home Minister that in the month of August, security experts of the country came together on one platform—it must have been brought to the notice of the Government—to express their worry over the deteriorating internal security situation and said: "There was a need to whip up a level of concern about, whether we are going in the right

direction?" So, this is the statement of the experts of the country. They are security experts. So, the Government should respond to this. This is their statement.

They also opined that there was continuous escalation of security problem. The 1st Annual Report of the Ministry of Home Affairs had stated that more than one-third of the country was afflicted with some kind of internal disturbances and that 165 districts in 14 States were affected by Maoist activities. The situation is worse now, but there is no permanent strategy for remedy and defence.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister that in the conclave of Chief Ministers of Internal Security, held on 5th September, the centre had admitted that cross-border terrorism has spread to the hinterland, and infiltration, in comparison to the same period last year, has trebled. It has also pointed to the rise in grenade attacks in Kashmir, increase in the number of casualties in Naxalite violence and no respite in insurgency in the North-East.

The country is shocked with all the sensational news which has been disclosed recently by the highest authority of the country, mostly by the Home Minister, hon. Prime Minister and Rashtrapatiji.

The sensational disclosure has come from the hon. Home Minister as he has sensitized the country's police and intelligence brass, to conspiracy by terrorist groups operating from Pakistan, to target oil and gas installations, IT sector, nuclear installations, communication networks and defence installations.

Mr. M.K. Narayanan, the National Advisor, has already disclosed about the targets of nuclear plants by the terrorists. In the recent past, Mr. M.K. Narayanan, as also the hon. Home Minister have pointed to the vulnerability of the multi-purpose projects like the Nagarjuna Sagar Dam and other infrastructure installations.

There are also plans by the terrorists to occupy some uninhabited islands and use them as bases for launching operations on the Indian coast. This has been told by the hon. Home Minister. So, I would like to know whether this statement is correct or not. If it is correct, what action the Government is taking to arrest and just to neutralize all these threats? Regarding IB chief's remarks, already, the Home Minister has refuted this. Since I have

given my Adjournment Motion, I have also mentioned this thing in the notice, hence I would like to draw the attention of hon. Home Minister again.

The IB Chief, Mr. Narasimhan had argued for a special law with the changed scenario since the legal framework was not adequate, in the presence of the Prime Minister.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: By making this statement, you are exposing yourself to the Motion of Breach of Privilege.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: That is all right. This has already been published in all the national newspapers. I admit. I am accepting your statement.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: You depend on national newspapers and we will depend on breach of privilege.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: I am accepting your statement. This is the convention of the House. But I must bring to the notice of the House how it has come out in all the national media the Government should clarify this. This is between the Government and the media.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I am not responsible. I am not writing in the media. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Then, will we disbelieve the media? Are you saying so?

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: We believe the media where it is true and where it is not true, we bring it to your notice.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: It is not in any one newspaper. It has come out in all the national media. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Tripathy, please address the Chair.

*[Translation]*

SHRI LALU PRASAD: Somebody said this, said that. You make your own point. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You please do not disturb in the middle of speech.

...(*Interruptions*)

*[English]*

SHIR BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Then, I would also like to know one thing from the hon. Minister of Home Affairs. If it is not a fact, then, let us know, let us also study the statement, the Address of the hon. Prime Minister in that same meeting. What did he say, at the Seminar on law, terrorism and development? The hon. Prime Minister was in complete agreement with the IB on the threat posed by different forms of terrorism. He told: "Having large financial and material resources at their disposal, the terrorist groups are able to use modern communication systems and state-of-the-art technology". He has also said in the same Seminar of the Police Chiefs that in the country, the present law is sufficient enough to manage the terrorists. If it is not a fact that somebody has not told in that Seminar, then how did it prompt him to make this statement? How had he made this Statement? Whom did he refer to? Why was it necessary to be referred to? Naturally, somebody had told in that meeting that a special law was necessary to tackle terrorism and that was why the hon. Prime Minister had been compelled to make his statement in his Address that a special law was not necessary and the present law was sufficient to tackle terrorism.

These terrorists have also become more sophisticated and better networked any highly motivated in carrying out their notorious designs. Respected Rashtrapatiji has also observed and has proposed setting up a dedicated police force equipped with sophisticated gadgetry to fight low-intensity warfare, to combat terrorism or war-like situation. Therefore, Rashtrapatiji has rightly advised the Government that there is a warlike situation and our police force is to be equipped with gadgetry to face this low type of warlike situation. He has also said and referred to the legal system. He stated that the legal reforms like witness protection, concealing the identity of the witnesses, compounding of offences and suitable protection, concealing the identity of the witnesses, compounding of offences and suitable protection to judges would go a long way in reducing the stress on the criminal justice system. He has also advised that there is some lacuna in the criminal system. That is why we must also see how to redress this thing, how the criminals are to be booked and how they will be punished and how the criminal system is to be changed. That is also the advice of the respected Rashtrapatiji. We must honour it. That is why a special law like thing is required as was suggested by IB Chief or anybody who were suggesting this.

[Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy]

Sir, we all know that this Government is suffering from serious dilemma and confusion. I charge, that they are trying to engage in a political strategy. But hopelessly it does not have the power to execute it. They are also engaging in a security strategy; but helplessly they cannot implement it for fear of political consequences.

These are the reasons for which this Government has miserably failed to combat terrorism in the last two-and-a-half years. There was a sharp fall in the number of terrorist modules busted. In most of the cases it is observed that the terror is practiced in local recruits, but unfortunately the hon. Prime Minister won't hear it from his security advisers.

It also observed that the Government is not taking serious steps to dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism. The proxy war of Islamabad is still continuing. Pakistani leadership has been aiding and abetting the forces behind terrorist activities in our country. As usual, nearly 62 terrorist training camps are functioning across the border in the Pakistan Occupied Kashmir (POK). The infiltration from the northern part of Pakistan is also on the rise with about 200 cases having been reported in the last nine months. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please maintain silence in the House.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the immigrants from the North-East and insurgent are continuing to find safe sanctuaries in Bangladesh and Myanmar. This issue also needs to be looked into by the Government.

Cross-border terrorism no longer seems to be a part of the diplomatic agenda of the South Block. We all know that cross-border terrorism has seriously jeopardized India's sovereignty and progress. Development will be impossible, without effective law and order mechanism being developed.

The Government also needs to take note of the naxalite problem. The Government of India should not leave it as a simple law and order problem of the State. The Government should also consider the social, economic and political reasons behind this problem. The serious backwardness due to regional imbalance and perpetual negligence prevailing in the country, poverty and hunger are also immensely responsible in encouraging the unemployed youth to be misguided.

The Government's strategy seems to be on the defensive. I feel that they are not thinking about any permanent strategy for defence, because we are not going for any offensive steps. We are only taking defensive steps against the terrorists. There should be some permanent defensive measures and strategies to be evolved by the Government to tackle terrorism. All the terrorists need to be made aware that they would have to pay a price for their actions. They must be made to realize that the world will be equally unsafe for them, and the nation has to prepare itself for a war against terror.

Lastly, I would hope that this Government will come out from the political trauma – which it is suffering – and good sense will prevail on them to give justice to the nation.

What action Government is taking to arrest these terrorist activities that are going on in this country? I would like that the hon. Home minister to respond to this issue as the entire nation is suffering from it. How will we come out of this trauma? This point should also be explained by the hon. Home Minister, while giving reply to this debate.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA (Panskura): Sir, at the beginning, I must confess that I thought that something more would come out of this debate. But I am really shocked by the way in which the whole debate has been allowed to degenerate. It has been made into a question of hanging a particular person, and into a question of debate between the Home Minister and the particular official. The debate has degenerated itself into an important question that this Government is deliberately playing soft to terrorism. This should not have been the intention.

The intention, as I understood it, was that the Leader of Opposition will seek adjournment to call the attention of the Government to the steps that are needed to combat terrorism in the country. The hon. Members who have spoken have created a sense of panic rather than building self-confidence in the nation. Further, in my humble opinion, the Opposition has succeeded in over-blowing or in blowing-up the present situation in the country, which is very unfortunate. Let us not play political games with a sensitive issue like the internal security of the country. If you play a political game, then it may boomerang on any side.

The nation needs to be united in the battle against terrorism. But I am sorry to say that the speeches – that have been made—have created a sense of division among the people. What has Mr. Advani said here? What is his programme to fight terrorism? Let me say very frankly that Mr. Advani was not in his form today because he was playing on a very weak wicket. He was not in his form. How will he fight terrorism? He wants to fight terrorism with TADA; with POTA; with a deterrent law; with stopping of illegal immigration; and with hanging of Afzal. This is his strategy to fight terrorism in India.

Almost it means that he wants police to be given more teeth. He almost wants a police State in this country. That is where we differ with him – whom to rely upon to fight terrorism. Should we rely upon to fight terrorism on only deterrent laws and police or should we rely upon the people, the nation, the citizens, and the anti-terrorist democratic forces in this country? In his own strategy, there is not a single word about the role of the people. My friend, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, has referred to it, but I would like to do it more elaborately. People have no role to play in the entire speech of nearly one hour. He has not referred to people; he has not called for people's vigilance, to fight the danger of terrorism. He has spoken of a movement of which he has been proud of, but he has not spoken of a popular movement or a popular upsurge to root out the basic foundation of terrorism in India. He has no faith in popular movement, he has no faith in people and he has no faith in the vigilance. He has only one faith, that is, the faith in police being given extraordinary power to do whatever they like in the name of fighting terrorism. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The interruptions will not go on record and only the speech of Shri Dasgupta will go on record.

...(*Interruptions*)\*

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: I am referring to his speech today. I had very attentively listened to him, and the whole speech is with me. In today's speech, Mr. Advani has not referred or has not used a single sentence on the role of the people. He has not said that because he has no faith; he does not believe in democracy. In a democratic set up, the ultimate strength lies with the people, but since he has no place in his heart for

\*Not recorded.

democracy, therefore, he relies upon police and he wants to make India a Police State. We have fundamental differences with the Leader of the BJP on this. He wants India to be converted into a police State to fight terrorism. We differ with him totally. Not only that, Mr. Advani and my friend were giving out Minutes of a meeting that the hon. minister had. Is it proper to tell in the public what has happened in a meeting where the police officers and the intelligence officers were present to tackle the question of terrorism? Is it proper to dish out the material on the floor of the Parliament? Please understand that you are making the strategy vulnerable by this. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Please do not disturb him.

[*Translation*]

Dasgupta Ji, you please continue.

...(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: By telling this, by harping on this, by divulging this—we do not believe all that comes out in the press—and by making a statement, you are giving sanctity to the unconfirmed police reports and the unconfirmed Press reports.

You are giving sanctity to the unconfirmed press reports by referring to them so elaborately. By that, you are making your defence lines open and you are making your strategy public. By that, information is reaching those people whom it should not have reached. It is not a proper thing that should be done in the Parliament.

SHRI BRAJA KISHORE TRIPATHY: We should compliment the Home Minister that he has exposed the real thing.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: This is the problem with some of our Members. They always try to do running commentary in order to interrupt everybody. They are too impatient to listen to a divergent view. This is the problem with their politics. They do not tolerate the people. They do not tolerate a divergent view. They do not tolerate multiplicity of views. They do not tolerate an opposing view. They believe in hegemonism.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Dasgupta, please address the Chair.

[Translation]

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN (Bhagalpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, Hon'ble Member is levelling an allegation.

[English]

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: You should know this is my right.

[Translation]

What allegation is being levelled?

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Dasgupta, it is not proper to address anybody else except the Chair.

[Translation]

DR. VALLABHBHAI KATHIRIA (Rajkot): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, he is straightway levelling allegations.

[English]

He is totally misguiding the House and the people of this country. We are equally concerned with the security of the country. He is not the only one who is responsible for the security of the country.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: Sir, I know there are some Members in the House who are organically against the Communists, not just theoretically. But that is not a part of my talk today.

Let me come the second part. Advani wants to tackle terrorism by what? Mr. Advani wants to tackle terrorism and, therefore, he says: "Talk to Pakistan with caution." He says, "Be vigilant about Bangladesh." They are two of our great neighbours. There are terrorists in Pakistan but there are hundreds and thousands of people in that country who are friends of India. There are terrorists in Bangladesh but there are millions of people in Bangladesh who believe in Indo-Bangla friendship. Let us not hurt them. When he speaks, he should speak of the bureaucracy, he should speak of the terrorists, but he should also speak about the people of these two great countries. I respect the people. People are the ultimate deciding force.

