

4.00 P.M.

the same thing is also published in Part-II of the Bulletins of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha so that the Members can consult the Bulletins and find out on which date which Bill was introduced and they can get their own copy.

SHRI FALI S. NARIMAN: Thank you. I am sorry that I have taken the time of the House...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU): No, no. It is okay.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Not at all. It is a good and interesting point that you have raised.

I hope the Home Minister is coming.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU): I am given to understand that he is attending the meeting of the Consultative Committee on Home Affairs. He will be coming in a couple of minutes.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

SECURITY SCENARIO IN THE LIGHT OF TERRORIST AND OTHER INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SECURITY THREATS AND THE REMEDIAL MEASURES TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT IN THIS REGARD

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to raise a discussion, under rule 176, on the security scenario, in the light of the terrorist and other internal and external security threats, and the remedial measures taken by the Government in this regard. Sir, when we are having this discussion, we have two documents before us -- one which was placed on the Table of the House on 25th July the 75th Report of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Home Affairs, which dealt with the terrorism and other activities in the State of Jammu & Kashmir. I am quoting from page one of the report. This is the evidence which the Chief Secretary gave us, and it is part of the Report. It had been placed on the Table of the House. That is why I can utilise it; otherwise I could not have utilized it. "Jammu & Kashmir was not faced with an insurgency or indigenous militancy, but a clandestine war that could be gauged from the fact that since 1990 to May 2000 over 33,763 weapons of various calibres, three million rounds of

ammunitions, 1,22,322 explosive devices and huge volumes of other war materials had been seized. During the same period over 10,000 civilians were killed, equal number of injured; apart from this, 2,217 security personnel were killed, 6,474 were injured; similarly, the security forces killed 11,299 militants." These figures relate from 1990 to May, 2000; and, thereafter, almost 13-14 months have passed, and almost everyday we are finding that the attacks in Jammu & Kashmir have increased. The problem is not merely confined to the State of Jammu & Kashmir. The threat to internal security and also the threat perception in our overall security environment are matters of great concern. In that context, we had report; though the report was not placed on the Table of the House, it was circulated to the Press. A Group of Ministers was appointed by the Prime Minister. This Group of Ministers included the Home Minister, Shri LK. Advani; the then Defence Minister, Shri George Fernandes; the Leader of the House and the Foreign Minister, Shri Jaswant Singh; and the Finance Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha. These four were the members of the Group of Ministers, who were entrusted to look into the internal and external security requirements in the context of the Subrahmanyam Committee's Report. But their task was much wider; and, therefore, they studied all security-related aspects comprehensively, and brought out this important document, consisting of almost 137 pages. I do believe the Government must have adequate reasons for not giving those portions of the report which were considered as 'classified'. In fact, the entire chapter on intelligence was deleted. And, certain other important aspects related to intelligence were also not included. But, nonetheless, they have studied various aspects in a very comprehensive way. Naturally, it has provided us an opportunity to review the whole scenario in a larger perspective. Sir, the problems with which we are confronted today are: one problem is arising out of the insurgency; another problem is arising out of the cross-border terrorism; linkages between drug trafficking and arms smuggling; funding the terrorist activities; the collapse of law and order in certain parts of the country; violence unleashed by some extremist groups; overall degradation of the efficiency of Central paramilitary forces and also of the State police forces. In this context, we are to review the overall security scenario of the country. In this connection, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to make a couple of general observations. My first general observation is this. I am not passing the buck to anybody, but, as a nation, we are failing to anticipate certain things and taking certain corrective measures. By the time we take corrective measures, a lot of damages are caused.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI) in the chair]

Kindly recall what happened 22 years ago on the floor of this very House, when the 44th Amendment was passed. At that point of time, I did not know what would happen actually after twenty two years. It was on 28th of August, 1978 Mr. Advani was sitting on that side, exactly where Leader of the House sits now, and I was almost sitting in the same place, the only difference was the seat, which is today occupied by Dr. Manmohan Singh, was occupied by Shri Kamalapati Tripathi, at that point of time. We were considering the Emergency provisions, under article 356. And, many in this House, at that point of time, considered that that was an absolutely irrelevant provision. They said "Delete article 356 altogether." There is no need for imposing President's Rule in a State where the constitutional machinery has failed. That State need not be brought within the purview of President's Rule. And, the proposed Amendment was to reduce the period of President's rule from three years to one year. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not a lawyer, nor could I have anticipated as to what was going to happen in Punjab between 1985 and 1991, but I will point out from my own observations; I am not quoting from anybody else's. President's Rule for failure of the administrative machinery in the State was considered. "President's Rule should be imposed in the States only for one year." That was the amended proposal. Earlier, a provision was made for three years. We found that only in two States, that is, in Kerala and Tamil Nadu it was extended beyond one-and-a-half years, not even complete two years. Even at that point of time, the approval of Parliament, at an interval of every six months, was required, as it is required even now.

But, somehow or other, we were carried away by the sentiments and we considered that it was a provision which had been highly abused and, therefore, it should be done away with. And, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, a situation arose in Punjab where elections could not be held. Every time, when you wanted to extend the President's Rule, you had to come to both the Houses of Parliament and amend the Constitution. A couple of amendments of the Constitution are related only to facilitate extension of President's Rule in Punjab. In this document itself, it has been suggested; and, in fact, the matter was referred to the inter-State Council whether the Central Government will have the authority to send Central para-military forces to the States without the consent of the States in case of an emergent situation, in case of an extraordinary position. The Government is considering it. Now, whether it will be done in today's situation and

whether it will get the approval of this House or that House, I am not going into that aspect. But, what, most respectfully, I am reminding this House is that this is the provision which we deleted ourselves 22 years ago; and at that point of time I also said, - and I quote from my own observations in Rajya Sabha - "I am opposing this provision; I am opposing the deletion of this particular clause; I am demanding that a situation may arise when Government may have to take this extraordinary position in order to protect a Union Territory from an internal disturbance." This responsibility of protecting the territorial integrity of a State, not only from the external aggression, but also from the internal disturbance has been thrust upon the Union Government under Article 355 of the Constitution. Yes; there might have been excesses, abuses of power through Emergency; there might be some emergency excesses, but those are aberrations, those are not the permanent features. Constitution is a basic document. Today, many of the recommendations in this document itself which you are suggesting, and which are being considered by the inter-State Council, refer to it. The political environment is totally different today. I do not know whether what is required, you will be in a position to get it done or not; but the provisions which existed and which were not misused, simply in our anxiety, we thought that they are to be deleted to deal with the security of the country, to deal with the ill-gotten money of the extremists, who have converted their ill-gotten money into the real estate. Just the other day, we made a very penal provision in the amendment of the Indian Registrations Act that henceforth the photograph and finger prints of the transferor will have to be provided in the documents for the transfer of a property. But in the statute book, there was a regular law, SAFEMFOPA, the Smugglers and Foreign Exchange Manipulators Forfeiture of Properties Act. The Act was there. It was passed by Parliament. But it was never used for the last 23 years. Today, even the Home Minister is going to the extent of providing amnesty to the security personnel from the human rights angle. I am not going into the merits of these things. The point which I am trying to drive at is, what you feel necessary to do, you yourself are putting your action taking ability into a straight jacket, where your manoeuvrability is limited.

This is not fair. I do agree that our problem of internal security and external security is closely linked with what is going to be our relationship with Pakistan. If somebody had gone through pages 11 and 12 of this Report, one would have easily understood the results of the Agra Summit. Kindly see what is stated in this report. I think, the Government should consider seriously whether this type of phrases should be used. I am

quoting from the Report. I do feel it is conveying a wrong message. I quote, "A recent phenomenon is the mushrooming of Pan-Islamic militant outfits with links to radical organisations in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and some other West Asian countries. Funded by Saudi and Gulf sources, many new Madrasas have come up all over the country in recent years, especially in large numbers in the coastal areas of the West, and in the border areas of West Bengal and the North-East. Reports of systematic indoctrination of Muslims in the border areas in fundamentalist ideology is detrimental to the country's communal harmony." It is a Government document. And you are using this type of phrases! You are taking the names of some of the countries with whom you have excellent diplomatic relations; you are saying that with their money fundamentalist forces in this country are getting strengthened. And long before the Parliament got hold of this copy - till now formally it has not yet got hold of this copy as it has not been laid on the Table of the House, - it has been circulated in the Press. In fact, we have got the first copy from the Press itself. So, what message do you want to convey saying that the Madrasas, which have been established in the border areas - Sir, I come from West Bengal. I do not know how many new Madrasas have come up on the border areas of West Bengal - are indulging in fundamentalist activities? But, it is equally true that fundamentalist activities generate fundamentalist activities in the other camp. If there be the Hindu fundamentalism, you cannot expect that there will be no Islamic fundamentalism and *vice-versa*. That is why the Government is to go very cautiously. They must be very careful in coining their phrases and in using their words. But, unfortunately, I do not know what prompted them to bring in this type of phraseology. I entirely agree on the nexus which has been built up over the years. Of course, North-Eastern parts are important areas where this type of activities are going on rampantly. Drug trafficking, arms smuggling and money generated through them are being used by the extremists and the terrorists. Cross-border terrorism is the most serious threat to the world peace in the post-cold war era, not merely to India but also to the world. Of course, India is at the receiving end. This is, in fact, the biggest threat to the world security. Naturally, and rightly so, India is demanding that there should be a comprehensive discussion under the auspices of the United Nations to deal with the cross border terrorism. But, there you have failed. You have not been able to get Pakistan to be recognised as a State, which is directly encouraging cross-border terrorism, though in these documents you have mentioned it abundantly. Mere mentioning it is not enough. Whom are you

trying to convince? Neither this Parliament, nor the people of this country require to be convinced that Pakistan is directly supporting cross-border terrorists. Everyone of us subscribes to your view and whatever measures you take to stop cross-border terrorism, we will support. What is needed that you are yet to convince the international community, though it is a different subject but it has very close links with our external security. What is needed is that after Pokhran-II in May, 1998, we will be able to tackle Pakistan with this deterrent. Have we been able to do that? With regard to conventional weapons, surely, we were ahead of them. I am not an expert in this area. Our Member, Gen. Roy Chowdhury, is here; he will make his contribution, he will point it out. But being a nuclear weapon State, we have allowed them to be another nuclear weapon State. Now, we are almost at an equal level; and the advantages which we had on conventional weapons have gone. At least, your being a nuclear weapon State did not act as a deterrent to Pakistan. After that, Kargil had happened. After that a Pakistani statesman, a Pakistani ruler, came to India, standing on the Indian soil he said-- which Mr. Ayub Khan, Mr. Yahya Khan, Mr. Zia-ul-Haq did not do so -- "yes; I will talk nothing, except Kashmir." Though a lot of militant activity was going on Jammu and Kashmir, he said that what was happening in Jammu and Kashmir was nothing, but a freedom movement. They knew that they are a nuclear weapon State, as India is a nuclear weapon State. They knew that they have not been isolated in the world. In your document, you yourself have admitted that they are on a buying spree of conventional weapons and nuclear weapons from China and from the West. The Pressler amendment was amended by the Brown amendment. Therefore, this document review wants to convince us that the situation is serious and we shall have to deal with Pakistan firmly. On reading this document, everybody will say, "Mr. Minister, yes; we agree with you. But for God's sake, you convince your friend." In the document, you yourself have admitted that there has been a phenomenal change.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would like to conclude because my colleagues are also there to participate in this debate.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): The time allotted for this debate is 2 i/2hours. I told the Parliamentary Affairs Minister that this is an important subject; and there should not be any time limitation. But he was of the opinion that it should be finished today itself.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: If you agree, Members can finish their speeches today; and the Minister can reply tomorrow at 12 o'clock. I do not