Along with Bangladesh and Pakistan, he speaks of Afzal. What else does he speak about? He speaks of destroying the infrastructure of terrorism. One plus one, plus one, and plus one, that is, four. This is nothing short of, please bear with me, communalizing the sensitive problem of terrorism in India. Is this the method of reviving India?

India stands united. I thank the Government for protecting the foundation of secularism in India. That is the reason of our supporting the Government. I thank the Government. Secularism is the basic foundation and the Government has protected that foundation. It is on the edifice of Indian secularism that we shall fight terrorism in India. We do not need police with more teeth. We want people. We want people's support. With people's support we can resist all the foreign agents and terrorists in the country. But, Mr. Advani has no faith in the people.

While concluding, I bring to the notice of the hon. Minister the question of Naxal. Naxal problem and the problem of cross-border terrorism are not the same. I refuse to accept that cross-border terrorism and the problem of Naxal are the same in nature. Since there is impatience among the people, since a significant part of the community does not believe that the political system of the country has delivered to the people their needs, there is frustration among them.

17.00 hrs

Therefore, there is a lack of confidence; therefore, there is a lack of faith in the democratic system of the country. Poverty is linked with naxalism; unemployment is linked with naxalism; and impatience is linked with naxalism. Naxalism cannot be eradicated with the massive and masculine force of the State. There has to be other efforts also. We need to create jobs; we need to eradicate poverty; and we need to build up massive source of infrastructure to tackle the basic human problems.

Look at Nepal. Naxals in Nepal have used and exploited the poverty to become portent political force. In India, if the hon. Home Minister would take care of it, he should take care of the problem of poverty, unemployment instead of falling victim to the fallacious argument of giving more teeth to the Police. In this regard, I refer to *Sahwan jhudam*, the movement being sponsored by two major political parties of the country. In Chhattisgarh, both the political parties are financing them; giving them arms. It will create the conditions of a civil war. Let the Government restrain the political forces; let the Government ensure that police will tackle naxalism. They should not arm the people to fight another section of the people. That is not the people's upsurge, that is the manipulated game of two political parties. In this connection, I way that we are not taking that path.

My friend, Shri Sudhakar Reddy is here. He addressed meeting in the naxal area. Seventy-five

thousand people had attended. Chhattisgarh Government never gave them the permission to hold the meeting. We have to go to the High Court to get the permission. Here is Shri Sudhakar Reddy. We mobilized 75,000 people without a single arm, without a single single grain of RDX. That is the way to tackle the problem of naxalism. I call upon the Government to protect the foundation of secularism. At the same time, step up its efforts to tackle the question of terrorism in the country.

With these words, I oppose the Adjournment Motion.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ILYAS AZMI (Shahabad): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me a chance to speak though I am ill and have been discharged from hospital only yesterday.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH: Speak slowly.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: Mr. Deputy Speaker, being a Member of Bahujan Samaj Party, I would like to bring on record the perception of an average Indian Muslim about today's circumstances through Bahujan Samaj Party's point of view. With folded hands, I would like to request the Members sitting on my left and right sides to listen to my views for a few minutes. If you have any objections. Please raise it afterwards. I always speak about justice and if I oppose BJP, I oppose Congress too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the matter regarding death sentence to Afzal is being discussed here. I would like to tell categorically that Chaudhary Lal Singh is the sole representative of Jammu and Kashmir. I would like to say making an apology from him, that the relation of average Indian Muslims with the Kashmiri Muslims have never been close.

17.04 hrs.

*[SHRI MOHAN SINGH in the Chair]*

Even today, thousands of Indian Muslims enter into wedlock within Pakistani brothers every year be it Lahore or Karachi. I would recommend to award Ph.D. degree to a person if he be able to arrange even a hundred weddings with the Indian Muslims. I do not know the number of Muslims living in Kashmir but their number is in lakhs. I recommend that if someone arrange a match about a hundred or fifty marriage; he may be awarded a

Ph.D. Degree. Why the matters of Kashmiri people are linked with the rest of Indian Muslims? They have been exploited in the past 50-60 years, but it is unfair to term all Muslims as terrorists. I would like to say that you should be thankful to Indian Muslims and it is unfair to link everything with them.

Mr. Chairman Sir, today 60-70 groups are engaged in terrorists activities in the country. They include groups from Jharkhand, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, North-East, Tamil Nadu, Kashmir and Punjab. Honestly speaking out of them there are only 4-5 muslim groups and groups like Jaish-e-Mohammad and Lashkar-E-Taiba who do not have any relation with India. You can not find more than 4-5 groups, who have any connection, with the Muslims and are engaged in terrorist activities. If a Muslim commits a crime, it becomes a big crime whereas big crime committed by a person of other community becomes a minor crime—this perception is not right.

Sir, our Shiv Sena colleagues are not sitting here. I think, you can not eliminate terrorism from the country till you keep on making a difference between Bal Thackrey and Dawood Ibrahim. Be it the NDA Government erramal or UPA Government, a trend is being followed that in order to cover its failure, police claim that external forces are behind every terrorist activities. A few months back an incident of bomb blasts in trains in Mumbai took place and within ten minutes of the incident the news about involvement of external forces has come. On the second day, the Chief Minister had also made a statement that ISI of Pakistan was behind the blasts. I am saying that police claim involvement of external forces behind every terrorist incident in order to cover its failure.

Sir, I would like to raise the voice of the Muslims of Hindustan emphatically and like to say that is it not a matter of shame that we have become so weak that we can not preach the involvement of external forces in the incidents taking place in our country? We have thousands of I.P.S. officers in addition to lakhs of police constables and inspectors in the country and if they could not check the involvement of external forces in the incidents, then what would be more shameful than that for our system? Either all these IAS and IPS offices should consume poison or should resign their posts or fresh recruitment should be made by terminating them. ...*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I said earlier, I do not want to repeat the things. You mention about POTA again and again. I would like to say that unless discrimination between high and low, race and community will not be eliminated from the society a thousand times more



[Shri Ilyas Azmi]

stringent law than POTA and TADA will not do any good for the country you will have to make every Indian feel through your deeds to asserts that the rule of justice is prevailing in the country. Until then we can't eliminate terrorism together.

Sir, many persons are being killed in encounter in various parts of the country in which Maharashtra is at first, Uttar Pradesh is at second and Delhi, at third place. You can kill lakhs of persons in encounters but you can't check terrorism. Someone from the race of the deceased person would rise up to take revenge. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please make your point.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: Please listen to a point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: You can eliminate terrorism from the country only by bringing equality in society and justice. If a large number of people will be kept without education and awareness for thousands of years in the society, they would become rebels and no power on this earth would be able to stop them from becoming rebels. It is unbecoming of you to talk only about terrorism and naxalism. You should change your perspective. If someone explodes a bomb or kills people by opening fire in a market or attacks a village in right by becoming fed up with injustice, as happens in Bihar, it will be termed as terrorism. Naxalism and terrorism are two different perceptions. Unless you change these perceptions it will not do any good to the country. If you demolish Babri Masjid in connivance with the Government of Uttar Pradesh and Central Government in broad day light and play with the sentiments of crores of people and order the police to open fire on the people in Mumbai who were demonstrating against it and to carry out massacre of thousands of people in two stages on December 6 and January 7 and deploy police there who keep on making announcements on wireless to save Muslims and if the then joint Commissioner of Police. Aftab Khan gave any order. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please resume you seat. It seems, you are not well.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: Despite repeated announcements and lack of justice, entire system is bent upon eliminating a community with the support of the Government of Congress; no case is registered and no body is arrested.

In this scenario, nothing can prevent recurrence of the incident that took place on 12th of March. The then Congress Govt. is more responsible than Maharashtra Police and Tiger Memon for the incident of 12th of March. What will happen if you indulge in massacres and not provide justice? I was in Mumbai and I have seen that. I have no hesitation in saying that if I was in my twenties, I would have been died as a terrorist. Hence, if you will close all the doors then nobody can stop the spread of terrorism. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may sit down please. You are not well.

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: Sir, this is my last sentence. I would like that the Members of Parliament should note this point and try to ponder over that if you will remove the disparity and crime from the society, make every class happy and remove discrimination on the basis of caste and religion in the country and then if anyone becomes a terrorist then hang Ilyas Azmi at the biggest crossing of Delhi, Ilyas Azmi will forgive. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we will have to install your statue.

SHRI LALU PRASAD: You are saying that hang me. But who will get involved in this litigation?

SHRI ILYAS AZMI: I will give it in writing that nobody should be implicated. I am going to read last sentence. Shri Shivraj Patil and Shri Sharad Pawar both are holding the reins of the Government of Maharashtra. The manner in which Maharashtra Government has taken stand against the Muslims is very shameful. There is not a single evidence. Our Government had said that we will provide evidence to Pakistan. But our Government has not provided any evidence on the occasion when the Home Minister of Pakistan had visited India. You are creating new terrorists by doing atrocities. Mr. Sharad Pawarji you must make it clear to your home Minister Shri Shivraj Patilji and your Chief Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your speech will not be recorded. Nothing will be recorded. Dr. Rattan Singh.

...*(Interruptions)\**

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may please sit down, nothing is being recorded. Nothing will be recorded except the speech of Dr. Ratan Singh. You may sit down.

...*(Interruptions)*

---

\*Not recorded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may please stop. Your speech is over now.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why are you interrupting. Nothing is being recorded.

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA (Taran Taran): Hon. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak in favour of the Adjournment Motion brought by Shri Advani. We should all be concerned about the internal security scenario. The security of the country is of paramount importance and it should be strengthened. However, this concern has not been reflected in the speeches made by the Hon. Members. Those sitting on my right are concerned about Hindu votes. The left parties are concerned about the Naxalites. The treasury benches are concerned about the Muslim votes. No one is concerned about the security scenario in the country.

Sir, who was responsible for the genesis of terrorism in Punjab? The Congress party is responsible for this. They are also responsible for the massacre of Sikhs in the country. Sir, the then Home Minister of India and the then Chief Minister of Punjab were at loggerheads. Their tussle resulted in the genesis of terrorism in Punjab. As a result, thousands of people were killed. It also resulted in assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. After that, thousands of innocent Sikhs were butchered. Sir, when Mahatma Gandhi was killed by Nathuram Godse, how many Hindus had been killed in retaliation? But, after Shrimati Indira Gandhi's assassination, Sikhs were targeted at the behest of then Government.

Sir, sixty years have passed since Independence. The Congress party has ruled at the Centre for almost 50 years. But, illiteracy, poverty and riots are the only legacy bequeathed by the Congress party to the Indians. The Congress party has ruled the country for the maximum period but it has meted out only injustice to the people. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may please sit down. Let him speak. Nothing will be recorded.

...(Interruptions)

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Sir, poverty is the root cause of terrorism and Naxalism but no one has ever tried to eradicate poverty. We have conveniently ignored the poor people of the country. We have announced numerous schemes for the poor. We have passed numerous budgets in this august House. But, no help ever reaches the poor and the downtrodden. Had these schemes reached the poor and needy, there would have been no terrorism, naxalism and riots in the country: The Congress party is responsible for all the ills plaguing this country as it has ruled over this country for fifty years.

Once, Punjab was a prosperous State. But, terrorism was introduced in Punjab. As a result the State bled for twenty years. It pushed Punjab back by fifty years. The economy of Punjab is in shambles. The education sector is limping. Terrorism left a trail of devastation for the youths of Punjab. An entire generation of youths was wiped out. The Congress party cannot shirk its responsibility for this disaster. As such, the Congress party was fully responsible for the genesis of Naxalism and terrorism. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gill, please sit down. Nothing will be recorded.

...(Interruptions)

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Hon. Chairman, Sir, I am speaking in Punjabi.

Perhaps the Hon. Member cannot understand Punjabi. Kindly use the headphone and listen to the interpretation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may conclude your speech immediately.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

[Translation]

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Hon. Chairman, Sir, the Congress party is in power in Punjab. A terrorist named Hawara, who had killed the late Chief Minister Beant Singh, escaped from prison during this period. It is

\*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

\*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

[Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala]

shocking to know that the Punjab Government was providing protection to this escaped terrorist.  
...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue. His point is not going on records.

*[English]*

Nothing going on records.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Chairman, Sir, these people cannot face the reality. They can neither speak the truth, nor listen to the truth. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gill, please sit down.

*[English]*

Mr. Gill, please take your seat. Nothing is going on record.

*[Translation]*

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Sir, in Haryana, the house of Schedule Caste people have been burnt down. If such an injustice is meted out to the downtrodden, they are bound to become terrorist. The hon. Member hails from Haryana. What has the Haryana Government done for the affected people? Sir, I am amazed. The Hon. Member from Haryana is silent on this issue. What is happening in Haryana? These people are responsible for the birth of terrorism in India. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gill, take your seat.

*[English]*

Mr. Gill, please take your seat.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Sir, Hawara was responsible for the assassination of late Chief Minister Beant Singh. He fled from the prison. He was given protection by the Congress Governments of Punjab and Haryana. He was caught from a Government accommodation. Who was protecting him? In Punjab, elections are round the corner. The Congress party is using terrorists to harm Shiromani Akali Dal. The DGP of Punjab has himself confessed that there are 300 such militants in Punjab who are dead in police records, but are actually alive. The militants are used to foment trouble during elections in Punjab.

\*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

Chairman, Sir, the Congress party has a habit of patronizing the terrorists. Can we check the menace of terrorism with such policies?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point, you may take your seat now.

\*DR. RATTAN SINGH AJNALA: Sir, the Government is living in a fool's paradise if it thinks that terrorism can be stamped out force or by the police. Without the active support of people, terrorism cannot be controlled.

The need of the hour is to work for the upliftment of the poor. We must rise above party politics. Only then can we control terrorism.

I appeal to the left parties not to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. They should not side with Naxalites. It is not in the interest of the country.

Sir, I request all the hon. Members to rise above petty politics. Let us all unite in our fight against terrorism. Let us rise above party politics. If we indulge in bickering among ourselves, we will not be able to rein in terrorism. Let us unite and fight the menace of terrorism together.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN (Bhagalpur): Mr. Chairman Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak in favour of the adjournment motion brought by hon'ble Advaniji in this House. Though everything have been said and when an hon'ble Member speaks as a fifth or sixth speaker, then there is no new point left to be made. ...*(Interruptions)* Mr. Chairman Sir, whenever I speak, I am interrupted but it gives me strength. ...*(Interruptions)* Without interruptions I cannot speak well. ...*(Interruptions)*

Internal security is not a subject to play politics. I am here to cast aspersions. I am not here to make allegations and counter allegation but I can't understand why people here feel worried when I speak. I am not able to understand.

I have won from Bhagalpur with more than 55 thousand votes. Many people here will be happy and many others here will be feeling uneasy over that. I have spoken about sealing but my this speech may be considered as my maiden speech because I had to speak on internal security only. I while supporting what Advaniji has said I would like to say. ...*(Interruptions)* we will also talk about Gujarat. Congress had engineered at riots Bhagalpur and I come here after winning from that place. I won election from that place where riots had taken place during the period of Shri Rajiv Gandhi.  
...*(Interruptions)*

\*English translation of the speech originally delivered in Punjabi.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Keep silence, nothing will go on record.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: Lalu Ji came to power after the Bhalalpur riots and they were wiped out. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You put your point.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: Mr. Chairman Sir, I will speak within the time-frame but please give me some extra time for interruptions are being made. ...(Interruptions) Terrorism is not a subject associated with any party or any caste or any religion. It should be considered rising above the caste, religion or border. I just want to say that there should be effective law for it. Laws regarding terrorism are being made across the world. Every time we give example of Pakistan but today Pakistan is forced to take action against terrorism under the global pressure after being infested with it. When there was the NDA Government we had compelled Pakistan to accept that they were promoting terrorism. You cannot tackle terrorism only with the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act. It is also right as Advani Ji has said that laws should not be misused. If section 302 is misused then would you abolish it by privilege motion. If there is a violation of any law then it must be stopped and whatever people say, it will make no difference to us.

When 9/11 occurred in America, I was Civil Aviation Minister here. There were many challenges before India. At the time of 9/11, when Twin towers were demolished by crashing the planes, same conspiracy was hatches here in India also. They were not able to reach airport because we have fully tightened the security. We had deployed CISF there. ...(Interruptions) That's why they targeted Parliament. ...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Manvendra Singh Ji, you are a senior Member. Why do you stand all the time.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: Mr. Chairman Sir, he is such a veteran Member but still he is not allowing a young member like me to speak. You can interrupt me, if I am wrong. I had made a special request

to Lalu Ji to be present in the House during my speech. I had written letter to him. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI LALU PRASAD: You may speak now.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: After 9/11, laws were made in America, Europe and Britain. Measures were taken to implement these laws effectively. But in our country attack was made on our Parliament on 13th December. Had the terrorists entered into the Parliament we would have been killed. We people would have been in the heaven instead of being here in this Parliament. Every member of Parliament was speaking in the same tone. But after that politics started. I was the member of 13th Lok Sabha. I joint the 14th Lok Sabha a little late, but it is better late than never. I am not a senior or junior Member. My party has allotted me a second row seat. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta was saying that I am the junior most Member. There should not be any problem to you if my party has given me a seat right behind the seat of Shri Vajpayeeji.

I would like to say that Ayodhya was attacked on 5th July, why was this attack made? It was made with the intention that tension may be created in our country. But I salute the people of this country. Again on 25th August a blast was carried out in front of the Taj Hotel in Mumbai in which 46 people were killed. This attack was made a day before Diwali on 29th October when we were also celebrating Id collectively and in which a large number of people were killed. Thereafter, the Technology Hub in Bangalore was attacked on 28th December. Again, Kashi in Varansi was attacked on 7th March. A number of people were killed in Doda of Udhampur District on 1st May. We visited that place. ...(Interruptions) RSS Headquarters was attacked on 1st May, 2006. There was a blast in train in Mumbai on 11th July. This department is under Hon. Minister of Railways. 190 people were killed in the train blast. People were dying there and you kept on announcing that the matter was being inquired into. What I want to say is that whether some measures should be taken or only announcements should be made that inquiry is going on. After the 9/11 incident, the terrorists have not been able to strike again because of proper planning by America. We should take some concrete steps to save the lives of innocent people in this country, but we are not doing anything for it. It is being discussed here. A number of things have been mentioned during the discussion on terrorism. Priyaranjan Das spoke in such a manner as he were speaking for everyone. I supposed that the speech of Advanijee would be talked about, for this

[Shri Syed Shahnawaz Hussain]

speech has been a hit. It was for this reason that Shri Gurudas Dasgupta intentionally stated that Advanijee was not speaking up to the mark. I never expected it from them that they will say that Advanijee made a very good speech. They are not so generous. We do not expect it from them. We know that whenever they say that Advanijee didn't make a good speech, we will suppose that his speech was very good. Priyaranjan da said that no reference should be made about DG, IG as our leader was doing. I think if the matter is highlighted by the press, is it not proper to discuss it in the Parliament? You can make a reference about them. Target of India was talked about here and it was said that Kargil was not allowed to be discussed here. Who prevented you? It was discussed across the country.

I will not stretch my point too far and would like to say you that it was discussed at different places. Shri Gurudas Dasgupta is a very senior parliamentarian and we are here to learn something from him. But he made a statement that Naxalites have eradicated poverty in Nepal. You are supporting the Government. Would you like to suggest that Naxalites should be invited to train the Government? Would they tell the Government how poverty is removed? Can Naxalism be an ideal solution to this problem? People holding the guns can never be held right, whatever religion they belong to.

Through you, I would like to say what is being discussed now-a-days about Afzal. Is the BJP opposing Afzal, for his name is Afzal? Had Afzal been Guru, even then BJP would have opposed it that much strongly. Our country, our Parliament, our freedom has not been attained easily, we have not been elected without someone else's sacrifice. We are here because Ashfaq Ulla Khan went to gallows to save this country and Parliament. Ashfaq Ulla Khan didn't go to the gallows that there will be campaign to save the people who attacked the country. Through you, I would like to say that this is our country. *...(Interruptions)* I would like to say to you that this country was divided on 15th August, 1947. The Muslim who didn't love India and accepted partition on the basis of religion, went to Pakistan. My and Azam Jee's forefathers decided that this is our country, this is our motherland. We live for the country and would like to die for the country. It is for this reason that I want to say that Muslims didn't need any certificate from any so-called secular leader. We have gone through examination. When the Muslims of Hindustan decided to stay here they didn't feel the need of any certificate. *...(Interruptions)* We do not need any certificate either

from Advaniji or from Luljee. I belong to the Muslim community and I am a citizen of India and I am proud of it. I do not need any certificate for it. *...(Interruptions)* Through you I would like to state that I have said anything wrong. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hussainji the time given to your party is over now.

*...(Interruptions)*

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: Sir, I am being disturbed. My party and you have allotted me time, but I am being disturbed. I would like to request you that when Ariel Sharon visited India, Advanijee met him in the capacity of Deputy Prime Minister. At that time he had made a strong statement. Since then I hold him in very high esteem. He had said

*[English]*

"We are against terrorism. We are not against Islam."

*[Translation]*

No Head of State said this to Ariel Sharon, which our leader Advanijee did. In this country Muslims are enjoying all the freedom. The rights Hindustani Muslims are enjoying, they can't get it in Pakistan. Minorities in Bangladesh can't get it there. Here a Muslim can become President, he can become Chief Justice, here a Muslim can become captain of Cricket and Hockey teams. When a player goes to play cricket for the country, when Irphan Pathan plays for the country and he sustains injury, then the pain that his father goes through, is felt by our leaders Shri Santosh Gangwar, Advanijee also and Mr. Chairman, Sir, even you go through the same pain. Here some people have alleged that I want to make a vote Bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is over now, you please take your seat.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: Sir, please allow me to speak for another five minutes.

Sir, the electorate of Bhagalpur have sent me here to speak. From the depth of my heart I would like to say that I have been elected from Bhagalpur. I am not a resident of Bhagalpur. A large scale riots erupted there in 1989. Luljee was in power then. The riots affected

people have not got justice till today even after 15 years. I have been elected and sent here as a symbol of Hindu-Muslim unity of the people of Bhagalpur. The place where riots took place, the people like us work for the Hindu-Muslim Unity. This is not politics for us, this is a mission for us. Shahnawaz Hussain has not come here to play politics, he is here to work for a mission. So I would like to conclude my point with Afzal's issue. India is a secular country, but Saudi Arabia is an Islamic state.

*[English]*

Saudi Arabia is an Islamic country where Quran is the Constitution. Article 1 of the basic law of the Government says: Quran and Sunnat Rassol are the substantive Constitution of Saudi Arabia.

*[Translation]*

The Quran is treated as the constitution there, and the persons who have indulged in terrorism, have relations with Al Qaida, have been charged with attacking the embassy, are beheaded openly in front of a Mosque in northern Saudi city Aljapha on a Friday there for rebelling against the country. Islam doesn't allow a person to be disloyal to his country. Patriotism is half honesty there. If someone is a Muslim and he is a true Muslim, it is certain that he loves his country. So what religion Afzal belongs to is not the question. Since people of every religion have faith in the Supreme Court and its verdict and if the court has found any person guilty of attacking the Parliament and has given its verdict then it should be put into action. We are not saying it just because of his being a Muslim. I would like to submit that this issue should not be politicized here.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to say while expressing my gratitude towards you that people of the country would not forgive those who are politicizing it in the name of the internal security of the country. *...(Interruptions)* I am an elected Member of this House. Kindly listen to me quietly. The security deposit of you candidate was forfeited there. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have discussed very well, now please conclude.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: I would like to say my last point. Some thing was said about Sachchar Committee. On the other hand a person from minority in NDA has become a member by winning election, he is not being allowed to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not respond to him and conclude by saying your last point.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: RJD Members are threatening us. Victory of a minority person is intolerable for them. They speak about minority. If any Yadave leader of your party threatens a Muslim leader then Lalu ji should rebuke him and ask him not to behave in such manner. The society in which we are born, the people of our society are not coward, I am speaking here as I do not fear anybody. Shahnawaz Hussain is not scared of anybody but Khuda. *...(Interruptions)* I am not accusing anybody. I have said my point here quite honestly. *...(Interruptions)* The Security deposit of the Congress candidate was forfeited there, so please sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have spoken well, now please conclude.

SHRI SYED SHAHNAWAZ HUSSAIN: I express my gratitude to you and appeal to the House that the matter of the internal security of the country should not be politicised. We all are united, we will speak unitedly and protect and country.

DR. RAJESH MISHRA: (Varanasi) Mr. Chairman Sir, with your permission I want to speak for the front seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

DR. RAJESH MISHRA: Mr. Chairman, Sir I rise to oppose the adjournment motion moved by the leader of the opposition Shri L.K. Advani. The reason to oppose the motion is not just because we are speaking against this. The matter of fact is that this motion is moved on the internal security but when it is discussed from that side it seems that it is not only the internal security but a motion on Afzal Guru which is being discussed here. The factual position of the internal security of the country is not clear by the kind of discussion being made from that side.

The internal security of our country is facing threat from three sides. Form one side there is a threat of attack form outside when we call terrorist, secondly, the naxalite activities have been going on in several parts of the country and it is causing threat to internal security and thirdly, threat to internal security from Maffias and Dons operating in several States is also being realized to some extent these days.