know about the Home Minister's position, The Parliamentary Affairs Minister can find it out. The Leader of the House is here; he was also a member.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will be replying to the debate. I will address the concerns and queries raised by the hon. Members. I will also address the questions concerning both internal and external security. I will be addressing the totality of the debate that takes place. Of course, subject to the convenience of the House. If the House decides that the debate should be concluded in 2 1/2 hours, or, if the House decides that they want more time, we are ready for it. But the only request is -- my colleague, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, has decided the time for this debate, I think, with the consensus of all the Members -- the discussion should conclude today. If necessary, should more Members wish to participate in this debate, I am ready to sit here till midnight. It is an important discussion. The hon. Member, Shri Pranabbabu, might remember that I had myself volunteered to have this discussion. I have no doubt, I will benefit from the views expressed here by the hon. Members. So, I am in their hands and in the hands of the Parliamentary Affairs Minister. Please decide how much time you wish to have. When you want me to reply, I will reply.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I would suggest, even if you take, normally, four hours, up to 8 o'clock, we can sit. Only one amendment I would like to have. Subject to the availability of the Home Minister, if you can fix up the reply of the Home Minister to be done tomorrow, immediately after the Question Hour....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): If the Leader of the House replies, then, if he can speak tomorrow, after the Question Hour, we can have the debate up to 8 o'clock today.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL): Sir, we would like to see that Members get as much time as they require. But we would like to see that the discussion is over today itself.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Including his reply?

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: We can sit up to 8 o'clock.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If you want that I should reply after the Question Hour tomorrow, that gives additional time. I have no difficulty.

Perhaps, after the Question Hour, there is nothing listed tomorrow. I am ready to reply tomorrow, if a majority of Members want it then.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I think that will be convenient.

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL: The Plant Varieties Bill is there tomorrow. It will take some time. It has to be taken up and disposed of tomorrow itself.

उपसभाध्यक्ष(श्री सुरेश पचौरी): ठीक है, इस पर रिप्लाइ कल हो जाएगा लेकिन चर्चा आज समाप्त होगी।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I can tell you, whatever legislative business you want to transact, this House will sit till every piece of legislative business is transacted. And you cannot say that we have ever stood in the way of getting a legislation transacted. There will be no problem for any legislative business to be transacted.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I think I can take two or three minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now you can take some more time.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: My colleagues are there. Others will also be speaking.

What I am trying to point out to the Government is that the situation is serious. All, at least, I do, believe that you cannot deal with the terrorists with the ordinary legislations. Specially, in today's context of terrorism, with their weaponry, competence and technological equipment being enhanced to those used by the normal security forces or being superior, you cannot deal with it with an ordinary law. To deal with an extraordinary situation, you require extraordinary laws. Those laws were available to us. But it is we ourselves who decided, sometime, just being carried by the emotion for the time being, to do away with that. Today, you are talking that you require a special law. There was a law. There was the TADA. Mr. Chavan was the Home Minister. Days-in and days-out, his life was made miserable, saying that that extraordinary piece of legislation must be given up. And, ultimately, it had to be given up. Now, again, there is a thinking that some sort of law like that is needed so that we can deal with terrorists, those who are endangering the security of the nation, endangering^s the security of a large number of innocent people. I have quoted the figures from the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee. Ten

thousand innocent civilians were killed! I can understand security forces dying, fighting with militants. But ten thousand civilian lives were lost for no fault of theirs! The State is failing to discharge its primary responsibility. A State is created to secure the life and property, individual dignity and honour. For that very purpose a State is created. It is the primary responsibility of the State. We are failing to discharge that responsibility.

Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do feel, let the Government come out with a concrete scheme of things, not merely some idea. It requires a lot of constitutional amendments actually if you want to implement some of the provisions of that. Given the political situation and environment as it is today, you will require a good deal of talking and trying to create a consensus through which the passage of these constitutional amendments, which will be required to implement some of your plans, has to be achieved. Secondly, what I do feel, Mr. Minister-the Leader of the House is the External Affairs Minister-you will have to use your persuasive skills to the maximum extent to bring upon the international community the notoriety which Pakistan is indulging in by supporting the cross-border terrorism, and, in this unipolar world, specially when they are indebted to the real super power, if you can prevail upon them-we know one favourable factor goes in our favour that there is a strong public opinion against terrorism in US-that strong public opinion must get reflected in the State Department and in other areas where actually decisions are being taken. And there comes your role, and you shall have to convince them, not merely this House or the Indian media. I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी मैं आपका कृतज्ञ हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया। प्रणब बाबू ने राष्ट्र की एक गंभीर समस्या, विशेष रूप से आंतरिक सुरक्षा के बारे में जो विचार व्यक्त किए केवल कुछ बातों को छोड़कर मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि तेइस वर्ष पहले इस सदन में क्या हुआ था। अच्छा हुआ जो उन्होंने इस बात को उठाया। लेकिन इन तेइस वर्षों में हमने जो सीखा है क्या हम उसका लाभ न उठाएं? संविधान के अनुच्छेद 355 या 352 या 359 के अंतर्गत भारत सरकार को जो विशेष अधिकार मिलते थे उनमें कटौती होने के कारण आंतरिक सुरक्षा के लिए जो समस्याएं उत्पन्न हो गई हैं क्या हम उन पर पुनर्विचार न करें? ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स की समिति ने इस पर विचार किया इस पर विशेषज्ञों ने भी विचार किया और यह पाया कि जो कुछ हो चुका है उस पर चर्चा करने से कोई लाभ नहीं है लेकिन हमें निश्चित रूप से संविधान में कुछ ऐसे आवश्यक संशोधन करने होंगे ताकि आतंकवाद और अलगाववाद पर काबू पाया जा सके। आतंकवाद और अलगाववाद ऐसी गंभीर समस्याएं हैं जिनसे वर्तमान संवैधानिक प्रावधानों के कारण केवल केंद्र सरकार अपने बलबूते पर नहीं निपट सकती। यदि किसी राज्य में कोई गंभीर संकट उत्पन्न हो जाएं और केंद्र सरकार चाहे भी तो तब तक

अपने केंद्रीय बल को नहीं भेज सकती जह तक राज्य सरकार से उसे इस बारे में अनुमति न मिले या उसकी मांग न आए। यह स्थिति बदलनी होगी। अभी तो केवल बाह्य आक्रमण की दशा में ही भारत सरकार कुछ कर सकती है। लेकिन मान लीजिए जैसी स्थिति आज माणिपुर में है वहां सौ दो सै करोड़ रुपये की अवैध मुद्रा भारतीय मुद्रा काउंटरसीट करेंसी लादी जाए तो उसे रोकने के लिए भारत सरकार कुछ नहीं कर सकती। हां, आज के दिन कर सकती है क्योंकि वहाँ राष्ट्रपति शासन है पर यदि असम में आ जाए या अरुणाचल में आ जाए तो हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते जबकि हम जानते हैं कि वहां आई.एस.आई के एजेंट किस तरह से भारत में अवैध मुद्रा प्रचलित करा रहे हैं। राजस्थान, पंजाब, कश्मीर में किस तरह से जाली नोटों का प्रचलन है। इसे रोकने के लिए भारत सरकार कुछ भी कर सकने में समर्थ नहीं है। मादक द्रव्यों की जो तस्करी हो रही है और उनकी जो नैक्सस है, हथियार बेचने वालों के साथ, माफिया सरगनाओं के साथ आतंकवादी तत्वों के साथ, अलगाववादी संगठनों के साथ उनका जो गठजोड़ है उसे भी भारत सरकार केवल अपने बलबूते पर नहीं रोक सकती। यह एक और समस्या है। ये समस्यायें 23 वर्ष पहले इस रूप में नहीं थी हमने 23 वर्ष पहले सोचा भी नहीं था कि ऐसा हो जाएगा। आप कह सकते हैं कि भूल हुई। लेकिन अब जब एक बात समझ में आ गई है तो संवैधानिक प्रावधानों में जो सुधार की आवश्यकता है, उन्हें अवश्य कर लिया जाना चाहिए। प्रणब दा आप इससे सहमत हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि आप अपनी पार्टी में भी इस बात की व्यवस्था करा दें जिससे वह इस संवैधानिक संशोधनो के लिए तैयार हो जाए। अगर कांग्रेस और हमारी सरकार दोनों मिलकर इस पर सहमत होंगे तो निश्चित रूप से वह संवैधानिक प्रावधान जो आतंकवाद और अलगाववाद को रोकने के लिए आवश्यक हैं, हम ला सकते हैं। यह संभव है और ऐसा होना चाहिए। यह राष्ट्र की आवश्यकता है। इस पर हम लोग राजनैतिक संकीर्णता से ऊपर उठकर सोचें। हम लोग राजनैतिक स्वार्थपरता का परित्याग करके राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा को महत्व दें। कारगिल में जो कुछ हुआ, उस समस्या पर विचार करने के लिए एक ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स का गठन किया गया था। उन्होंने चार टास्क फोर्स बनाए। इनकी जो रपट है, वह आंखों खोलने वाली हैं। हम उसकी उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा इस देश में पहली बार हुआ है। पहली बार भारत ने, 54 वर्षों में अपनी राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के परिदृश्य का गहन समीक्षा की है। इतिहास इस बात का गवाह है कि इसके पहले कभी ऐसा नहीं हुआ। यह सरकार की अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण उपलब्धि है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपके माध्यम से सदन से चाहूंगा और दूसरे सदन से भी चाहूंगा कि इस गंभीर समस्या पर सारे राष्ट्र को एक स्वर से, एकजुट होकर खड़े होना चाहिए ताकि हम आतंकवाद और अलगाववाद से निपट सकें। मान्यवर, प्रणब दा बिल्कुल सही कहते हैं, जब वे कहते हैं कि भारी मात्रा में हथियारों के जखीरे इस देश में आए हैं और पकड़े गए हैं। लेकिन अकेले केंद्र सरकार उनको नहीं पकड़ सकती है, इस बात को हम भूल नहीं सकते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक समय उत्तर प्रदेश में जगह जगह हथियारों के जखीरे आने की बात चल रही थी। अखबारों में छप रहा था। केंद्रीय सरकार ने वहां की सरकार को अनेक पत्र लिखे लेकिन वहां की सरकार ने कहा कि हम केंद्रीय हस्तक्षेप नहीं चाहते। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, क्या यह संभव नहीं है कि एक कोई ऐसा फेडरल स्ट्रक्चर बना लिया जाए। समिति बना ली जाए, ऐसा आर्गनाइजेशन, संगठन बना लिया जाए जो इस प्रकार के मामलों पर संयुक्त रूप से कार्यवाही करे? प्रणब दा जी, क्या ऐसे किसी फेडरल स्ट्रक्चर के बारे में विचार हो सकता है कि अगर आईबी की रपट हो, राँ की रपट हो कि ऐसा कुछ हो रहा है तो यह फेडरल संगठन तुरन्त उस में हस्तक्षेप कर सके और राज्य सरकारें इसमें बाधक न बनें? आज राज्य