[Dr. Rajesh Mishra]

Sir, when we think over the fact that from where the first bullet of terrorism was fired then it automatically comes to our mind that the very foundation of the terrorism was laid at the very site from where a man had shot at the father of the nation Mahatma Gandhi at the time when India got freedom and those who line up in the same category are the ardent supporters of terrorism. We do not want to discuss about the places where the incidents of terrorism had occurred during the rule of NDA and UPA Government. We were listening to the speech of hon. Advani ji that we had invited Musharraf Saheb to Agra for talks, he did not accept our proposals and left India with resentment. It did not cause any adverse effect on us. As you know, Musharraf Saheb was given a warm welcome at Agra just like a bridegroom leading a baarat. When Musharraf Saheb did not concede to their point and left for Pakistan by making them repenting then their Government said after getting ashamed that he did not concede to their point.

During the discussion Advani ji was saying that he was associated with the Ayodhya movement and he was proud of it. We are very junior to the leader of the opposition and new members of this House but we want to say and we are of the opinion that if any leader of national level visits any place where there is apprehension of riots are going on, his visit controls the situation and it returns to normalcy only then it is assumed that he is a leader of national level. Advaniji's visit creates riots in entire India.

Last year, a bomb exploded in Sankat Mochan temple of Varanasi. The bomb blast occurred at quarter to seven at railway station. Parliament session end at 8 p.m. and U.P.A. Chairperson visited Varanasi in the night and stayed there till morning. She met people of both Hindu and Muslim. Community. *...(Interruptions)*. You should listen to me and learn something from that and hon. Advani ji should also be asked to act in the same way. When hon. Sonia ji arrived at Varanasi at 12 p.m. Muslims were frightened and Hindus were apprehensive that their temple had been attacked. Sonia ji visited every nook and corner of the area and returned to Delhi at 6 a.m. In the evening, peace was restored in entire Varanasi. The people of India and outside could not believe as to how the peace had been restored in entire Varanasi? Next day their leaders hold a chowki inside the temple and made a demand to arrest the terrorist otherwise they will go on hunger strike.

I want to congratulate respected priest of the temple who showed the exit way to their chowki and asked

them that if they want to go on hunger strike and politicise the matter then please get out of the temple they were not allowed to do so inside the temple. this was told to their national leader. We are proud to say that UPA has a chairperson of such a great personality that when she visited Mumbai bomb blast site with Hon. Railways Minister, peace and normally restored in Mumbai the very next day. Today, big mafias are a threat to internal security of India for example, I want to say that today there are big mafias in every district of Uttar Pradesh. Few of them are in jails and some are outside the jail and remaining mafias are ministers in the Government there. A threat has been created to the internal security there. Today, people of the state are less scared of terrorist and naxalites from out side the state. The mafias in Uttar Pradesh Government and those who are in jails operate their activities from there in 15 districts. They conduct administration of these districts from jails.

*...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your point has been accepted. You have made your point. *...(Interruptions)*

DR. RAJESH MISHRA: He is my elder brother. He is my brother from my home district. I would like to tell those NDA Members who talk about Afzal that they have given a request letter of clemency to the President as per legal procedure. They are perplexed and in hurry because he is Afzal. During the term of N.D.A. Government 22 such cases were referred to H.E the President. *...(Interruptions)* During the term of their Government, they had not taken action against a single person. Why they did not show any urgency about it that time. Since Afzal is not a terrorist but he is a Muslim. Had he not been a Muslim, they would not have shown their urgency about it. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

DR. RAJESH MISHRA: If you want to combat terrorism, you will have to change your attitude. We cannot divide any terrorist in the name of community or caste. If any person of any religion is a terrorist, he is a terrorist. We should have same attitude towards every terrorist. If you want to deal with terrorism by dividing the community, we can say that you do not want to fight the terrorists. We are not making these allegations, the people of whole India are of this opinion. When you talk of Afzal, every person is given to understand that you are not talking of a terrorist. *...(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point. Now what you are speaking is not going on record.

DR. RAJESH MISHRA: ...\*

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have concluded your speech.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: His speech is not going on record.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH (Maharajganj, Bihar): Mr. Chairman Sir, today the issue of Internal Security is being discussed here. ...(Interruptions) Sardar is sitting here and you are working under his leadership. Mr. Chairman, Sir, if such interruptions take place, I will also have the slip of tongue. I would like to submit that I don't want to speak about anybody, but if somebody uses the foul language, I will reply him in the same language. I should not be underestimated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You kindly address the chair.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, today discussion is taking place on the issue of internal security. The only reason for discussing internal security is that not only the Government but every one feels that the internal security of India is under threat. When the adjournment motion is discussed here, it is understood that the adjournment motion means censure on the Government. Several Members have participated in this discussion and it has been discussed at length. However I would like to mention only one or two points. The terrorism has been perpetrated and sponsored in this country in a well planned manner from outside any we are facing its threat. However the country has also become the victim of various threats from within in the form of Maoism, extremism and Naxalism. The circumstances or leading the country to reel under such situation have resulted in threat to our internal security. I have gone through the report received from the Hon. Home Minister in which it has been discussed in detail as to what he is going to do with regard to strengthening police forces in the states, providing training, allocation of the funds and raising battalion of the Paramilitary forces. It is clear from the report that there has been a decline in the terrorist activities in comparison to the scale of terrorism earlier. However, he has given a statement in a newspaper, which he has already refuted. The

authenticity of the newspaper is also being doubted but now a days this country runs on the newspaper. An S.P. was transferred in Ranchi and it made the headlines in the newspaper of which the High Court took cognisance and put a stay on the transfer. We also discuss issues in the House on the basis of news published in the newspaper. When the country is run through the newspaper it is beyond doubt to question the authenticity of some news. There is a contradiction in both the manner in which the Hon. Home Minister's statement has been published in the newspaper or in his report regarding the decline in terrorist activities in the country or the way it has been highlighted in the newspaper regarding threat can pose to various institutions of the country, these two contradictory conceptions have given rise to the atmosphere of fear in the country. And we seek friendly relations in this atmosphere of fear. It is quite good to seek friendly relations and we must adhere to it but you need to be cautious from such a friend because when you extend your hand of friendship for cementing the relations some backstabbing takes place somewhere and it has become a routine feature. As Shri Advanji had pointed out that when Shri Atal Bihariji went to Lahore by bus from Delhi as Prime Minister, we had to face the Kargil war. Sometimes it is witnessed that whenever process of friendly talks begins a terrorist attack takes place. Where does the attack take place? The attack takes place in the religious places or crowded places or the trains. The terrorists have only one intention behind these attacks, not of killing the people rather attacking the unity and integrity of India. This is because the very fabric of India consists of different language speaking people living in various regions and people of various castes and religion with different life-styles but whenever the different caste or religion stand together firmly to save the integrity and unity of the country. That is why they resort to attacks because attack on the religious places will kill many persons which will lead to communal passions in the country and pose threat to its unity and integrity. Similarly, by attacking the crowded places, they want to create an atmosphere of terror in the country. Not only this, they also attack the economy of the country. The fake currency being smuggled in the country by the I.S.I. is an attack on the economy of the country.

18.00 hrs.

Similarly, this problem persists from Andhra Pradesh to Nepal. However, the situation in Nepal has undergone a change for the time being. The changed situation in Nepal seems to be favourable for India. The Maoists groups used to intrude in India from the territory stretching from Uttar Pradesh to Bihar on the border to give rise to some incident. We feel that the rise in extremism and

\*Not recorded.



[Shri Prabhunath Singh]

Maoism in the State of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar was triggered from Nepal side. But now the Nepal's Maoists are joining the mainstream there. Therefore, we realise that India is going to heave a sigh of relief in this situation.

Hon'ble Minister of Home Affairs is not present here now. We would like to urge the Government that talks with Maoist and Naxalite leaders of those areas should be held. If useful, then whether it may be Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Orissa or Chhattisgarh, those leaders should be contacted and they should be brought into the main stream. The feeling of insecurity will continue, whether there are external terrorists attacks, or whether there are internal attacks of Naxalites, Maoists and terrorists. Therefore we would like to urge upon you that the Minister of Home Affairs of the Government of India is needed to seek assistance from the Naxalite and Maoist leaders for internal security of India if they are willing to do so.

Secondly, I would like to say that according to the data given in their books, it is observed that the number of citizens and policemen killed is equal to those of the terrorists killed. Although all the means are available with us. We have trained personnel of Military and Para-military forces, even the police forces of states are being trained to counter the terrorists. But in spite of all these things the terrorists are getting success in their mission. We assume that the failure of our intelligence Agency is the reason behind this. Just two days ago, a news was reported in the newspapers that two terrorists were detained in Delhi and they were living in Delhi for last one year. Delhi is the Capital of the country. From Intelligence Agency to all types of intelligence are available here. Usually newspapers tell out that if some outsider wants to live in Delhi, first of all he should inform the Police Station. He has to submit his personal details also. Only after that he can rent a house in Delhi.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now conclude.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: So early?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am constrained.

SHRI PRABHUNATH SINGH: Let me speak for one more minute. I was saying that in spite of such a strong arrangement a terrorist had made his nub in Delhi for one year and intelligence agencies could not find him out. It means that our intelligence system is weak our

intelligence system is not capable to find out such terrorists. Since you have rung the bell, I conclude by thanking you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The timing for the House was up to 6.00 P.M. If the House agree the time may be extended for an Hour. The Minister of Home Affairs is yet to reply. If you agree the proceedings of the House will conclude in one Hour.

SHRI LALU PRASAD: May be increased for half an Hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ok. The time of House is being extended for half an Hour.

*[English]*

PROF. M. RAMADASS (Pondicherry): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the every word of the Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, hon. Shri Advaniji. I oppose this Motion because the arguments advanced by Shri L.K. Advaniji have no substance. The arguments are fallacious, and they are not based on facts.

His main onus is that there is an alarming growth in the incidents of violence in the country causing great concern in the security situation. If someone says that there is an alarming situation, he should be able to substantiate with the facts and figures.

I have listened to the speech of Shri Advaniji with all care and attention, and I could not find out any of the bases on which he had built his arguments.

Therefore, I tend to believe that the argument of the Leader of the Opposition cannot be accepted. He was mostly obsessed only with absurd issue and not about the security issue of the country. This morning when he made a statement he said that he was indicted because he was leading a movement. What kind of movement he was leading into? Was he leading a movement for the sake of the Scheduled Caste people of this country? Was he leading a movement for the sake of the Other Backward Classes in this country, who constitute about 60 per cent?

When the issue of Mandal Commission came, he said: "Mandir is more important than Mandal". What kind of movement it was? Therefore, the argument that he has given has no evidences. But to put things in the right perspective, I would like to tell this House that the

security situation has to be judged in terms of three parameters. One, we have to take into account the terrorist activities in Jammu and Kashmir. The second one is that we have to look into the Naxalite problem, and the third one is that we will have to look into the communal situation. Now, in assessing these three parameters, we will have to take into account some of the temporal and inter-temporal facts and figures.

When you look at the facts, the facts are available from the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Government of India about the various incidents that have taken place, and there are a large number of reputed research studies in this country. They have also assessed the security situation. I have gone through all those facts. They reveal that the security situation today is not worse. It has not become bad when compared to a few years ago.

To give you some of the statistics, I should tell you that in the case of Jammu and Kashmir, the terrorist incidents in 2002 were 4038. It declined to 1442 in October, 2006, which means, three-fourths of the incidents which existed in 2002, have come down now. The number of civilians killed was 1008 in 2002. It has come down to 340. What do these facts show? What do these statistics show? They show that the incidents of violence are declining and the security situation is improving in the country.

When you take the situation in the North-East also, the number of incidents in 2002 was 1319 and it has become 1000 in 2006. Therefore, all parameters show that the situation is improving today. Even in the North-East, especially in Manipur, the situation is improving today. Now apart from the facts about the terrorists, the Naxalite incidents also show that there is only a marginal increase but the overall situation is improving, thanks to the efforts taken by the Government. ...(*Interruptions*) I am giving relevant facts to this House. Kindly permit me to speak for two or three minutes more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Home Minister has to reply.

PROF. M. RAMADASS: Yes, Sir, Everybody will have to speak. You have given 15 to 20 minutes to other hon. Members. They have spoken only stories and wishful thinking here. I am substantiating my points with facts and figures and statistics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your Party has only three minutes' time.

PROF. M. RAMADASS: What kind of distribution it is!

MR. CHAIRMAN: What can I do?

PROF. M. RAMADASS: I can give you one more evidence. It is not given by the Ministry of Home Affairs. But a reputed study done by the Centre for the Study of Developing Society also shows this. It conducted a survey. The results of the study were published on 15th August, 2006. This study was based on a survey of 14,860 respondents in India spread over 883 villages and urban areas in 19 States. Now, the important finding of the study is that three-fourths of the people feel completely safe in their own localities and only five per cent say that they feel very insecure. It means that India is now becoming more and more a secured place to live in. Only 25 per cent of the people today feel less safer than what they did a few years ago.

When you compare the South Asian security, about which also the same Centre, the Centre for the Study of Developing Society, had made a study, it shows that among the South Asian countries, India is more secure than other countries. Now, what more evidence do you want to show that today the security situation in India is better than other countries?

The third important suggestion is that popular perception of the people about security is not associated with terrorism at all. They are worried more about the normal occurrence that are taking place, and in the perception of the people, terrorism is not a major thing.

Muslims and other minorities do not link the terrorism to a particular community. Even the Hindus among the Hindus, 38 per cent of the Hindus feel that it is not connected with any of the religious groups. Therefore, a clear majority of the people feel that the security situation is safe. Now, these two evidences which I have given go to disprove what Shri L.K. Advani has said and the dismal picture that he has painted with regard to the security situation.

I have one more point. Not only that, in the last two-and-a-half years, the Government headed by Dr. Manmohan Singh has initiated a large number of imaginative initiatives in the field of tackling the security issues. He has taken economic development as the surest antidote against terrorism. He has taken a large number of issues like tackling unemployment, distribution of land

[Prof. M. Ramadass]

resources to the people, providing large amount of welfare measures to people etc. All these things have created a congenial situation in the country. The hon. Minister of Home Affairs is initiating a lot of discussions with the Chief Ministers, with the Minister of the foreign countries. The Union Home Secretary is initiating a number of measures.

All those things, therefore, have now created an environment in which the security of the nation is secure. Therefore, the argument of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there is an alarming growth in the terrorist activities or other activities causing security concern cannot be accepted. Therefore, I urge this House to reject this Adjournment Motion of Shri L.K. Advani, lock, stock and barrel.

SHRI SARBANANDA SONOWAL (Dibrugarh): Sir, this is an important issue. Please allow me to speak.  
...(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI SANTOSH GANGWAR (Bareilly): Mr. Chairman, Sir, some more members from our party are to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time allotted for your party is over.

...(Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI ABDUL RASHID SHAHEEN (Baramulla): Sir, we should be allowed to speak. Please give us some time. ... (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI KIREN RIJIJU (Arunachal West): Mr. Chairman, Sir, give me two minutes time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The names of other members from your party have not come. If the House will continue up to 4 A. M. then only your name will come. Let Yogi Aditya Nathji speak, why are you disturbing him? Now you sit down. We will see later on.

...(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chaudhary Lal Singh Ji, please sit down. Your party has not given your name. Minister of Home Affairs will reply, he himself is capable, he will speak on behalf of your party only.

YOGI ADITYA NATH (Gorakhpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I stand in favour of the Adjournment Motion presented by the Hon'ble leader of the opposition in regard to the internal security in the country.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the points on which the hon'ble leader of opposition expressed his concern, are actually serious in nature and for the last 2-2½ years, I myself felt that the Government is playing with the internal security of the country. There are so many points we have been noting, whether those are about inside J&K or inside North Eastern states of the country or whether it is the question of attack on religious, spiritual places of majority community or the question of creation of atmosphere of terror among the majority community by bomb blasts on the occasions of festivals in all such cases the petty reaction from the Government side comes that it is the activity of some miscreants. Can we actually ignore our national security and internal security by such a petty reaction? But now-a-days all these things are happening.

We remember that in April, 2004, only five states were affected with the Naxalism. Today, according to the official data, 13 states are affected with Naxalism and if we see it without official data, then about 20-21 states are directly or indirectly affected with Naxalite violence. After all who is supporting them? It will be discussed here and hon'ble leader of opposition has also called attention towards the visit of that Maoist leader of Nepal Mr. Prachand to India. This is the person who is responsible for killing of thousands of people against whom the Red corner notice has been issued in India or Nepal. I wonder, why that person is moving freely here at all? I want to draw attention of Hon'ble Minister towards the fact the peaceful solution of the Maoist problem in Nepal is not actually what it seems. Plundering and anarchy are rampant there. Not only this a conspiracy to make a corridor near the border area of India and Nepal by creating Muslim Liberation Front has also started which is dangerous indication for the internal and external security of the nation.

In addition to this, the Government has always tried to put the National security in danger by ignoring the various important points even if it be the issue of capital punishment by the court to the conspirator of attack on the Parliament the supreme institution of our democracy.

The way statement has been given by a Chief Minister associated with Congress and by a former Chief

Minister points to the direction from which terrorism gets its support and encouragement. I hope the Minister for Home Affairs will give an explanation in this regard. Many-a-time it is said that terrorism has no case but we are sorry to say that while saying so attempt is made to mislead the society only. Terrorism is not being dealt in its right perspective.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

18.18 hrs.

I would request the Minister of Home Affairs to make their governments stand clear about the man in which the question of national security and internal security is being taken very lightly, the way conspiracy is being hatched to divide the people in the name of religion by constituting Sachhar Committee to provide reservation on religious grounds, and the way internal security is being compromised by reacting casually on the issue of Afzal who is an antinational. He should also explain as to in what capacity the Maoist leaders from Nepal are freely moving in India whereas their relations with Naxalites, ULFA of Assam and hardcore terrorists of LITTE of Tamil Nadu are well known. ISI motivates and encourages them for anti-India activities. Despite all this, these elements encourage anti-India activities while freely moving inside the country. Who does not know that when Maoist violence was going on in Nepal, these leaders used to roam around in JNU. Sir, at that time all these Maoist leaders used to move inside JNU and today also these institutions support them from all angles.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Please cooperate, Yogi Aditya Nath.

[*Translation*]

YOGI ADITYA NATH: Therefore, through you I request that Muslim Mukti Morcha being created by the Government in the border areas of India and Nepal is an attempt to create a dangerous situation for India's security.

MR. SPEAKER: Yogi Adityanath ji please cooperate.

[*English*]

Your party's time is over, and your time is also over.

[*Translation*]

YOGI ADITYA NATH: I want to say that Government should not take it lightly.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: I will can the hon. Minister to reply, if you do not cooperate.

[*Translation*]

YOGI ADITYA NATH: I want to say that the Government is constantly playing with the internal security of India, whether it is the attack on Ram Mandir in Ayodhya, or attack on Sankat Mochan Mandir in Kashi or bomb blast on the eve of Deepawali in Delhi or bomb blasts in trains in Mumbai. This is all done on the pattern of conspiracy but the Government is ignoring the internal security of country. This has created threat for the national security also.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: You have exceeded your time long ago. Yogi Aditya Nath.

[*Translation*]

YOGI ADITYA NATH: Sir, the Government of UPA is continuously ignoring the internal security of the country. Therefore, while supporting the Adjournment motion presented by the leader of opposition, I request the Minister for Home Affairs that when he replies, he should clear as to why the Government of India is continuously ignoring the internal security of the country.

[*English*]

SHRI SARBANANDA SONOWAL (Dibrugarh): Hon. Speaker, Sir, the security situation in the North-East is very serious. Our hon. Home Minister very well knows about the present situation and the developments. The people of Assam are demanding practical measures to be taken by the Government of India to restore peace and tranquility in the State of Assam. In the last few days, there were a lot of killings by the security personnel. They have killed some innocent civilians; for example, Depojit Moran, a five year old boy from village Mohong Bordumsa in Tinsukia District, was killed by the Indian Army personnel on the 8th of November, and his sister, who is seven years old, is still fighting for life at AIIMS. No inquiry has been instituted so far. As we are against all forms of violence, we demand that the hon. Home Minister and the Government of India should immediately start peace talks with the ULFA and other extremist groups so that peace can be restored in the North-East.

[Shri Sarbananda Sonowal]

For your information, Sir, about a few hour back, there was a bomb-blast in my Constituency in which some Army personnel were killed and one Captain was seriously injured. We condemn all forms of violence. Whoever commits violence, whether it is by the extremist groups or by the security forces, the Government has to take strong political initiatives, and also goodwill measures. The Government of India and the Army failed to bring those extremist outfits to the peace talks. That is why, it is my sincere request to the Government of India that they should put all possible hard-work, dedication and commitment so that peace can be restored in the State of Assam and in the entire North-East. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Sarma, if you want to associate, you can associate.

DR. ARUN KUMAR SARMA (Lakhimpur): Sir, North-East is the worst affected area in the country. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Without my permission, you are standing up and speaking. You are a very sober Member.

*[Translation]*

I have already given time to you party.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is being recorded, Dr. Sarma. Why are you saying that? Do not record one word.

...*(Interruptions)\**

SHRI SUBRATA BOSE (Barasat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Adjournment Motion moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the failure of the Government in maintenance of internal security. I would have to be very brief because there is no time. So, I would not like to repeat all the comments which have already been made by various speakers on the hon. Leader of the Opposition's speech, but I shall only mention one point which has not been mentioned by others. The Leader of the Opposition made a very concrete suggestion that the issuance of Citizens Identity Cards should be speeded up. It is the need of the hour. Citizens Identity Card will not perhaps eliminate illegal immigration but at

least it will make it easier for the security forces to identify illegal immigrants.

As far as the status of internal security is concerned, which we have received from the Ministry of Home Affairs, it is certainly satisfactory to know that over the last one year terrorist activities have been contained to a certain extent and I hope this will be maintained. But I think there is no place for complacency in the matter. I think there is a threat and there is a danger and we should be very vigilant on this score.

I would like to mention that however much we may dislike -although it is not a reflection on the people of our neighbouring countries - two of our neighbouring countries, we know, have been training and sheltering terrorists and helping them in their activities. That is one of the sources of concern, particularly from the point of view of West Bengal. West Bengal does not figure in the statistics given in the status report and luckily there has not been a major terrorist activity, so far there. But because of its geographical position, and because another country, Bangladesh is there, which is also harbouring, sheltering and training militants, we have to be very vigilant on that. We have, as you know, certain activities being conducted by organization like KLO and the Maoists in the State.

I agree with hon. Mr. Gurudas Dasgupta that perhaps the Maoist movement has emerged more for economic reasons. But they are being taken advantage of and used by terrorists who are helping them. Therefore, we should take them seriously and we should be very vigilant. The Centre also should see that terrorist activities in West Bengal, Assam and other North-Eastern States are contained.

With these words, I hope the Ministry of Home Affairs will remain active. All of us should perform our duty and help the Government of India to combat terrorism in our country.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ABDUL RASHID SHAHEEN (Baramulla): Sir, I agree to the decision of the chair. I thought that you would not allow me to speak. I represent Baramulla and Kupwara and hail from Kashmir. We the people of North-East and Kashmir live in the pool of blood. We do not need to talk much. We heard the speeches of prominent leaders. The leader of opposition moved the

\*Not recorded.

Motion and we heard speeches thereafter. From that it became clear that attention from the real problem has been diverted and personal heated exchange is going on. Anyway, it is the spirit of democracy and constitution to happen. I want to humbly submit that our struggle was for freedom of speech. It was snatched from both sides of the border. Nobody is ready to listen anything. But I consider the Prime Minister a praiseworthy leader because he for the first time openly spoke for minorities. He said that the minorities should be brought closer and they should not be made the target. I am thankful to our friends sitting in opposition because, at that time the leader of the Government, the Prime Minister opened the door to Pakistan and reduced the distance by breaking atmosphere of mistrust. We could go to Pakistan many times and have come to know that the people of politics, bureaucracy and judiciary, the common man also want peace. But who is behind terrorism is known to the Ministry of Home Affairs very well. We believe that our Government is alive to the situation but they are not the angels who can solve the problems in a day. Only the contentious issues must be checked and those people should be taken into confidence who at the risk of their lives have been elected whether they are the Members of Panchayat or Assembly or Parliament. Only this way by taking these into confidence these issues can be solved. I want to urge that by giving fillip to our secular ethos and restoring it, the problems in Kashmir, the terrorism would be defeated and peace would return there. But we will have to work unitedly in this effort. If we engage ourselves in differences, our opponents will benefit from the situation.

With these words I urge the Minister of Home Affairs that the Government must check the movement of drugs. Because drugs is the rock bed of terrorism, it must be checked on this side of line of actual control by the Government. I thank you.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Shri Athawale - just three minutes.