सरकारें इसमें बाधक बन रही हैं, यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है। आज राज्य सरकारों का अहम इतना बढ़ गया है कि उनके लिए राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा गौण हो गई है। मदरसों की बात पर प्रणब दा को आपत्ति है मैं उत्तर प्रदेश से आता हूँ। मुझे मालूम है कि भारत नेपाल सीमा पर जहां मुस्लिम आबादी नगण्य है, वहां पर पिछले पांच वर्षों में मदरसों की ऐसा बाढ़ आई है कि समझ में नहीं आता कि यह किसके लिए है। पढ़ाई की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। वहां क्या होता है यह सोचने का विषय है। इसी प्रकार से राजस्थान में के जैसलमेर में ऐसी दुकानें खुली हुई हैं, जिनको कश्मीर चला रहे हैं। वहां पर ऐसी ऐसी दुकानें हैं जहां पर कोई व्यापार नहीं होता। कहां से धन आता है? कहां जाता है, कौन लेता है? खरीददार नहीं हैं लेकिन दुकानें हैं, पढ़ने वाले नहीं हैं लेकिन मदरसे हैं। यह जो गंभीर स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है इसकी ओर ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स की रिपोर्ट में संकेत दिया गया है। निश्चित रूप से हमारे देश में जो मदरसे हैं, सभी मदरसे खराब हैं, ऐसा नहीं है। मदरसों में पढ़ाई कराने का अधिकार मुस्लिम सम्प्रदाय को है, हम इसके समर्थक हैं। लेकिन मदरसों में पढ़ाई होनी चाहिए। वहां आतंकवाद का प्रशीक्षण नहीं होना चाहिए। वहां अलगावाद का प्रशीक्षण नहीं होना चाहिये। वहां भारतीय संस्कृति का विरोध नहीं होना चाहिए। प्रणब दा ने एक बात कही कि हिन्दु रुढ़िवादी है अतः उसकी प्रतिक्रिया स्वरूप मुस्लिम रुढ़िवादिता बढ़ रही है। मैं इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ। हिन्दुत्व कभी रुढ़िवादिता का समर्थन रहा ही नहीं। प्रत्येक मजहब के लिए, प्रत्येक उपासना पद्धति के लिए हिन्दुत्व में पूर्ण सम्मान है, पूर्ण स्थान है। लेकिन यह बात छाती ठोक कर के कोई अन्य पंथ नहीं कह सकता जो हिन्दुत्व से जुड़ा हुआ नहीं है। कोई नहीं कह सकता। हिन्दुत्व एक भूसांस्कृतिक अवधारणा है, मैं बार बार इस बात को कहता हूँ। सभी उपासना पद्धतियों के लिए पूर्ण सम्मान, पूर्ण स्थान केवल हिन्दुत्व में है, हिन्दुत्व दर्शन में है, भारतीयता में है। यही तो भारत की विशेषता है, हम उसी से जोड़ना चाहते हैं। लेकिन अब यह कहना कि हिन्दुत्व रुढ़िवादिता है, इसलिए मुस्लिम रुढ़िवादिता आ रही है, यह उचित बात नहीं है। मैं फिर चाहता हूँ कि आज की बहस को हम राजनीतिक रंग न दें। प्रणब दा ने बहुत सही कहा कि यह गम्भीर समस्या है, हमें इसे इसी रूप में देखना चाहिए। समझना चाहिए, सभी देश का कल्याण होगा। देश की कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति निश्चित रूप से कोई बहुत अच्छी नहीं है। आन्तरिक सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से भी स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है। ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स की रपट में यह बात बहुत साफ तौर पर कह दी गई है, मैं उसको पढ़ कर सदन का समय खराब नहीं करना चाहता। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम इस बात को राजनीतिक से ऊपर उठा लें। राज्य सरकारों और केन्द्रीय सरकार के बीच जो तालमेल का अभाव हो गया है, वह कैसे स्थापित हो। हमारी इंटरस्टेट काउंसिल कैसे और सक्रिय हो, हमारे मुख्य मंत्री वास्तव में राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के प्रति पुनः कैसे संवेदनशील बनें, यह अपने आप में एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है। आज तो अनेक मुख्य मंत्री केन्द्रीय सरकार के पत्रों, प्रपत्रों का सही ढंग से उत्तर भी नहीं देते। कुछ राज्य सरकारें तो ऐसी हैं, जो समझती हैं कि वह भारत से कुछ पृथक होती जा रही हैं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री बालकवि बैरागी (मध्य प्रदेश): ...(व्यवधान)... नरेन्द्र मोहन जी यह तो 6 दिसम्बर, 1992 में सिद्ध कर चुके हैं आप लोग। क्षमा कर देना, जो आप कह रहे हैं इतनी देर से...(व्यवधान)...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं माननीय बालकवि जी, का सम्मान करता हूँ।
...(व्यवधान)...

श्री बालकवि बैरागी: मैं भी इनका सम्मान करता हूँ। लेकिन जिस मुद्दे को यह उठा रहे हैं गये 10 मिनट से, उसमें 6 दिसम्बर, 1992 भी शामिल है। आपके मुख्य मंत्री ने संघ राज्य को ठेगा बताया, उसका परिणाम यह निकला था...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): चलिए, बैठिये अब आप लोग।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री ब.प.आपटे (महाराष्ट्र): हम इसके लिए तयार हैं, कराइए चर्चा।...(व्यवधान).... लेकिन बीच में नहीं करनी चाहिए।...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): यह शब्द असंसदीय है। यह रिकार्ड में नहीं जाएगा। कृपया ऐसे शब्दों का प्रयोग नहीं करें।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपकी मेरे ऊपर बड़ी कृपा है। बालकवि जी मेरे छोटे भाई हैं। मैं उनका बहुत सम्मान करता हूँ।...(व्यवधान).... नहीं, मैं 70 वर्ष की आयु का हूँ और वे 70 वर्ष की आयु के नहीं हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री सी.एम.इब्राहीम (कर्णाटक): वे आपसे बड़े हैं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैंने मान लिया बड़े भाई हैं, बात खत्म।

श्री बालकवि बैरागी: नरेन्द्र मोहन जी, मैं आपसे हर तरह से छोटा हूँ। लेकिन मेरी उम्र कुल 71 वर्ष है, बस।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: आप मुझसे बड़े हैं, मैंने स्वीकार कर लिया है।

श्री सी.एम.इब्राहीम: हमारा इस्टीमेट कभी गलत नहीं होता है।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: अच्छा बालकवि जी, 6 दिसम्बर, पर जिस दिन सदन चाहेगा, हम चर्चा कर लेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): इसी विषय पर आइए।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: सीमा पार से जो आतंकवाद आ रहा है, उसकी चर्चा प्रणब जी ने की और बहुत सही चर्चा की कि सीमा पार से जिस प्रकार से आतंकवाद आता है, वह फैलता जा रहा है। अब यह केवल सीमावर्ती राज्यों तक सीमित नहीं है, यह तो अब दक्षिण तक में प्रवेश कर चुका है। इसका दुष्प्रभाव आन्ध्र में देखने को मिलता है, महाराष्ट्र में देखने को मिलता है, मध्य प्रदेश में देखने को मिलता है और उत्तर प्रदेश में देखने को मिलता है। इसको रोका कैसे जाएगा? आप कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान को हमने बराबरी पर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया, इसलिए यह बढ़ा। ऐसा नहीं है। आप कहते हैं कि परमाणु परीक्षण न किया गया होता तो पाकिस्तान हमारी बराबरी पर न होता। फिर हम उससे निपट लेते। उसका साहस न होता। संभवतः आपके कहने का आशय यही था, प्रणब दा। मैं फिर आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि परमाणु परीक्षण कर भारत ने जो उपलब्धि किया, जो पाया है क्या उस पर हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान तो पहले ही छद्म

रूप से परमाणु हथियार बना रहा था। यह आपकी जानकारी में है प्रणब दा और लगभग उसका हथियार बन गया था। पाकिस्तान ने अपने परमाणु हथियारों का छद्म रूप से परीक्षण भी किया था। इस पर उसको अमेरिका ने डांट भी लगायी थी। लेकिन हमें जब इसकी जानकारी मिली तो हमने भी अपना कार्य किया। हम परमाणु हथियार बनाते, न बनाते, पाकिस्तान ने तो बना ही लिया था। यह एक वास्तविकता है। हम इस सत्य की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते।

संसदीय स्थायी समिति ने जिसकी आपने चर्चा की, इस सीमा पार से आने वाले आतंकवाद पर बहुत गंभीरता से एक टिप्पणी की, मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसको पढ़ें। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि सीमा पर से जो इस्लामी आतंकवाद आ रहा है जिसकी चर्चा संसदीय टिप्पणी में भी है, जिसकी चर्चा गृह मंत्रालय की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट में भी है, उसकी संकेत में चर्चा प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय की वार्षिक रिपोर्ट में भी है, उसकी चर्चा कई बार हो चुकी है, उसकी चर्चा विश्व में अनेक मंचों पर हो चुकी है कि किस प्रकार से इस्लामी आतंकवाद विश्व शांति के प्रति षडयंत्र कर रहा है — हम यह चाहते हैं कि उसकी ओर ध्यान दिया जाए। हम यह चाहते हैं कि उस पर मान्यवर आप ध्यान दें। आपकी अनुमति से मैं कुछ पढ़ना चाहता हूँ। समय अधिक लेगा। बाद में समय रहेगा तो मैं पढ़ना चाहूँगा...(व्यवधान)... मैं गृह मंत्रालय के 59वें प्रतिवेदन की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहूँगा, जिसके पेज नम्बर 11 पर इसके बारे में कुछ लिखा गया है। इसमें लिखा गया है।