Let the time be extended till the end of the debate.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir,

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE (Pandharpur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really thankful to you. I was feeling that were annoyed with me, but you have given me an opportunity, therefore, the motion moved by Shri Advaniji in respect of internal security. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Speaker is never angry. I am trying to articulate the views of the people of the country, in my very humble and imperfect way.

*[Translation]*

SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE: Here, we are discussing about the internal security of the country. Though we are opposing the motion moved by Shri Advaniji, there is a need to ponder over the issue of internal security ...*(Interruptions)* We are responsible for the safety of one another. The Constitution framed by Baba Saheb Ambedkar has made us accountable for the security of Hindus, Muslims, Dalits and people of all other castes and religions. Therefore, politics should not be played on the issue of security.

In my view, the number of bomb blasts are on the rise since the demolition of Babri Masjid in December 1992. Terrorism is on the rise and atrocities are being committed on Dalits since then. We are going to complete 60 years of our Independence on the coming 15th August but incidents like murder of a dalit in a village named Khairanjali in Maharashtra are still happening. Unitedly, we would come forward and make all efforts to abolish this casteism.

I am thankful to Shri Advaniji for he has expressed unhappiness over the demolition of Babri Masjid, therefore. I appeal to all the Members that we should rebuild the Babri Masjid together at its original site. We are required to make concerted efforts to promote national integration. Mandir, Masjid, Gurudwara, Bodh Vihar etc. should be protected which will lead to national security.

You may get annoyed if I take more time. Therefore, while concluding I would like to appeal that we all should stand together to fight naxalism and to check the atrocities on Dalits, Hindus and Muslims. Slogan like "We all are united" should echo all over the country. Musharaf should be made aware that Advaniji has come to our side. A

[Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi]

message of national integration should go out. With these words, I appeal to Shri Shivraj Patil for internal security. He is a scholar and is a very good person. He hails from Maharashtra and we have lots of hope from him. Such an arrangement should be made which could provide security to all. My demand is that Dalits should be allowed to keep weapons with them if the police is not capable to protect them. It should be given consideration. You may get annoyed if I continue to speak, therefore, I conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: You should also cooperate with the Chair.

*[English]*

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY (Berhampore, West Bengal): I rise to oppose in no uncertain terms the Adjournment Motion as has been broached by our no non-sense former Deputy Prime Minister, at present the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Advani ji. As a fashion he has spelt out the security situation which demonstrates his blinkered view and myopic attitude.

We must admit that nobody can be protected by a man with a gun in his hand because security is not a military hardware though it may include it; security is not a military force, though it may involve it; security is not a military activity, though it may encompass it. But the fact is that the Government has been trying and striving hard to generate favourable national and international strategy environment to promote, to protect and to proliferate our national values against all existing and potential threats. This Government has been pursuing this policy in a right manner. We believe in the school of thought that without development there can be no security. Therefore, this Government has been pursuing very stringently the path of development in terms of Bharat Nirman, National Rural Employment Guarantee Act and a plethora of programmes and it has adopted; we believe that only gun cannot silence the security scenario.

I am just surprised to know that Advani ji who laboured hard to know the ISI's spending for anti-Indian activities in their soil, but he did not take any pain to peep through the report as has been presented by our Home Minister in regard to internal security situation; a vivid depiction is an eloquent testimony and one can easily understand the improving security scenario of our country. However, much is yet to be desired.

I would like to raise 2-3 points. I am coming from the Eastern Region of our country. Indo-Bangladesh

border is very proximate to our area. The Home Minister must be aware that the focus of terrorist and insurgent activities have been gradually shifted to the Eastern and North-Eastern areas as the Bangladesh regime, willy-nilly has been harbouring the anti-activities in their soil. Now, it has been found that those adverse possessions in the name of 'enclaves', are being exploited by the insurgents to launch terrorist activities.

A few days earlier, one bomb explosion took place in North Bengal's Belekoba Railway Station. Therefore, I would urge upon this Government to deal with this matter with the Bangladesh Government. Earlier, Indira Gandhi and Mujibur Rahman agreed to exchange adverse possessions or those 'enclaves'.

In this Report, the Government has been paying special emphasis on intelligence infrastructure. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Home Minister to the fact that we are paying so much for strengthening the intelligence infrastructure because intelligence cannot be supplied out of blue. It has to be purchased and for purchasing intelligence you have to pay more for source money. In the naxalite affected areas in my State, West Bengal, only Rs. 3 lakh are being given for the source money.

MR. SPEAKER: Do not discuss these thing in open.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY: If these Rs. 3 lakh are distributed to 30 Police Stations - one naxalite affected district consists of 30 police stations - arithmetically you will find that per thana will have per day Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 to spend for intelligence. Naturally, Sir, in garnering intelligence you have to pay more for souce money.  
...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: These matters are not to be discussed in open.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY: Sunderban Delta region in the State of West Bengal will become a breeding ground and the landing ground for the insurgents who are coming from Bangladesh. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: You have made your very well.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY: There is virtually no existence of administration in those sprawling islands. So, I would request the hon. Home Minister to pay special attention to those isolated islands which are lying in a

vast area in treacherous environment which could be optimally used by the insurgents.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. You have been very articulate, as always you are. You have made very good points.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY: Due to paucity of time, I am concluding my speech. I must be thankful to our Government and the Home Minister as he is striving hard to improve the security situation though we know that internal security management is and enormous task.

MR. SPEAKER: You should thank the Chair also because I have given you the time to speak.

SHRI ADHIR CHOWDHURY: Thank you, Sir.

*[Translation]*

SHRI TAPIR GAO (Arunachal East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by Shri Advaniji. Whenever a discussion takes place here on internal security, the same should be considered deeply in respect of North-Eastern States. I have meticulously gone through the reply of Minister of Home Affairs. I would like to tell the House that there are more than 50 terrorist groups in North-Eastern States. It is the responsibility of the UPA Government to restore peace in North-Eastern States. I would like to tell the Minister of Home Affairs that the Government is holding peace talks with NSCN(IN) and extending the cease fire but NSCN is not only creating troubles for the North-Eastern States but it is bothering the entire country. Also, 10 years have passed since the formation of NSCN. The ULFA problem, the problem in Manipur and Tripura cannot be solved till any solution is found for the problem of NSCN. Therefore, I would like to request the UPA Government that a political will and courage is required in this regard. A solution should be found after holding discussions with NSCN (IN) and NSCN (K). Only then peace can be restored in North-Eastern States. Recently, cease fire was breached by ULFA. I wholeheartedly support the Motion moved by my colleagues from Assam and I would like to state that the Government should initiate talks with UPA also. North-Eastern region is an land-locked area and also the birth-place of hon. Speaker. We want peace in that area.

I would like to give two-three suggestions. Government should not remain confined to the modernization of arms and ammunitions of para-military

forces. The achievement of Punjab Police is praise worthy. The North-Eastern Police should handle the situation in Assam, Nagaland and Manipur on the lines of Punjab Police. State police should be well equipped with all ammunitions. Otherwise, the problem will not be solved. I would like to cite an example. ...\*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: That will be deleted.

*[Translation]*

SHRI TAPIR GAO: It is right. It has been published in the newspapers. All are aware of it. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude now.

SHRI TAPIR GAO: Sir, I am concluding.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no time left for your party now.

*[Translation]*

SHRI TAPIR GAO: I will conclude in few minutes. ...*(Interruptions)* The issue of border fencing. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: A few minutes are out of question now.

*[Translation]*

SHRI TAPIR GAO: We should strongly raise the issue of border fencing of our boundaries with Bangladesh. The arms and ammunition being supplied from Myanmar and the drug trafficking is a serious problem for North-East. ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: I have given you enough time.

...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Kiren Rijju associated himself with this matter.

---

\*Not recorded.



*[Translation]*

SHRI TAPIR GAO: A long discussion was held in the House regarding enactment of a Special Armed Force Power Act for Manipur in the North-East. A study Committee was constituted for Armed Force Power Act. I would like to know as to when this Study Committee would present its report and when action will be taken in this regard? Elections will take place in Manipur in the near future. On behalf of the people of North-East I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister has postponed his visit to Manipur scheduled for 27th. The reason behind it is that the law and order situation there is not quite good. It is my demand that President's Rule should be imposed in Manipur. ...*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER: Now nothing will be recorded. Do not exploit my affection for you.

...*(Interruptions)\**

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir we welcome the discussion on security situation in India. I would like to congratulate the hon. Members from all sides of this House who have made very pertinent points and definitely we will keep them in our mind while taking the decisions on providing security to the country and to the individuals.

In fact, national security, internal security and law and order are three aspects of security to be provided. The national security is provided by the Defence forces with the cooperation of the Para-military forces and in some cases the police and the people in the country.

Internal security is expected to be provided by the Government of India. But we shall have to understand the meaning of internal security in clear terms and if we do not understand the meaning clearly, then we will be mixing up the issues and unnecessarily creating confusion. It is not possible for the Government of India, in all cases, to send the Para-military Forces, or make the Defence Forces available to the State Governments to control the situation over there. Whenever a request is made, whenever a demand is made, these Forces are made available to them and then it is left to the State Government to deal with the situation in their territories. If the Government of India comes to the conclusion that it is beyond their capacity, or the situation has worsened so much that it is necessary, in which case, extraordinary steps, as provided by the Constitution are also taken.

Now, this fact, in clear terms, has to be understood by us while discussing internal security. It does not mean that the Government of India does not have the responsibility. It does not mean that it is the responsibility of the State Government alone to provide security. It means that there has to be understanding and co-operation between the Union Government and the State Governments to provide national security, internal security as well as, in some cases, maintain law and order in the States. This, in clear terms, has to be understood by all of us who are sitting here to consider the policies and who are in a position to guide the Government and the country as to how we should deal with this problem in our country. The only request which I can make on the floor of the House is that while discussing an issue of this nature we should consider what kind of importance is attached to security by our Constitution. If we study the Seventh Schedule of our Constitution, the Union List, the State list and the Concurrent list we would find that the security is the first topic which is mentioned in all the three Lists. National security is mentioned in the Union List; law and order is mentioned in the State List and criminal laws and procedures and other things are mentioned in the Concurrent List. Security comes first and then development and other issues are dealt with by the Constitution. Why I am emphasizing on this point is because these days, very rightly, we attach a lot of importance, a great importance to economic development. But if we fail to understand the importance of security that has to be provided, then it will be very difficult for us to carry on with economic development as well. So, these two issues—economic development and security—should go hand in hand.

As far as the Constitution is concerned, top priority is given to security and second priority is given to other things. It is very correct that without economic development, security cannot be provided and without security, economic development also cannot be carried on with the same spirit with which it has to be done. We may discuss this issue in any form or the other in every session—I will not quarrel with the form, which is adopted, whatever form is acceptable by the House and to the Presiding Officers and to all of us, but if we discuss it in the right form that gives us the advantage and if we just accommodate ourselves, probably, it also creates difficulties in considering this issue in a proper manner.

The only request that I have to make on the floor of the House is this. When discussing this important issue,

---

\*Not recorded.

I would say that the first responsibility which we have to fulfil is that we should consider the policies. Policies are more important than anything else. Then we can consider the laws if it is necessary. Then we can consider the plans but if we use our time in discussing individuals and incidents, then probably it becomes very difficult to give clarifications on how one individual has conducted himself and how an incident has taken place. It is because there are thousands of pages which can be quoted against individuals and incidents and these are matters generally looked into not by the Parliament but by the courts. If this policy is followed, the debate on security is definitely going to be very useful. Fortunately for us, we have very experienced, well meaning hon. members. Once or twice, a statement here and there may be made which may not be palatable to all of us. But at the same time, they are in a position to guide the Government and the country and there is no other forum which is more important than the Parliament for discussing this issue. I am looking to the discussion on this issue from this angle.

The second point which I want to make is this. It is said that the security scenario in our country has deteriorated and that is why, we should discuss it. I have great respect for Shri Advani. If he had really felt like that, he would have quoted figures, facts and the logic to establish these facts. He has neither said that it is good nor he has said that it is bad. But he has touched upon certain points. If I am not wrong, I take this thing as something which is spoken in a very responsible manner and not in an irresponsible manner. He has not said that the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and North-Eastern States is bad and the States affected by naxalites are in a bad situation. He has not done that and we respect that kind of an attitude in this argument. But my only submission is that there are other hon. Members who have said that the situation has worsened. They have said that the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and the North-Eastern States has worsened and the situation in the naxalite affected States is worsening. It is not necessary for me to go into all these details to defend or to rebut the statements which they have made. The office has collected information and has given it to you. If you read this book, you will find that it gives you the correct picture. We have not said that everything is rosy and that there is no difficulty or that everything in every area is good. That is not what we have said this book. Those who have read this book have appreciated it. There are positive and negative points mentioned there. If you take both the negative and the positive points and the sum total of it, we can come to the conclusion that the

situation in Jammu and Kashmir has improved like anything. What we have actually done is that we have given a graph here. At a glance you can see whether the graph is dipping or escalating. Even without reading a line, one can come to the correct conclusion. If these facts are not correct, we would correct them. But I shall give these facts. I have authenticated them and I have put them on the table of the House. These things are done in a responsible manner. I do not want to say anything more than this as far as the situation in Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. As far as the North-Eastern States are concerned, the situation has improved. Just look at the graph. The graph will show that it has not improved as it has improved in Jammu and Kashmir but it has improved to some extent. If we have to consider the situation in North-Eastern States, there are different States showing different things. Mizoram is quite peaceful and Arunachal Pradesh is quite peaceful. Tripura has shown a great improvement in the situation.

19.00 hrs.

Tripura has shown forty per cent improvement. In Meghalaya, the situation was good, but it has deteriorated a little. In Assam, the situation is fluctuating. Sometimes it is good and sometimes it is bad. It has remained nearly on the same plain. In Manipur also, which is one of the States which has caused a lot of concern to us, the situation has improved a great deal. In Nagaland, the situation was very good. But, unfortunately because of the conflicts between the tribes and between the parties over there, the situation in Nagaland has worsened a little.

If we take the sum total of the scenario in the North-Eastern States, we will be able to come to the conclusion that certainly there is a slight improvement in the situation. Definitely the situation has not worsened. I have given separate comments on the situation in different States. But if we take the sum total of it, then this is the situation.

We come to the naxal-affected states. Some naxal-affected States also have shown a lot of improvement in the situation. Andhra Pradesh was one of the worst affected States. But Andhra Pradesh has shown wonderful progress in maintaining the law and order situation over there. Here, we have given just the graphs and a glance at the graphs will show what kind of improvement has taken place in Andhra Pradesh. The State Government of Andhra Pradesh was wanting to talk to the leaders of the movement. But when they were requested to abjure

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

violence and lay down arms and when it did not become possible, talks were terminated and some kind of action was taken and that really proved to be very effective. In Bihar also the situation has improved. In Jharkhand also, the situation has improved a little. In Orissa, the situation was very good, but it has deteriorated a little. One of the States which is worst affected is Chhattisgarh. The State of Chhattisgarh is so much affected that nearly forty per cent of the killings and seventy per cent of the incidents in all the States taken together have gone up because of the situation in Chhattisgarh. I am not blaming the State Government. Let us not think that because they belong to a different party, we are blaming them. I am not blaming them. Since action has been taken in some other States, probably the naxals might have migrated to that State and the situation has worsened there. We are going to help them and they have also said that they would be able to do their best.

It is not necessary for me to say anything more than this. The only request I will make to you is; "Please read this. Please have a glance at the graphs which we have given to you." If you think that it is not correct and it is not in line with the actual situation prevailing in the States from where you come, you tell us. If it is necessary, we will rectify them. But my opinion is that these facts and figures were compiled on the basis of the information received from the States. These are not facts and figures which we have ourselves collected from the ground. But these facts and figures are given by them. While giving these facts and figures, they have been very careful and correct.

We have to consider one point and that is the communal violence in the country. Fortunately for us, the communal situation in our country has also not worsened a great deal. There is a slight upward trend, but it has not worsened. I am saying this because otherwise, it will be quoted that Home Minister has said that the communal situation has worsened. I am not saying that. A slight upward trend is there. But one of the most important things which has happened with respect to the communal violence in the country is this. Ayodhya was attacked. In Banaras the temple was attacked. In Delhi the Masjid was attacked. In Malegaon the Masjid was attacked, and in Mumbai, the train was attacked. How did the people behave when these religious and other places were attacked? I feel very proud to put before this House that Shrimati Sonia Gandhi visited all these places within hours. When some of us said that we could go, she said, 'No, if you people can go why can't I'. Now, people

have started the visit to these places and looking at it from a different angle. They say what has come out of it. Let me humbly submit to this House that what has come out of the visits to these places is the confidence which is given to the people that you are not alone and you will be supported. This is why, exactly, when we went to Banaras, we met people there and came back.

I am very happy to bring it to the notice of this august House that when the Jama Masjid was attacked, we were a little worried. But the Imam of the Jama Masjid came out and said that if people in Banaras could understand why it was done, can we the people in Delhi not understand why it is done? Those who are doing it do not belong to any religion. They are the enemies of humanity. Now, when we went to Malegaon, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi was there and we all were there. Shri Lalu Prasad was there in Mumbai. When we went to Malegaon, what they said was if people in Mumbai could behave responsibly, then why can we not behave in the same manner? I will tell you that they had the vehicles on the road with microphones fitted, appealing to the people to be sensible and not do anything which will create problem. This is the result of the visits. This is the result to the sympathy and this is the result of the confidence that we have. We have tried to give that confidence and fortunately it has actually happened. It goes to the understanding of the people. That is the most important thing which has happened.

I am indeed very happy that the communal situation, fortunately, in our country is controlled by the people, more than by the forces. We should salute their sanity and we should salute their understanding. This is what I have to say on communal harmony.

As against that, please do not misunderstand me, if you take up Afzal's issue in the manner in which it is being taken up, the impact of taking the Afzal issue is going to be quite contrary of the impact which has been created in these places. People are going to feel that for some ulterior motive or some other intention, it is being done. If it is avoided, we would be very grateful to all the leaders here. As far as Afzal's issue is concerned, it is not necessary to project it in the manner it is done.

While replying to the debate on the abolition of the death sentence moved by one of the hon. Members who presented the case in a wonderful manner in this House, I had given the facts and figures that during the last five years' time, only one person was hanged. Only one

person was hanged from West Bengal. We have the cases pending since 1997. We, some of us, feel very unhappy and feel in our hearts that Rajiv Gandhi case was also kept pending for nearly five years with the Government and it was not sent to the President. In the background of this, why is it necessary for all of us to come out and say "do this thing and do not do that thing." The law will take its own course. Constitutionally, we would like to deal with it. ...(*Interruptions*)

We would like to behave.

One more thing which has happened in-between is that one Supreme Court judgement has been given on this. That judgement is very pertinent. The judgement says that if the clemency is granted, whether it is granted on good grounds or not, can be looked into by the court. If is not granted, then also it can be looked into. Granting the clemency is the responsibility of the Executive but whether it is properly granted or not, it can be looked into by the court. That is what they have said. In view of all these facts, we shall have to be very careful. Why should we, in a matter like this, show extra anxiety for somebody to be hanged? Whatever has to be done, whether we like it or not, as per the Constitution and as per the rules, can be done. But why should we say that we are going to do this thing, do that thing and develop extra constitutional pressure on those who have to give their opinion and things like that. If we develop extra constitutional pressure, we all, who are human beings, are likely to commit mistakes. That is exactly why even in the Parliament, when the matter is pending in the court, we are not allowed to discuss and we call it a *sub judice* matter. Why should we not, when somebody has to be hanged or given the death punishment, wait for some time and do it in a correct manner? My only request would be this. Please have faith and confidence in the judgement of all your colleagues here and then do not create a situation in which it would be treated in a manner which would not be useful for the unity of the country and harmony between the communities. That is the only request that I have to make before this House.

A few questions were very rightly raised by some of the hon. Members. One of the most important questions is: "What is it that you are going to do?" In fact, this is the most important part of our discussion. While criticizing also, the hon. Members have given certain suggestions. According to their views, they have given certain suggestions. We may accept them. We may not accept them. We may modify them. But all the hon. Members from all sides have given their suggestions. It is a very

important thing. It is but natural for hon. Members to try to find out as to what the Government would be doing in order to provide better security.

I am saying that the situation is under control. It has not deteriorated. It has improved. But definitely, we cannot rest on our oars. We cannot say that everything is all right and nothing more is required. That is not the case. The question is: What can be done? Very simply, very succinctly, I would like to say that we would like to strengthen the police—the Union Police and the State police. We have been requesting that we should spend more money on strengthening the police, increasing the number so that the police population ratio very soon becomes satisfactory. We are also requesting the State Government to increase the number of members over there.

The other thing is that they should be modernized. They should be well trained and their morale should be increased. That is exactly what we are trying to do.

The next thing is this. It is very rightly stated by some of the hon. Members that the crux is Intelligence. When we are dealing with the terrorists and the naxalites or terrorists of any kind, what is most important is the Intelligence. Nothing is as powerful, as useful, as efficacious as the Intelligence can be. We have decided to strengthen the Intelligence machinery at the national level and at the State level also.

We are asking that the Special Branches of Intelligence Agencies of State Governments should be strengthened in every respect, by adding more staff, by giving them technologically sophisticated equipment, by giving them better training and giving them more and more facilities. That is what are doing.

Then, we have also seen that the borders in our country to the not create any hurdles for the terrorists to go from one part of the country to the other parts of the country. That is why, we are asking the State Governments that they should prepare their own plans, they should discuss these plans with each other, consult the Union Government also and we said that we would readily help them. We are saying that the benefit of modern technology should be given to them.

Sir, the Chief Minister of Chhattisgarh and others, when they visited us, asked for very sophisticated equipment to deal with the situation in their State. We

[Shri Shivraj V. Patil]

readily gave them the sophisticated equipment and other things. I would like to bring to the notice of hon. Members here that they wanted helicopter service for shifting the injured persons and we provide that. They said that when police personnel go to fight against the naxalites and others, they get killed and so they should be provided with armoured vehicles and we provided them that also. Then, they wanted some equipment for collecting intelligence and we gave them. We wished them good luck in their effort. Then, I would like to submit that 36 battalions of Central forces are given to the States which are affected by naxalite problems. It is nearly 36000 men and officers which is equal to the army of a small country. This is what we have done. Not only that, but we have also said that if they are using the Para-military forces they will not be charged for three years. Previously they were being charged. They were asked to give money, but now we have taken a decision not to charge for three years.

Sir, another thing we are trying to do is to increase the police-people ratio. I was told that there were some private agencies which could help in this. We have passed the laws and if the private agencies can help and provide security to private installations and individuals, then those many people will be available for discharging governmental duties.

We are going to have good plans for providing security in mega cities, metropolitan cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Bangalore etc. let the Members not think that simply because I am mentioning these cities it is only these cities which are going to have these facilities. We will be providing these facilities to other cities also.

Then we are also strengthening our policing in the desert areas. Somebody asked a question about fencing our border with Bangladesh. I have been told that this job would be completed by end of December. If it is not completed by the end of December, it may take one or two months more, but they are on the job and they will do it.

Sir, we are talking to our neighbouring countries, like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Myanmar, Nepal, Sri Lanka and others and we have entered into many agreements

with them for legal assistance as well as extraditions. We have also requested them to not allow free flow of funds from their territories to terrorists. Some Members have said that fighting terrorism is like a mini war or a proxy war something of that kind. If somebody uses this word, somebody else takes objection to it. If somebody say that the situation is good, then also some people take objection. But this kind of situation is developing. That is why, in international conferences we are asking these countries not to sell small sophisticated weapons and explosives to those people who do not have the permit or the permission or the licence from the Government to use them because these can be used by terrorists. Then, we were told that the development of economy is very important. Some hon. Members very rightly emphasized on this point. That is exactly why we have given a package to Jammu & Kashmir, which is equal to Rs. 24,000 crore. When we give this big number, they ask where is this money, where has this disappeared, why is it not visible to us? This money is going to be used for constructing the power stations, the roads, irrigation dams, schools, hospitals and things like that. Then, we are also trying to provide employment to the people through the plan, through the Employment Guarantee Scheme and through other schemes also.

One of the hon. Members from the North-Eastern States got up and said, keep talking to ULFA. I would like to say Government has not said that we would not talk to ULFA. What the Government is saying is that when we are talking please do not do anything which will hurt the innocent people. We are saying that if extortion is going on, it should be stopped and something of this kind. We have not stopped the discussion with ULFA. We have always said and somebody told me and quoted President Kennedy: "We will not fear to talk or we will not talk out of fear". We would talk with anybody who is willing to abjure violence, lay down the arms. But that is not the only thing on which we will be depending.

There are a few more points which I will cursorily refer and conclude my speech. The deterrent laws should be there. This was the point Shri L.K. Advani made and he has been making this point. Probably he believes in it. We do not have to quarrel with this kind of proposal if it is coming from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. We will carefully look into it. Even if we have repealed

POTA, some of the salutary provisions in POTA have been transferred into the Unlawful Activities Act and there are other laws also which can be used.