“गृह सचिव ने आगे कहा कि आतंकवादियों में अति आधुनिक हथियारों और प्रौद्योगिकी के कारण समस्याएँ गंभीर हो गयी हैं। भाड़े के सैनिकों और विदेशियों का अनुपात पिछले कुछ वर्षों में काफी बढ़ गया है। इसके परिणामस्वरूप देश में उग्रवाद और आतंकवाद के सम्मिश्रण में व्यापक परिवर्तन हुए हैं। इन समस्याओं का जवाब सुरक्षा बलों के पास मौजूद उपकरणों और कौशल लाभ में लगातार कोटि उन्नयन है अर्थात् हम अपने सुरक्षा बलों की जो स्थिति है उसे और मजबूत करें, उन्हें और आधुनिक हथियार दें। इसका यही आशय था। यह भी इसमें कहा गया है कि — शीघ्र ही नयी बटालियनों को बनाने के लिए सरकार के समाने प्रस्ताव विचाराधीन है। नयी बटालियनों का गठन हो रहा है। यह बता रहा है कि यह सरकार किस तरह से इस समस्या को गंभीरता से ले रही है। गृह मंत्रालय के नये बजट के प्रावधानों में इसके संकेत हैं। संकेत ये हैं कि हम न केवल नयी बटालियनों का गठन करने जा रहे हैं बल्कि जो हमारे वर्तमान सुरक्षा बल हैं, केन्द्र के, उनको हम आधुनिकतम हथियारों से लैस भी करने जा रहे हैं। यही नहीं उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, भारत सरकार ने यह भी तय किया है कि राज्य सरकारों में जो पुलिस की स्थिति है, उसमें सुधार हो और उनका भी आधुनिकीकरण हो। यही नहीं बहुत सी राज्य सरकारें जो आज आतंकवाद और अलगाववाद से लड़ रही हैं और उस लड़ाई में उनका जो खर्च हो रहा है, कहीं तो 50-55 प्रतिशत उस खर्च को भारत सरकार दे रही है और कहीं शत-प्रतिशत दे रही है। यह भारत सरकार ने किया है। क्या यह अपने आप में एक सही कदम नहीं है? इस सही कदम को इस सदन का पूर्ण समर्थन मिलना चाहिए। जहां तक आलोचना की बात है, आलोचना हमारी हो, जहां हमारी भूलें हों वहां हमारी आलोचना हो, लेकिन जहां हम से भूलें नहीं हुई हैं और अगर अकारण हमारी आलोचना करेंगे और राजनीति लायेंगे, तो फिर कठिनाइयाँ बढ़ेंगी। मैं एक और ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि आंतरिक सुरक्षा की समस्याएँ भी अलग अलग राज्यों में अलग अलग तरह की हैं। यह स्थायी समिति की रिपोर्ट से ही मैं कह रहा हूँ। ऐसा नहीं है कि जो समस्या जम्मू-कश्मीर की है वह समस्या उत्तर प्रदेश की हो या जो समस्या उत्तर प्रदेश की है, वही समस्या त्रिपुरा की हो, ऐसा नहीं है, हर राज्य की आंतरिक सुरक्षा की समस्याएँ अलग-

अलग हैं। कुछ राज्यों में वामपंथी अतिवादिता है, कुछ राज्यों में विदेश समर्थित आतंकवाद है, कुछ राज्यों में अलगाववाद है और कुछ राज्यों में मादक द्रव्यों की तस्करी के कारण उत्पन्न समस्याएँ हैं। इस प्रकार की अनेक समस्याएँ हैं और उन समस्याओं के लिए हमें अलग-अलग उपाय खोजने होंगे, जब तक ऐसा नहीं होगा तब तक बात नहीं बनेगी। राज्य पुलिस बलों को आधुनिकतम बनाने की आवश्यकता है और इसीलिए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इस बारे में अनेक कार्यक्रम बनाए हैं, अनेक प्रकार के प्रोत्साहन दिए हैं, लेकिन फिर भी उपसभाध्यक्ष मुख्य दायित्व राज्य सरकारों का ही रहेगा। अंततः राज्य सरकारों को ही तो काम करना होगा। वर्तमान संवैधानिक स्थिति में केन्द्र स्वयं अपने सुरक्षा बल को कैसे भेज देगा? जो काम राज्य सरकारों को करना है वह काम राज्य सरकारें न करें तो क्या कठिनाइयाँ उत्पन्न नहीं होंगी? यही वह समस्या है जिससे हम जूझ रहे हैं। यही वह समस्या है जिसका हमें निराकरण करना है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक और बात बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ। (समय की घंटी)
महोदय, मेरी पार्टी के पास समय है और फिर यह भी तय किया गया है कि हर व्यक्ति अपना अपना बोल ले।...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): अन्य दूसरे स्पीकर भी हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: हां, एक व्यक्ति हमारे यहां और है। लेकिन उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप कृपा करके इस महत्वपूर्ण मुद्दे पर मुझे बोलने दें, यह मेरा आपसे विनम्र अनुरोध है। मजहब आधारित आतंकवाद को चूंकि अब विश्व के अनेक राष्ट्रों का खुला समर्थन मिल रहा है, केवल पाकिस्तान का ही समर्थन नहीं मिल रहा है, बल्कि विश्व के अनेक राष्ट्रों का पूरा समर्थन मिल रहा है और इसी की ओर संकेत ग्रुप ऑफ़ मिनिस्टर्स की रपट में किया गया है। यह ठीक है कि हमारे उनके साथ मित्रतापूर्ण संबंध हैं, हम पाकिस्तान के साथ भी मित्रतापूर्ण संबंध रखना चाहते हैं, हम तो किसी को शत्रु बनाना ही नहीं चाहते, हम तो चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान जो हमारा भाई है वह सही रास्ते पर आ जाए, लेकिन जब वह आतंकवाद को अलगाववाद को आई एस आई के माध्यम से खुला समर्थन देता है और जो आतंकवादी हैं उनको कहता है कि वे तो स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानी हैं, तो हमें दुख होता है। हमें उसकी आलोचना करना चाहिए। मैं इस बारे में एक ओर रपट पढ़ना चाहूंगा। यहां दिल्ली में इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ़ डिफेंस स्टडीज की एक एनैलेसिस है और वह अपने आप में बहुत गंभीर है। मैं आपकी अनुमति से उसको पढ़ संकू तो आपकी बड़ी कृपा रहेगी। उसमें है

"It is feasible for terrorist groups to procure the technology and conduct chemical weapons, and even biological weapons, in a future scenario, maybe, by 2005 or so. It is a very serious thing. Chemical and biological weapons markets are proliferating. The State support would further complicate the issue. However, use of chemical weapons is more likely due to simplicity in their handling".

Now, this is a very serious situation. Can we deal with it? Should we not go forward?

Now, again, I would like to read ये वेपन फॉर मॉस डिस्ट्रक्सन पर मि.ए.के. लाल का एक आर्टिकल था जो कि इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ डिफेंस स्टडीज एंड एनॉलिसिस के आथर हैं, फेलो हैं और उन्होंने लिखा है कि "A panorama of global terrorism -hot spots, and their analysis will show the pattern of giving the existing gradation of terrorist-infested continents; globalisation is making weapons of mass destruction terrorism a looming threat in today's society, necessitating mock response practice". For example, terrorist expert, Walter Laker, stated that some terrorists -almost, certainly, will use weapons of mass destruction, and a Harvard study accentuated U.S.A's vulnerability to unconventional terrorist अब यह समस्या भारत के सामने बढ़ती चली जा रही है और हम इस समस्या से कैसे जूझें, मैं चाहूँगी कि सरकार इस पर प्रकाश डाले। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह इस्लामिक आतंकवाद अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या बन गया है जिस से जूझने के लिए हमें कुछ तो करना ही होगा क्योंकि आज सर्व-संहारक हथियारों का जो खतरा पैदा हो गया है, अगर ये सर्व संहारक हथियार आतंकवादियों के हाथ में चले जाते हैं, तालिबान के हाथ में चले जाते हैं तो हम इस समस्या से कैसे निपटेंगे? हम जानते हैं कि अफगानिस्तान की तालिबान सरकार किस प्रकार से आतंकवाद की सहायता कर रही है। हम जानते हैं कि ओसामा बिन लादेन सरीखे लोग किस प्रकार से आतंकवाद को बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं और भारत के लिए समस्या बन चुके हैं। हम जानते हैं कि अल बदर पठान मुजाहिदीन, लश्कर ए तैएबा, हरकतुल अंसार, हिजबुल मुजाहिदीन, दीनदार अंजुमन, जैश ए मोहम्मद और जम्मू-कश्मीर लिबरेशन फ्रंट सरीखे संगठन देश के लिए जो समस्याएं पैदा कर रहे हैं, मैं उन की विस्तार से चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन इतना कहना जरूरी समझता हू कि ये संगठन आज भी हमारे देश में सक्रिय हैं और कुछ लोग विभिन्न कारणों से उन्हें समर्थन दे रहे हैं। यह चिंता की बात है।

पाकिस्तान एक आतंकवादी राष्ट्र है और दुर्भाग्य यह है कि हम इसे सिद्ध नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। अमेरिका सरीखा राष्ट्र जो इस बात को जानता है, वह भी सार्वजनिक रूप से इसे स्वीकार करने को तैयार नहीं है। उस का तर्क यह है कि पाकिस्तान ने सेक्युरिटी काउंसिल के रिजॉल्यूशन 1333 को चूंकि स्वीकार कर लिया है, इसलिए वह आतंकवादी राष्ट्र नहीं है। यह कोई तर्क है? उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं परम् आदरणीय विदेश मंत्री जी से चाहूँगा कि वह इस बारे में बार बार अमेरिका से बात करें। आतंकवादियों को स्वतंत्रता सैनिक कहने वाला राष्ट्र निश्चित रूप से आतंकवाद राष्ट्र है। आगरा में जनरल मुशर्रफ का जो बयान हुआ, मैं उसकी चर्चा अब नहीं करना चाहता। इस पर चर्चा सदन में हो चुकी है, लेकिन कश्मीर में आज एक गंभीर स्थिति है। वहां लगभग 30 हजार व्यक्तियों की जान जा चुकी है हालांकि उनमें आतंकवादी भी शामिल हैं इसलिए इस विषय में राष्ट्र को बहुत गंभीरता से चिंतन करना होगा उपसभाध्यक्ष जी 10 वर्षों के अंदर लगभग 30 हजार व्यक्तियों की मौत कोई साधाराण बात नहीं है। मैं इस विषय के विस्तार में अभी नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन एकतरफा संघर्ष विराम वापिस लेने के बाद इस आतंकवाद को कुचलने के लिए भारत सरकार ने जो कुछ किया है, वह निश्चित रूप से महत्वपूर्ण है। वह निश्चित रूप से हमारे लिए गौरव की बात है। मैं सदन को बताना चाहूँगा कि इस बारे में किस प्रकार से कार्य हुआ है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, पिछले एक वर्ष में 1059 मिलिटेंट्स को हम मार चुके हैं जबकि गत वर्ष केवल 886 मारे गए थे। After the withdrawal of NICO in

5.00 P.M.

May end, 542 militants have been killed till date, as against 339 during the corresponding period last year, यह मैं अगस्त के महीने की रपट दे रहा हूँ।

Terrorists killed included over a hundred identified foreign mercenaries and five top terrorists, commandants of Lashkar-e-Taiba and Hizbul Mujahideen, यह बताता है कि किस प्रकार से अफगानिस्तान के लोग, सूडान के लोग और दूसरे देशों के लोग भारत आकर समस्याएं उत्पन्न कर रहे हैं। यह बताता है कि हम उस पर चुप कैसे रह सकते हैं।