I remember a story and I have been repeating this story because it makes this very clear. There were two friends and they were hunters. One said, 'I go to hunting, I carry my gun but I do not carry the bullets. When the tiger comes, I show the gun and he dies and my job is done'. The other friend said, 'oh that is nothing, when I go hunting, I neither carry the gun nor the bullets. I carry the licence in my pocket. When the tiger comes, I show him the licence'. It is something like this. The law is required, and the law is necessary to punish, but whether the law will stop the terrorist activities is really the question. If the law is too stringent, too deterrent, it can be used and misused. Even the balanced laws have been misused and that is the only thing which we are keeping in mind. At the same time, we are trying to use these laws in a manner. What is lost by repealing the POTA was the change of onus of proof from the prosecution to the accused. That was done there, we have not said that.

Sir, the Conference was discussed a great deal. I sincerely feel that it would have been better if the Conference would not have been discussed because Conference is something which was not a public meeting, which was not meant for the media and we were following the tradition which was laid down and which is not bad also. Whatever we discussed in the Conference is not always totally secret. But if it is correctly presented, it can create good impression. But if some mistake is committed, it can create a lot of problems and it has created some problems.

I have been saying that this kind of statement I have not made. They say how does it appear? How can I explain how does it appear? You shall have to ask those who are responsible for giving that thing in the media. I can only say that I have not made it. If I have committed a mistake or giving wrong information, you can proceed against me. But how can I explain why they did it, how they did it and all those things?

In this debate, there is one thing to which I have no reply. Somebody has said something, you explain. They are not asking me that you made this statement and you explain. If they do that, then I will explain. But somebody has said something in some meeting, you explain. Something in the name Prime Minister is also said

somewhere in a foreign country, he made the statement, you explain. This kind of debate does not help. You can make a political point or you can win some applause from the people who want to make the debate and the speeches spicy but it does not take us anywhere, and it is not necessary to do so. I would very humbly say that the situation has not deteriorated, the situation has improved. I am sure that you want and I want the situation should further improve, and we will definitely go by your advice, certainly go by the advice of persons like Shri Advani ji and others also. I do not promise that everything suggested to us we will accept. But then we would attach great importance to any suggestion coming from any senior Members over here, and it will be very useful to us.

One of the most important things which I have been repeating everywhere is that the people in India, 99 per cent people in India are peace loving and their support is the most important. The second thing I am saying is that your forces, the country's forces, whether it is the Defence forces or the paramilitary forces or the State Police or the other forces which are available are so strong that we do not have to be afraid of these things. We do not want to die many times before our death. We would like to deal with this problem with confidence and we have confidence. We have confidence because we know that you have confidence and the people have confidence.

The situation may not be very comfortable but the situation is under control, and with your help and cooperation we will definitely discharge our duties, if not to the hundred per cent satisfaction of you, but certainly to the satisfaction of those who know it clearly what can be done and what cannot be done.

Sir, I do not have to say anything more than this.

19.28 hrs.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have carefully listened to the Union Home Minister. He has, at several points in his speech, expressed that he holds me in esteem, and he would like to have my cooperation, guidance, etc. I can say that it is a mutual feeling.

This Conference was held perhaps on the 22nd or 21st, I do not know, but it is almost one week back, and the entire Press in the country gave it headlines. It was not the discussion with the DGPs or the IGP's and it was

[Shri L.K. Advani]

the inaugural address formally given to the press. ...  
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: The next day I contradicted it. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Have you contradicted it? No. I saw that contradiction which simply said that the reference made to the Indo-US agreement in the context of the nuclear deal is wrong. I have seen that contradiction also. Therefore, for me, the rest of the speech was the speech, and the rest of the speech in itself made me think in terms of an Adjournment Motion. I would frankly concede at this point of time the manner in which the Adjournment Motion has been moved by me does not amount to an Adjournment Motion. I would have agreed to a discussion under Rule 193 if I had been known that the entire Press report is baseless. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I have said that. I have brought it to the notice. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: You have brought it to the notice of the Speaker and not to the country.

The country at large read that our installations on the coast are under threat from terrorists. The LeT operatives are trying to occupy uninhabited islands and launch an attack on the country's coast. That in itself was evident. I did not have, at that time, the advantage of this document that you have given. Today, I did not want to start with statistics to prove that the situation had worsened, though I can say that, leave aside the two terrorist-affected areas, Jammu and Kashmir and North-East, the rest of the country in all these years has not suffered so many terrorist incidents. Perhaps, someone told me that the number of deaths also in the rest of country is the highest ever in these 58 years. I may be wrong. I do not know. But I did not want to raise the issue of just statistics and on that basis come to any conclusion.

Therefore, I had wanted that this Adjournment Motion to be phrased on the basis of the speech of the Home Minister published in the Press. The moment he said that I have not said it, I dropped it. But at the same time, I think that it was a lapse on the part of the Home Ministry itself not to have contradicted what has been published in the Press apart from that little portion.

Having said that, I would like to just make one or two more points and then conclude. Firstly, I strongly hold that it is democracy and secularism which give India its present strength. If these two attributes were not there, we would not be as strong as we are. ... (*Interruptions*) I have said it earlier also. Mr. Sibal is there. Many times I have said it. I do not want to quote what I quoted at that time about Muslims in India. Why I have said? In Jammu and Kashmir also, where there are terrorists who operate, there are *jihadis* who operate, we have people coming from across the border; we have people coming from Afghanistan and even from Sudan; but we do not have people coming from here. Why? It is principally because Muslim community may be dissatisfied for very many reasons as many other communities are, but they have not come.

'The world is flat', Thomas Friedman says that Pakistan gave us 500 Al-Qaeda people to be lodged in the Guantanamo Jail. There was not even one from India. Why? He replies and says that the answer is 'context' and, in particular, "the secular democratic context of India heavily influenced by traditions of non-violence and Hindu tolerance." This is absolutely right. Therefore, when it is again and again said that the people of the country are not to blame, I agree. But at the same time when I blame the Government, I am thinking not in terms of statistics but I am thinking in terms of the message sent by many of our statements many of utterances, many of our decisions, and in which I include even the scrapping of POTA. It is a message that goes that these people are not concerned.

Do you think that POTA or TADA make us a police State? If that is so, almost all democracies of the world would have become police States.

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: No.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: No, it is not true. I do not agree to that. There are situations where such extraordinary powers assumed by the State are justified. If this is not justified, what else is this?

SHRI GURUDAS DASGUPTA: I did not say that. I said that you talked about police being given more teeth; you talked about deterrent law; you talked about TADA; and you talked about POTA. Never in your speech, you mentioned democracy and people. Therefore, I concluded that you wanted a police State.

[*Translation*]

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Very good.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I request the hon. Leader of the Opposition not to yield anymore.

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: But not to the Leader of the House who is here. I have with me a statement of October 18, which says that there is no apparent change in Pakistan's support to cross border terrorism not only in Jammu and Kashmir but also in other parts of the country.

He added: "Occasional restrictions placed on terrorist groups by Pakistan remained cosmetic and reversible. Terrorist training and communication infrastructure in Pakistan-occupied-Kashmir are in tact".

Now, this is the reason why I would like to emphasise and appeal to the hon. Minister of Home Affairs that you have to think in terms of this joint mechanism. Firstly, I am extremely skeptical about the wisdom of this approach - a joint Indo-Pak mechanism to deal with terrorism. It evokes as much cynicism as the hon. Prime Minister's statement that Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorism. It does not carry conviction with the world as to what are they doing if they are really sincere about it. We were telling the other powers, Western Powers, the EU, Britain and America that force them to dismantle the infrastructure in Pakistan, the infrastructure that they have created. Instead we say — we are going to jointly deal with terrorism.

Before you undertake this operation, I have two requests to make. Firstly, talk about this infrastructure to Pakistan itself, directly, before formalizing this arrangement. Secondly, those terrorists who have been declared absconders by Interpol, those 20 that we claim, I do not know how many of them are alive, where are they, I do not know today; but it should be our demand that they should be handed over to India.

These are steps which convey a message. We want friendship with Pakistan, but we do not want friendship in which he assumes that 'somehow Kashmir is going to come along with us. They have given me a non-paper which meets some of my objectives.' Let us see that the focus is still on terrorism so far as Indo-Pak relationship is concerned. Let us not shift from there. We must have

a composite dialogue on everything including Kashmir. But do not let terrorism go away from the focus.

Sir, there was a reference made even to me, and to Agra and to Gen. Musharraf's book. I would again like to point out one thing. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee ordinarily does not issue statements of this kind. He refers to Agra after the book was published and says: "At Agra, during our talks, Gen. Musharraf took a stand that the violence that was taking place in Jammu and Kashmir could not be described as terrorism. He continued to claim that the bloodshed in the State was nothing but the people's battle for freedom. It was this stand of Gen. Musharraf that India just could not accept and this was responsible for the failure of the Agra Summit".

Having said this, I feel happy that when you said that the Constitution, in all the three Lists gives priority to security over economic development. I, therefore, wonder this UPA Government's hallmark is the Common Minimum Programme and that Common Minimum Programme does not mention anything about security except that POTA will be scrapped. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I would have read the Common Minimum Programme to you if you had raised this issue. I would have read every word of it. ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I have read it. I know what else is written.

Therefore, it is that I am sorry to say that even though yours was the only speech in the whole debate, all others mentioned about the clemency case sent to the President, on the assumption that it is for him to decide and it is not for the Government to say anything. The fact is that you were the only person to say that it is the Executive that decides and so leave it to us, that we will decide it at the proper time and in the proper manner. In this matter also I can say that Article 72 is the Article which gives the President the power to grant pardons etc. and to suspend, remit or commute sentences in certain cases. Commentators on this, one of them is Shri P.M. Bakshi says that it seems a reasonable view to take that this power like other powers of the President is expected to be exercised on the advice of the Cabinet.

Further, if there is any doubt about it, then the Supreme Court removed it completely when it laid down very clearly, and said in the Kehar Singh case that:



[Shri L.K. Advani]

"The power of pardon has to be exercised by the President on the aid and advice of his Council of Ministers."

Therefore, if you were to decide it early, then it would stop the present campaign on both sides. Actually, you are rally penalizing the country, and dividing the country by allowing it to go on. Further, you are accusing us of polarizing the country, which is not correct. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: What is the explanation for keeping the Rajiv Gandhi file for five years. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: I would certainly find out the position with regard to this issue. Five years would mean that ... *(Interruptions)* I have never seen it, but when you say five years. ... *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): How can it be that the then Home Minister did not see that file? ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not indulge in giving running commentary in the House.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: Shri Rajiv Gandhi passed away in 1991, which could mean that ... *(Interruptions)* I will certainly find out as to what has happened in that regard. But at the same time, in this particular case—when there is a division in the country, and a campaign is going on—do not forget that 13 December is fast approaching. We all again go there to pay homage to those martyrs. Had it not been for them, I hold that 13 December would have been far worse than 11 September in America. The kind of massacre that could have taken place would have destroyed democracy in the country. We owe our responsibility to the families of the martyrs also. Therefore, we should take an early decision on this issue, and not let it linger on.

This idea should be removed from the minds of everyone that it is not the President who, in his discretion, decides about it, but the President has to be guided by the aid and advice of the Council of Ministers. Have an early meeting on this, and decide about it. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHR PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: There is a procedure to be followed in this regard. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI L.K. ADVANI: There is no commitment on this ground too. I feel that I cannot participate in the voting that takes place now. Therefore, I would like to leave the House.

19.41 hrs.

*(At this state, Shri L.K. Advani and some other hon. Members left the House.)*

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the House do now adjourn."

*The motion was negatived.*

19.41½ hrs.

#### MATTERS UNDER RULE 377\*

MR. SPEAKER: Matters under Rule 377 listed for the day are treated as laid on the Table of the House. Please maintain silence in the House.

... *(Interruptions)*

##### (I) **Need to take step to check the increasing cases of diabetes in the country**

SHRI N.S.V. CHITTHAN (Dindigul): Alongwith westernisation and globalisation, the incidence of diabetes has reached pandemic proportions. From 33 million in 2003, India is poised to uniquely but sadly become the diabetes capital of the world, with a projected 57.9 million by 2025. Almost every 5th India is a diabetic. The global diabetes drugs treatment market was valued at 3 billion dollars in 2005. Diabetes is a silent killer. It is the 4th leading cause of death by disease globally. It cannot be cured but can be effectively controlled, postponed and also prevented. A person with diabetes has a risk of heart attack equal to a person who has already had a heart attack. Uncontrolled diabetes can lead to stroke, heart attack, kidney failure, blindness, leg amputations, nerve damage and death.

\*Treated as laid on the table.