मैं कश्मीर के बाद अब पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों की स्थिति के बारे में बात करना चाहता हूँ। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों में असम में 2, मणिपुर में 6, नागालैंड में 2, त्रिपुरा में 2, मेघालय में 2, अरुणाचल प्रदेश में 2 आतंकवादी संगठन सक्रिय हैं। मैंने सबेरे ही बताया था कि किस प्रकार त्रिपुरा में और नागालैंड में ईसाई मिशनरियों की सहायता से आतंकवाद को चलाया जा रहा है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह चर्चा आपकी जानकारी में है और सभापति जी की अनुमति से मैंने इस बात को उठाया है कि किस प्रकार से बापिस्ट चर्च ने वहां पर आतंकवाद को प्रश्रय दिया और आर0एस0एस0 के कार्यकर्ताओं की, मंदिरों के पुजारियों की और बौद्ध मठों के पुजारियों की हत्याएं की हैं, उनका अपहरण किया है। यह हमारे लिए समस्या की बात है, हम उसकी उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत सरकार नार्थ इस्टर्न काउंसिल का शीघ्र गठन करे। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि यह काउंसिल अभी प्रॉपली सक्रिय नहीं है। वैसे तो इस काउंसिल को सुरक्षा के खतरों पर हर बार चर्चा करनी चाहिए थी लेकिन, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपके माध्यम से मैं सरकार को बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस मामले पर, आंतरिक सुरक्षा के खतरों पर, नार्थ इस्टर्न काउंसिल ने अभी तक कोई चर्चा नहीं की है। यह चर्चा होनी चाहिए।

अब मैं सीमा प्रबंधन की स्थिति पर आता हूँ। सीमा प्रबंधन की समस्या बहुत गंभीर है। हमारा आकाश, हमारा समुद्र तट अब शत्रु की पहुंच के अंदर आ चुका है। हमें इस समस्या का समाधान खोजना है। गुजरात के जो हमारे सांसद यहां हैं वे जानते हैं कि गुजरात में, कच्छ के क्षेत्र में क्या स्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है। राजस्थान की स्थिति के बारे में हमारे सांसद महोदय जानते हैं कि वहां किस प्रकार की समस्याएं आ गई हैं और किस प्रकार से घुसपैठ हो रही है। हमें अपनी कोस्ट लाइन की रक्षा करनी है, हमें अपने तटबंधों की रक्षा करनी है और इसके लिए हमें नए उपाय करने होंगे। पंजाब में हम समस्या का बहुत कुछ समाधान कर चुके हैं लेकिन अभी राजस्थान में, कच्छ में हमें इस बारे में काम करना है और विशेष रूप से कश्मीर में काम करना है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सबसे बड़ी समस्या भारत और तिब्बत की सीमा रेखा है।

श्रीमती जमना देवी बारुपाल (राजस्थान): राजस्थान के लोग उनको पनाह तो नहीं देते हैं न?

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं इसके लिए राजस्थान के लोगों को बधाई देता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारत तिब्बत सीमा रक्षा की जो बटालियन है, उसको और समृद्ध बनाया जाए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): नरेन्द्र मोहन जी, अब आप समाप्त करिए।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह समस्या बहुत गंभीर है, आप कहें तो अभी समाप्त कर दूंगा।

मैं बहुत संक्षेप में अपनी बात कहकर समाप्त कर दूंगा। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि जो ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स की रपट है, उस पर हमें राजनीति से और दलगत राजनीति से ऊपर उठकर विचार करना चाहिए। उनके जो सुझाव हैं, 94 सुझाव प्रमुख उन्होंने दिए हैं, उनको लागू करने की आज आवश्यकता है। एक सुझाव पर मैं थोड़ी बात करना चाहूंगा। हमारी फोर्सिस का कोई एक हैड बने, इस पर सरकार को अभी अपना मत बनाना है लेकिन जहां तक आतंकवाद और अलगावावाद से लड़ने की बात है, उस पर हमें बिल्कुल एकजुट हो कर लड़ना होगा तभी हम इस समस्या का समाधान खोज सकते हैं।

मैं एक ही बात कहकर समाप्त करना चाहूंगा कि पाकिस्तान ने जो हमारे ऊपर छद्म युद्ध थोपा हुआ है, वह बराबर चल रहा है। महोदय, हमारा देश 5 लड़ाइयां लड़ चुका है, इनमें से 4 पाकिस्तान ने हम पर थोपीं और एक चीन ने हम पर थोपी। अब हमें सतर्क होना ही होगा। जो हमारे अंदर घुसे हुए पंचमांगी है, उनसे लड़ने का एक संकल्प राष्ट्र को लेना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अंत में मैं एक श्लोक पढ़कर अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहूंगा। मेरे पास एक किताब है "नेशनल सिक्योरिटी सिस्टम", मैं इसी किताब में से यह श्लोक पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। यह बड़ा अच्छा श्लोक है और यह "शुक्रनीति" से लिया गया है। श्लोक इस प्रकार है —

"सैन्याद्धिना नैव राज्यं न धनं न पराक्रमः।

बलिनो वशगाः सर्वे दुर्बलस्य च शत्रवः।"

इसका अर्थ है कि - "सैन्य द्वारा प्रदत्त सुरक्षा के बिना राज्य, धन और पराक्रम कुछ भी नहीं रहता। स्मरण रहे बलशाली के वश में सभी रहते हैं और दुर्बलों के बहुत से शत्रु हो जाते हैं"।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें अपने राष्ट्र को बलशाली बनाना है और एकजुट होकर बनाना है, राजनीति नहीं करनी है। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी): तथास्तु।

श्री ऐमादुद्दीन अहमद खान (दुरु) (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय सदस्य ने राजस्थान के बाड़मेर और जैसलमेर के मदरसों का जिक्र किया है। हमारे मंत्री जी (श्री जसवंत सिंह जी) यहां बैठे हैं, इन्होंने उस इलाके को रिप्रैजेंट कर रखा है। मेरे ख्याल में इस हाउस में जितने मेंबर्स हैं, मंत्री जी से ज्यादा बाड़मेर और जैसलमेर के बारे में कोई नहीं जानता। मैं चाहूंगा कि ये अपने जवाब में यह बताएं कि ये इतने सालों से उस इलाके को रिप्रैजेंट करते आए हैं, इन्होंने कितने मदरसे वहां देखे हैं जिनमें कोई हथियार निकला हो या कोई आतंकवादी पकड़ गया हो या कोई ऐंटी नेशनल ऐक्टिविटी हो रही हो विशेषकर जब 8 साल तक यानी 1998 तक वहां बीजेपी की हुकूमत थी और वहां उनके वहां चीफ मिनिस्टर थे। तो यह बार बार क्यों जिक्र होता है हमारे मदरसों का?

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA (West Bengal): Hon. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that after the collapse of the East European power bloc, after the emergence of the monopoly unipolar world, after the collapse of the countervailing power of the Soviet Union, after the emergence of the Taliban forces very near to our Northwest frontier and after the nuclearisation of a country in our neighbourhood, there has been a tremendous rise in the cross-border terrorism from the Northwest frontier. In the background of all these international developments, it is a very belated move on the part of the Government to go in for a review of national security or to institute a Group of Ministers or whatever initiative they have taken in the recent period. In fact, this has been acknowledged in the submission of the Group of Ministers Report that this is for the first time since Independence, even after this well-known increase in the threat to the security of the country, both internal and external that a serious review of our national security policy and its impacts and different ramifications on our internal security were taken up by this Group of Ministers. It has acknowledged that in most of the cases, these policies have been tackled by the over-burdened bureaucracy and the Government and the policy-makers have never cared to plug the loopholes and to check whatever problems and lapses have remained in our security aspect. The Report of the Kargil Review Committee by Mr. Subramaniam was published long time back. Even so many months after the publication of this Report, the second most important recommendation of the Kargil Review Committee to the Government was with regard to the post of the National Security Advisor has not been implemented. Even in this kind of emergence of the international situation and particularly nearer to our Northwest frontier, the country cannot do without a full-time National Security Advisor. The post of the National Security Advisor has to be de-linked from any other. All these months have passed. The second recommendation of the Kargil Review Committee has not yet been implemented.

And the post of the Principal Secretary to the Prime Minister and National Security Advisor, even after the startling disclosure and revelation through the Tehalka tapes, remains the same, to the danger and stake of the security of the country. There are many other recommendations in the Kargil Report which have already been made public and which have repeatedly been pressed by the political parties in different fora. For example, the Kargil Review Committee recommended more dissemination and interaction on security perceptions with the common people of our

country. It wanted a White Paper on the Nuclear Policy of our country. It wanted more interaction with the Chief Ministers and the elected representatives on the security threat perceptions of our country and, particularly it has recommended giving more information to the people, more disclosures to the people, regarding what is being planned at the top level of our defence mechanism and what is the defence strategy of our country. Because, in our country, defence strategies have been hardly shared with the common people. We have suffered five wars. We have suffered at Kargil. We have suffered at Siachen because of that situation. We have suffered a lot of cross-border terrorism because of that. And, even now, there are a lot of loopholes across our North-West Frontier, as admitted by the Kargil Review Committee. The loopholes should have been plugged decades back and adequate security measures, both in terms of modern equipment, intelligence and other things, should have been taken. But it has not yet been done. The Kargil Report mentioned about the deadly intelligence failure that led to the sad episode of Kargil and the demise of so many soldiers of our country. It is yet to be properly reviewed. And, who were the persons who are responsible? When the Director of Intelligence Bureau passed on very classified, secret, information for immediate action, nobody had taken any action on that. And, people concerned with security will know that intelligence information is something which is very much different from ordinary information. The intelligence information is something on which the persons concerned or the officers concerned are supposed to act immediately. This is not a mere piece of information over which somebody is supposed to sit. Despite the early warning signal from the IB, the Government did nothing. There are very rare occasions hardly the Chief of the CBI or the Chief of the RAW or the Chief of the IB passes on this kind of classified information to the authorities concerned. But why was not the early warning signal, much before the Kargil incident, adequately attended to? It is pointedly mentioned in the Kargil Review Committee Report It is not yet known to the people as to what action has been taken on that and what preventive measures have been taken on that, it is a good initiative that, for the first time, since independence - though belated and though after a lot of damage has been caused to the security of our country - a Group of Ministers was constituted and a comprehensive review has been made. The hon. Home Minister was a party to that review process, which set up four Task Forces for the purpose. I am not going into that. Hon. Minister, may I ask you, very humbly, with all humility, with all respect to your concern as well, for the security of the country, how

come our we are associating our military with the US command in the sea lanes of Diego Garcia which they want to use in order to keep a monopoly, not only over the area, but they want to use this to head towards the oil-rich Gulf? With this oil-rich Gulf, we, as a nation, are required to maintain a very cordial relationship, since our interest in petroleum import and other things are very much involved in that. How are our defence interests and national interests served by our decision to succumb to the US pressure and join them in their Diego Garcia Base and associating our military with that? I fail to understand, how our defence interests - I am suggesting this with all humility, Mr. Minister; I am eager for a reply on this - and national interests are going to be served by allowing the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the USA to open its office right under your nose, in New Delhi, for conducting all their investigations and whatever they want to do? We all know that this FBI will do all kinds of notorious activities and all other things. And we all know that this is a stepping-stone on behalf of the US administration to put up fresh pressure to have some kind of an opening in our country for the clandestine operations of a notorious organisation called the Central Intelligence Agency. Are we not to believe that when the National Security Advisor of the hon. Prime Minister, during his visit to the USA, I believe, in June, had an official meeting -- we don't know how many unofficial meetings have taken place between them - with the CIA Director? Is it not a part of the pressure of the unipolar world, international world, today, to have some kind of an opening for this notorious organization? And, are we to believe, and are we sure that the CIA, through FBI or through some other pressure, today, is not able to penetrate in the exercise and everything of our country? Tomorrow, along with the CIA, will the Mossad not come? Are we sure that the Mossad is not involved in any political assassination, damaging political assassinations that had taken place not only in this sub-continent, but also in our own country? Are we sure that none of these agencies, like Mossad, are involved in the political assassination of our former Prime Minister and many other people? Can you assure us how can, by inviting the FBI through the backdoor, opening the floodgates for the CIA to come in, our defence and national security be protected? With all humility, I want to put all these questions. A neighbour of our country wants to be the Israel of the middle-east by going into the machinations of the US mechanism. The President-converted-General of our neighbour even after going back from Agra Summit went on international Press to publicly state - and even before the Summit - that the Summit was taking place only because of the pressure

of the United States. And we had to humiliatingly succumb to that, digest that, stomach that. Anyway, that is a different issue. He is part of the trained products of the International Military Education Training Programme of the USA, which the USA is forcing to enforce on us so that we can be a full-fledged part of it. Instead of stopping all kind of military cooperation, which had started with the US from 1992, and instead of not succumbing to the pressure of going into International Military Education Training Programme in the USA, which was started in 1995, it was, very unfortunately, institutionalised in India in 1999. Although we have repeatedly been warned about their motives, their ramifications and their implications on our internal and external security aspects, very unfortunately, this Government has gone for the IMET, which is so called. And all the persons from Christiana Droka, Assistant Secretary of the United States to Henry Shelton, visited India. Why Chief of Staffs of the United States come to India, which started in 1995? Instead of stopping all these things, this Government, unfortunately, rather cooperated with them. How come? Are we competing with our neighbour to become another Israel in this subcontinent, another South Korea in this sub-continent? How can that increase our defence interests and other interests? Sir, I am not going much into that. But, given the background of the episode in Chile in 1974, given the background of Nicaragua, many other Latin American Countries, in South Africa, in Mozambique, and many other places, we should be very careful, particularly, after the dissolution of the eastern power bloc; and, after the emergence of Taliban and many other forces like that, emergence of Islamic fundamentalism about the unipolar security threats, and the possible threats, and possible internal subversion attempts that this notorious organization and organizations associated with that, like Mossad -I am not renaming it - have all been active in different countries and have been active in our country also. I am not going into that past, of assassination of our former Prime Minister and former leaders of our country. Sir, today, everybody knows the situation in Kashmir.

There are certain passes called smugglers' passes and various other passes, through which infiltrators or cross-border terrorists are coming like anything and the intelligence machinery of the Government is not able to do anything. I do not know whether the State Government is adequately taking the people into confidence. Even after it has been recommended by the Group of Ministers and everybody else, we have not realised the problem yet. The internal security problem that Kashmir, Manipur, Assam, North-East and Tamil Nadu face today, has been realised

after the loss of 30,000 lives in Kashmir; after the loss of a few thousand lives in Manipur and in the North-East; after the loss of a few thousand lives in Punjab; after the loss of hundreds of lives in Tripura and other parts ' of the North-East, and after the loss of so many soldiers in our battle with Sri Lanka. When we said "Writing a letter and having any kind of negotiations with the outlawed Tripura National Volunteer Force will be an assault on our internal security and will amount to subverting the nation further"; we were misunderstood. When we said, "the Central Government, in no case, should abet Bhindranwale or any kind of Frankenstein tomorrow, in India, because it would sabotage and subvert the country" we were misunderstood. When it goes from Lalthanhawla to Laidenga, all enemies of this country, who have their bases either with the ISI or in some other foreign country...*interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Please, don't take the name of Lalthanhawla.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: I am sorry. Sir. I correct myself they are having their bases in foreign countries; they are based in some West European countries; they are based in the South Atlantic areas; they are having operational bases in our neighbouring countries -- Chattogram and everywhere; and having sources of funds from outside. When we warned about them, when we said "you should not interact with them" we were misunderstood. *(Time-tell)* Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, you understand the seriousness of the point. I seek your indulgence. Although I have regard for my colleagues who want to speak, I will not take much time. So, we were misunderstood. After all these episodes and massacres, after all this has happened, today, it is being remedied. So, it is a very belated initiative or move on the part of the Government. We are happy that this initiative has been taken, but it is a lapse on the part of the country that all these are taking place at the cost of so many lives of the ordinary citizens of our country. It could have been averted, had we not tried to create those Frankensteins. Had those policies not been followed, the country would not have had to face this kind of a situation. Even today, we have to see how to protect the people of this country from the forces of internal subversion and from the forces which are posing a threat to the national security. Can it be done by bypassing the State Government? No doubt, some laws, like the Prevention of Terrorism Law, may be necessary. The day the Central Government thought that a law was essential, the day it came to the perception that there had been an erosion in the powers of the

Union Government and powers have been taken over in the name of federalism, there should be a reversion of the powers back to the Centre, immediately, the Government should have consulted all the Chief Ministers cutting across political affiliations, and should have had an all-round consultation in the National Council; in the Inter-State Council so that internal subversion does not take place. At the same time, all the State Governments can be involved in that process. Had this been done when the Prevention of Terrorism. Law was being enacted, when all those policies were being followed, today, it would not have happened. Now, amnesty to the security personnel in Kashmir is proposed to be given. Had the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir been consulted -- I do not believe that he was- the statement, today, of the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir and his party, and the statement, a few days back, by the same partner of the NDA, who was part of the Government earlier, but ruling in Kashmir, would not have come up in the newspapers. Sir, instead of demanding abrogation of article 370, what should have been done was not to impose, in 1953, any Prime Minister on the State of Jammu and Kashmir; was not to impose a Chief Minister, without the consent of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, on the State of Jammu and Kashmir, in 1985, bypassing the popular opinion over there. Even now, instead of demanding abrogation of article 370 and instead of curbing the autonomy that was required in order to permanently plug all the loopholes, to stop the cross-border terrorism which has taken so much toll of life, the people of Kashmir should have been taken into confidence first. After the Agra talks, in particular, there was a big threat in Amarnath, in Doda and in some other places. The Government thought that the security threat requires Central intervention. What should have been done was, immediately, the Government should have contacted the Chief Minister over there. He should have been consulted over there. Sir, before I conclude, I would like to mention one last thing. It is a pertinent point which has been mentioned in the Group of Ministers' report. And it is about the role of police in different States. There is no doubt about the fact that there has been Deen Communalisation of police force in our country. There is no doubt about the fact that there has been politicisation of the police force in our country, there has been indoctrination of the police force in our country. Armed Constabulary of a particular State was indoctrinated and communalised. All these are facts of life in today's situation. The police force has deteriorated. The standard of the police force, the service that the *bona fide* citizens of this country expect from the police force has deteriorated to a great extent. There was

a requirement for total overhauling and modernisation, which the Group of Ministers talks today, of the police forces of our country long back. But before that, before it is being planned now for being implemented by the year 2003, the Law Commission had also proposed that particularly for providing law and order, security and all kinds of amenities to the citizens which they deserve, there should be separate police personnel for the law and order in a particular police station. In order to implement all that, when this came up, why is this belated awakening? And when there is an awakening at the Central Government level, why the Central Government did not take up the issue with all the Chief Ministers of all the State Governments in different fora, which was very much required? And I want to conclude by saying that it is true that the law and order, and the internal security have failed, because of the role of the State Governments and also because of the failure of the police system in many States.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Please conclude now.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA: Sir, basically the internal security is the role of the Central Government. It is right that the State Governments have failed in many aspects, the police have failed in many aspects, but after looking at Kashmir where Central Government had the control over the internal security for so many years, after looking at the North-East, and after the total mismanagement of the extension of Naga ceasefire beyond Manipur and other areas of North-East, can it be believed that the Central Government will be able to tackle, will be able to stop the subversion and will be better able to tackle the situation after the experience that we had in Manipur and Kashmir? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman for allowing me to participate in this very, very significant discussion. My senior colleague, Pranabda has already laid the ground work for the discussion and my learned friend on the other side has also mentioned, and, rightly so, that this is not an occasion to score political points and that all of us must rise above our party predilections and look at the issue from a national perspective. What really concerns me is not the intent of the Government. I do not think we can question this Government's intention that it is very much concerned with national security. What worries me is the ability of this Government to tackle the situation. If I look at the national security scenario in our country, when we talk of national security, we do not talk merely of internal and external security, we talk about

financial security, food security and, of course, internal and external security. When I think on a holistic basis of national security, I find that our country is sliding very fast towards an abyss from where unless the Government takes some hard action, it will not be able to recover. If a Government is serious about national security, will that Government ever have a Minister who is in charge both of External Affairs and Defence? I asked myself this question. External Affairs is a portfolio where three Ministers are required -- two Ministers of State and one Cabinet Minister.

The Defence Ministry has two Ministers. That is where I question the policy of this Government to deal with issues of national security. How can a Government, which believes in national security, have a Minister, who is both a Minister of External Affairs and also a Minister of Defence? I have never understood it. What is the message that you are sending to the international community? This is where this Government compromises on national security on every issue.

We are given to understand that the reason why this is being done is that there is a Minister-in-waiting. When that Minister is cleared of certain inquiries, he will take over the portfolio. Is this the seriousness with which we consider our national concerns, in relation to national security? I need an answer from this Government on this issue.

The second issue that I want to raise is this. Recently, we had an episode, by which it was clear that our Defence services are pores in matters of national security. There was this Tehelka episode. Again, I question the sincerity of this Government to deal with issues of national security. We find two sets of inquiries which are being conducted today. One set of inquiries is within the Defence Services — Courts of Inquiry -- to deal with those individuals who were seen on tape. The other is the Commission of Inquiry, which has been set up to deal with other individuals. I think, the people of this country do not even know that under the Commissions of Inquiry Act, no investigating authority appointed under that Act has the powers of a Police Officer. That means, nobody can be arrested under the Commissions of Inquiry Act. Nobody can be interrogated in police custody. If the Commission of Inquiry cannot interrogate and arrest a person to find out what the truth is, then what purpose does it serve? You will have somebody seeing the tape; another person who is an accused, and the person who was given A.P. notice, coming forward saying, "well, I have nothing to do with it, and the Commission cannot go forward." I understand, there are two political motives of this Government in

setting up such a Commission. But when we see it in the context of national security, you will realise that the serious concerns that we people have after we saw what we saw, are not even being addressed by this Government. Forget about the hon. Ministers against whom you can raise a needle of suspicion, but there were other individuals in the Tehelka tapes who were not Government servants, who were not public servants, who were private individuals, who had made admissions on tape. Why have they not been arrested? There is no law, which bars a Commission of Inquiry, parallel with the conduct of an investigation. After an FIR is lodged, under the Code of Criminal Procedure, there is no such bar. In matters of national security, because this is of vital importance, why then has this Government not lodged an FIR, not arrested the people, not interrogated the people, who were seen to have stated on tape that they gave money to individuals for the purpose of supply of sub-standard arms to this country? Is this the genuineness of concern that this Government shows?

Sir, the problem is that a coalition Government, not based on ideology, is itself a threat to national security. That, Sir, is the problem. The reason why I say that is that you have an erstwhile Defence Minister who was keeping in his house certain individuals, who were human-rights activists, whereas the policy of the Government of India *vis-a-vis* Myanmar was entirely different. Is that not a concern of national security to us? But the Government cannot address that concern because it is a coalition Government. If it attempts to address that concern, it will fall. So, the people of this country must know that a compromise is being made on matters of national security because of the instability of a coalition of this nature. In fact, we have to look at the past three years from 1998. Today, you see the breaches of national security that have taken place. I just might mention one because the Leader of the House was involved in a trip by air from here to Afghanistan. Here was a situation when the IC 1A-814 was hijacked; a bargain was made by this Government. The Minister went to Afghanistan. Thereafter, what happened? While he was at the tarmac, the Taliban Government allowed those people to go to Pakistan. We could not do anything about it. May I know from the Minister what steps the Government has taken from that day till today to deal with those individuals whom we had to release, pursuant to our bargain that was agreed upon? These are questions that this Government will have to answer.

Sir, if you look at the Defence Budget of our country, you will understand that in the context of the security scenario, we don't have the

means and wherewithal to deal with that scenario. I will give you an indication of what our Defence expenditure has been. In 1998, when this Government came to power, our Defence expenditure was 2.2 per cent of the GDP whereas in 1990, the beginning of the nineties, it was 2.8 per cent. In the period 1990 to 1997, it came down to 2.2 per cent. In 1999, it rose to 2.8 per cent, but less than that of 1990. In 2000, it went up to 2.68 per cent, which was also less than that of 1990. Why did the figures increase in 1998 and 2000? The reason was. intrusion by Pakistan in Kargil, not that you had not any concerns. You realised that you could not jeopardise the security of this country by allowing another Kargil. So, for you, national security is a reactive process, it is not a pro-active process. If this Government has to be concerned with national security, it must have a pro-active posture. If you look at your external security situation, what proactive posture you have? Your entire policy is Pakistan-centric. But you know, Sir, this Government knows where the militants are fed, from where they are sent. It is that very Taliban regime with whom you shook hands when you went on a plane to Afghanistan. That very Taliban regime is imparting training to the militants who are ultimately sent to Kashmir. Ever since 1998, what pro-active posture you have followed towards Afghanistan? Sir, you are aware of the fact that even in Afghanistan, there is a problem. There are three power centres in Afghanistan itself. You have Ahmed Shah Masood holding power in the Panchsher Valley. You have the Dostom's Northern Alliance, supported by Uzbekistan, Tajakistan and Kazakhstan. And, of course, you have the Taliban in the rest of Afghanistan. You have Iran which has a large force on its border. What pro-active steps has this Government taken to deal with the security scenario from which the militants are bred? To strike at the roots of militancy in Kashmir, you do not need a law; you do not need the Special Powers Act. What you need is a policy to strike at the root cause of militancy. It is not in Pakistan; it is across Pakistan. The issue is not Kashmir. The issue is Pakistan, in the context of regional security.

Now, let us go to China. As late as July, which is last month, Mr. Powell met the Chinese leaders in Beijing. He told them that he had new evidence of continuing Chinese missile transfers to Islamabad. I am talking of last month. What progress has been made by the Chinese? You had, in 1993, a Border Peace and Tranquility Agreement. What steps have been taken after that to deal with the Chinese? The Chinese are now talking about the Merc missiles—one arrow, three stars—as they call it, on the border, on the Tibetan border. As far as the United States and Russia are

concerned, they have de-targeted them, pursuant to negotiations. What about India? Have you talked to the Chinese about de-targeting? They are, in fact, re-targeting. I am only explaining the reactive policy of this Government on issues of national security. This Government has no policy. In that context, I am explaining the regional scenario. You had a recent meeting of the Joint Working Group in Beijing. There was no tangible result. There was only exchange of maps between the two countries. This was last November. You could not even settle the easy middle sector of the border between the two countries, let alone settling the issue on the line of actual control. And these talks have been going on for the last 20 years! The question is, what is your posture towards China? What have you done, in terms of dealing with China, in the context of the national security of India? Remember, you are aware, the Chinese are transferring arms not only to Pakistan. They are transferring arms to Myanmar, to Bangladesh and to Nepal also. And that vitally contributes to the vitiation of India's external security environment. In fact, with Myanmar and Pakistan, China maintains strong defence ties. They are supplying, as you are already aware, M-11 missiles and technologies to Pakistan even today. So far, what have you done about it? In fact, the supply of arms to Myanmar has serious security ramifications for India. You are aware of the kind of incidents that took place off the coast of India.

Another aspect; and what is it you have done about it? Beijing is not willing to recognise Sikkim as part of India even till date. Chinese maps show Sikkim to be independent, and Arunachal Pradesh to be part of China. J and K is shown as a disputed territory, but not that part which China occupies! What, then, have you done about that environment? Your entire policy is Agra, Lahore, which also has vitiated national security, because the more you talk to them on a reactive basis, the more difficult it is to deal with them in Kashmir. And it is very surprising. I remember, and I distinctly remember, Advani talking about hot pursuits! I remember the initial days of 1998 when he talked about hot pursuits. Then, hot pursuit was given up; then, he talked of proactive policy. When proactivism was given up, then it was reactive policy. Even reactivism was given up; now, it is contemplative policy. There is no policy, Sir! The fact of the matter is that they don't have the wherewithal, and their financial situation is so disturbing that they are not able to deal with the issues relating to national security. In fact, Sir, I just give you a few figures to demonstrate as to how this Government can have no national security plan which will work. Our total Budget—and you are aware of that—this year is around Rs.60,000

crores to Rs.62,000 crores, and of that total Budget, Sir, 75 per cent-I am talking of the Defence Budget-is spent on salaries. They have a balance of 25 per cent which is spent on other outlays, and a very small percentage, ultimately, is left for buying new equipment. Now, that is the financial situation on the one hand. See our Defence commitments on the other. The Air Force has decided to purchase over a period of eight to ten years, 150 Sukhoi's from Russia of the 30-MK1 category with an approximate expenditure of over Rs.10,000 crores. In addition, we are talking about acquiring 80 to 90 AJTs with an additional liability of Rs.5,000 crores. We are to buy two squadrons of Mirages with a liability—that is about 48 craft-of Rs.2,500 crores. We have to get replacements for MIG 21 s, which is about 150 aircraft, with a liability of Rs.2,000 crores. At the Army level, Sir, we have decided to purchase T-90 tanks. Now, on the T-90 tanks, I have a very, very interesting statement to make. I was looking at the website, a Russian website* I hit upon a site which was in Russian, relating to T-90S. I then had it translated. In fact, I called a Russian expert to have it translated. And when I looked at the translation, I was appalled, astounded as to what had happened, and this relates to the T-90 tanks. It says:

"Ural that has appeared is not ready for execution of the largest tank contract: The contract on delivery to India of tanks T-90S of production 'Uralvagonozavod' is under threat of frustration. It was declared, yesterday, by the Governor of Sverdlovsk Region, Eduard Rossel, appearing before Sverdlovsk defence products producers. According to his words, many accessory manufacturers of 'Uralvagonozavod' that have appeared are not ready for realisation of such a large project (the contract envisages assembly of 100 tanks in Nizhni Tagil and 220 in India). According to the Sverdlovsk Governor, he was horrified--

He was horrified! We are not horrified; we placed the order for T-90S.

When he found out how the matters are going on for implementation of the contract. At present, 'Uralvagonozavod' has only complete contract with the Chelyabinsk tractor factory on delivery of tank engines."

"It looks like the partners from Izhevsk, Magnitogorsk, northwest part of Russia -only recently have learnt that they are the participants of the project too. As Mr.Rossel informed, some

plants of VPK (military production complex) that involved in the project, already have suspended the manufacturing facilities, and have dismissed the people".

You don't have even people in Russia to manufacture the tanks and you have placed an order for the T-90 tanks! This is your regard for national security. It is all very well to have a Group of Ministers' Report; it is all very well to have a Kargil Report; it is all very well to conceptualise as to what our national security system must have. That is all very well. But what is the ground reality? Where is the security to the people of this country? It is this that this Government has to answer. *(Time bell)*. I will take just three minutes, Sir.

On this T-90 tanks, the expenditure that they have committed is Rs. 10,000 crores. On 120 Arjun tanks, the expenditure is going to be Rs.2,500 crores. The upgradation of T-72 will cost us Rs. 1,000 crores. As far as Admiral Gorshkov is concerned, it is going to cost us a lot of money. Now the question is this. Seventy-five per cent of your Defence Budget goes on salaries. The balance goes on other things. A very small percentage is left for purchase of equipment. You made these commitments. When are you going to purchase these things? How are you going to purchase them? Who are going to give you the money? Your financial markets are down. The only silver lining is the FDIs. That also is transient. But it is now negative. You have, of course, got a surplus of 40 billion dollars. That is all. So, in this overall context, in this holistic context, where is the national security that we are talking about?

Having said that, let us now talk things nearer home. What happened since the Group of Ministers' Report? Mr. George Fernandes, in February, 1999, had announced that the Service Headquarters would be integrated with the Ministry of Defence within 30 days. What happened? We waited^a for two years. You cannot get a Chief of Defence Staff because there is rivalry between the Army and the Air Force. Let me tell you, nowhere in the world, even in the United States -Gen. Roy Chowdhury may correct me-does the person, who is the Chief of Defence Staff, belong to the Army. He belongs to the Air Force. That is not the controversy I want to get into. If you want to appoint one, appoint one. You have a Defence Procurement Board, which has been formed on paper and the clearance of the Cabinet Committee on Security has not been given. So, all the procurements are at a standstill. The same is the case with strategic command and the Andaman Nicobar Command. We are the only nuclear

power which doesn't have a nuclear command and control structure. This is the kind of concern that we have for national security. In Kashmir, our people don't have the night vision devices for battlefield surveillance even today. For instance, the Army needs 1,500 night vision devices. But they have only 200. All the procurement is struck because of Tehelka. One of the things that featured in Tehelka was Krasnopol laser-guided shells which cost Rs. 14-15 lakhs from Russia. That deal featured in Tehelka. They were, in fact, purchased, despite the fact that they failed the high altitude trials during the Kargil war. When it comes to purchases, consideration of national security and other considerations come to the fore. When it comes to the regional security, you have no proactive policy. When it comes to procurement, you have no money. When it comes to commitment, you don't fall upon anything.

One last aspect and I am done. I do believe, in our country we had agreed upon a policy that we should become more and more self-reliant. In fact, we had decided as a policy that in respect of our purchases our self-reliance should be 70 per cent. But, since 1998, that percentage has gone down. If we commit ourselves to purchasing arms from abroad and do not have the money to purchase and allow others to dictate to so as to what will be purchased and what will not be purchased, that, according to me, is the single most serious issue relating to national security. It is time this Government came out with a policy statement -not just a report of the Group of Ministers because that is not good enough- as to what structural steps at the ground level you will take to protect the people of our country from internal and external security. Let that issue be debated in Parliament. Let there be a national consensus on that issue. Wherever you feel that the national interest is paramount and your coalition partners will have to be sacrificed for the sake of national interest, please have the courage to do that. If you compromise on that, you are doing disservice to the nation and the nation will not forgive you. Thank you.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I must express my thanks and also commendation to Shri Pranab Mukherjee for initiating the debate really in a spirit of national perspective. On the basis of his knowledge and experience, he has covered a very wide ground, but he has always held that national security is a matter which is above petty or partisan politics and not for scoring points. Having paid tributes to

6.00 P.M.

Shri Pranab Mukherjee, I wish Shri Kapil Sibal had taken a leaf out of his book. Anyway, I have to deal with it separately. But I know the obsession with Tehalka that he suffers from. But that is not the issue under consideration. He has also said a lot of things so far as the Defence Budget is concerned. I am also a Member of the Standing Committee on Defence along with my distinguished colleague, Shri Shankar Roy Chowdhury. We discussed quite a bit of this when we had a debate on Defence last time. I would like to remind him that he is not totally unaware as to why this country landed itself into this kind of a situation over the last 15 years. For the last 10 years, there was absolutely a stagnation so far as the Defence Budget is concerned. The people had been talking about it. All the three services had been critical and were actually restive on this point but naturally disciplined as they are. Though he said that he did not want to enter into this question, while talking of CDS, he talked about rivalries amongst various services. If we go into this, we will have to go into many other historical instances, but the national perspective which Shri Pranab Mukherjee has placed before us prevents me from doing so. ,

Sir, I had an opportunity to discuss with Shri Pranab Mukherjee, while I initiated the discussion on a number of occasions on some of these issues. Probably, now, these issues have got accentuated; the context has changed. But, still, many of the issues remain the same because, in these matters, there is an element of continuity and an element of change. Sir, I hate, as I said, to enter into any argument with Shri Pranab Mukherjee because whenever he speaks on finance or economic matters, or speaks on defence or military matters, he always speaks with restraint and always with an idea to ensure that some kind of a consensus emerges; that more light is thrown rather than heat being generated. But since he made a fleeting remark about the Convention and on the question of the nuclear power, I would just like to bring to the notice of this hon. House the Summary Report on Kargil wherein it has been stated, and I read from Para 13.10: "Successive Indian Chiefs of Army Staff and the Director-Generals of Military Operations told the Committee that bringing to bear India's assumed conventional superiority was not a serious option in the last ten years for a variety of reasons." I do not want to read further. I am sure, Mr. Sibal himself would have seen this. And that is why, I found that his view was focussed on the future, as to what needs to be done. Another thing which is, of course, very well known, and which has been stated in Para 13.9 is:

"It is evident from the Pakistani pronouncement and the writings of those with access to the highest decision-making levels that at least from 1987 onwards, one Dr. A.Q. Haq conveyed the nuclear threat to India in a Press interview to the Indian journalists,..." and one of the journalists happens to be now a Member of this House. I do not want to go into all the other details. While participating in an earlier debate, I had also mentioned that all the successive Prime Ministers, since the Pokhran - I onwards, have contributed to the building of the nuclear capability of this country. There was only a question as to how and when this nuclear capability could be transformed into nuclear strength, as and when it is required. Even the Report goes on to say about this, and there are two or three other knowledgeable books, so far as this subject is concerned, about the nuclear equipping or capabilities of this country. In this, the credit goes to one, and the decisions were taken, as was necessary, at different points of time. One can go on talking about this; but these things have been discussed earlier and I don't want to go into many of these details. Only in a cursory manner I would refer to those points. Sir, my friend, Mr. Sibal, spoke about the Lahore and Agra summits. Of course, this book was written before the Agra summit. But, on the Agra summit, much has been discussed and I don't want to go into it again. So far as Lahore is concerned, the Report states that the Government did not lower down its guard.

I do not want to say more on it. So far as I am concerned, there are some hallucinations and obsessions of which, probably, I cannot rid myself. Maybe, there are some others who can shake themselves off those obsessions, the obsessions of my very distinguished friend here.

I would like to say, as Mr. Pranab Mukherjee said, it is the first time that such a comprehensive study of national security has been done in this country. It is both, the internal security and the external security. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee raised this point that both these aspects should be covered and the people of this country should realise that national security cannot be fragmented and it cannot be looked at from this angle.

So far as the Kargil Review Committee was concerned, it made certain recommendations. It gave its findings. I do not hesitate to admit that it has said quite a few things about our inadequacies or difficulties or the pitfalls, so far as Intelligence at various levels was concerned. It has said these things at great length. We had undertaken this review in order to remedy the things. But it was not done so after the Chinese aggression.

There was a spurt in our activities so far as reorganisation of defence was concerned. But, unfortunately, it was not possible to do much more or as much as the then Prime Minister and the others desired after the Chinese war, maybe, due to some reasons, maybe due to compulsions of development or, maybe, because of the economic decline that was caused by the war and so on. It was not that we were oblivious of the security requirements of the country at that time.

Sir, I would like to mention that as a consequence of this review committee and also as a consequence of an awakening in the country — though people had been talking earlier also about it -- people felt that there should be a thoughtful and comprehensive review of the security environment in the country because of the many changes around us. Somehow, it is always a crisis which becomes a defining moment in any country's history and that crisis makes the country decide which road should it take. Every improvement in the world has followed some or the other critical situation in a country's history. It is for us now to learn from such events. That is why, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee also mentioned about what happened with regard to the dilution of article 356. I think it was a very administrated voice. Even if he voiced it as an admonition, it should be taken in the proper spirit. But, the situation now is much more complicated. That is why, if there have been difficulties anywhere, I think an effort should be made to rectify those. Of course, I do not find myself in agreement with what my friend, Mr. Sibal, talked about coalition politics. I will not dilate on this point at great length, except saying that this tendency or this mentality of the party being equated with the Government or the ruling party being equated with the State, created misgivings and doubts and that is why there arose this unrest since there was a party dominating the scene for forty years. So, it is not as simple as that. But that is not the issue that we are discussing here. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I again don't want to go into any of the controversial points that have been raised. But on the point which Mr. Pranab Mukherjee had raised -- he drew our attention to page 12 and para 2.29 -- I am prone not to disagree with him -- probably, this could have been phrased in a more felicitous language and presented. But the fact of the matter is that this information is there -- I have been in this House for the last eight or nine years -- in the earlier Defence Committee Reports, and the Annual Reports of the Home Ministry of the successive Governments. I am afraid, my friend, Shri Sibal, despite the admonition by a senior colleague, refused to learn because, probably, he thinks that the learning process is for everybody else, except him.

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL: Why do you target me?.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: You know, this is my affinity or affiliation or something. It is there, because whenever you speak, I jot down the points. There is much more or something. But, as you said, there is no question of targeting. It is only a friendly banter, to strengthen our bonds of friendship.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): But he remembers on which issue he is going to speak.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to mention that the Committee has gone into the entire matter in a holistic way, and the approach, through the Task Forces, I think, is something praiseworthy. It is true that so far as the Task Force Report and intelligence is concerned, it has been related; and, for obvious reasons, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, and everybody else who dealt with these matters, well appreciated it. Similarly, in the Report of the Group of Ministers. But the point has to be kept in view that the global security environment has been briefly outlined. One may agree with the analysis or not agree with the analysis, in all its aspects.

Similarly, nearer at home, and also the regional impact of the problem that are arising or have arisen at home; these problems are not just the creation of only yesterday. They have been there for quite some time. That is why the Report of the Group of Ministers acquires for us the importance, so far as the future is concerned. I think, this is the issue to which we should address ourselves. Here, I would like to say, fortunately, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee as well as my friend, Shri Kapil Sibal, - now this is an encomium; this is a bouquet I am handing over to you -- talked about the broader concept of national security. I think, this report has taken note of this. This is not the first time that it has been taken note of. I myself had referred to this, while speaking on Defence last time. If I remember aright, even the 29^m Report or the 23rd Report of the Estimates Committee in 1992-93 -- if my memory does not fail, probably, the Leader of the House was the Chairman at that time - had talked about the broader concept of this. This is a broader concept; where it is the food security, it is the energy security, which was there. This is the broader concept which has now been put down in writing, probably, for a more focused attention. While certain other Task Forces dealt with other things, the matter about economics and

other things that were referred to, would be taken care of, or are taken care of, separately. Sir, it is the 19th report of 1992-93.

Sir, in the Group of Ministers' Report, I find that it is not only the broader concept of national security that they talk about; while discussing internal security, particularly, border management, again, the concept has been interpreted in the right perspective, with the right type of nuances.

Sir, I would not like to mention what kind of recommendations have been made so far as the intelligence is concerned. One can well understand; but there is* naturally a delicacy about its being spelt out in great details. In view of the inadequacy that has been referred to in this House, sometimes, a concrete plan of action has been taken.

Something has come in the press about the strengthening and even drastic restructuring of our various intelligence services, whether it is RAW--redifining their role-or IB. I think, the formation of integrated tri-services of Defence Intelligence Agencies, DIA, is an extremely important step forward.

Sir, even the other Central Forces with regard to signalling, etc., have done a yeoman's service. I am aware of how the BSF gave us information on a number of important occasions, including that of the assassination of a Bangladeshi Prime Minister, when nobody was aware of it; at 2 in the night, when the incident took place in the Chittagong Hills, the Force gave us the information. The need here is greater coordination and analysis at different levels. I think, this is the point which they are trying to do. I don't want to go into the internal security aspect of it because of the tyranny of the clock. But, here, I think, an effort has been made in the report in a very comprehensive, very critical, and in a very imaginative manner, backed by facts and figures--whether it is the Central Paramilitary Forces that have to be revitalised or how the State Police Forces have to be revamped. There are a number of other precautions that have been suggested.

Sir, about border management, I would have liked to say a number of things. But, at least, I would like to mention one thing, without going into the details. The report has brought to our notice the importance of border security. It is not the border of landmass, it is for the common people and for everybody in the country. India has 4,880 kms. of land border running through 92 districts in 17 States and a coastline of 5420 kms. skirting 12 States and Union Territories. India has a total of 1197 islands accounting

for 2094 kms. of additional coastline. There are 51 Bangladeshi enclaves area involved. I need not go into it. In fact, barring, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Delhi and Haryana, all other States have one or more international borders. Each of this becomes a frontline. Similar is the position so far as the coastline is concerned. The coastline that we have is almost equal the landmass of the country. After the ZEP, they say what things to be looked after by us. I think this, as an effort to tackle this problem from this wider angle, has to be appreciated by each and everyone of us. I think this will be a great help so far as the country is concerned and even for general information. Sir, before I close, I would like to mention as to how I have looked at this particular problem and briefly and in telegraphic terms what I expect from the Government in this because this is, I agree with Pranab Mukherjee, primarily, basically, apart from giving a lot of information is a statement of intentions. I think it is from the intentions that one derives the programmes;" one derives the policies, projects and the direction in which we have to move. Sir, at places this is a blueprint for action. It is a plan for action. The only thing is how. We have yet to be enlightened, though I know a number of things have been done and what is to be done. I think this report also highlights the problems of federal coordination. Not only the federal coordination with the States, I would like to say that the States have equal anxiety so far as the national security is concerned. Now, it is a question of approach and why it should be done. So, it is also a question not only of vertical coordination, but it is a question of horizontal coordination even within the various Ministries on a number of issues. That is why this prompted Mr. Mukherjee to say that a number of laws and other things have to be looked into. They have to be attended to early. They have also some financial implications. That is why I mentioned the Ministry of Finance. I know that the Finance Minister in this House, since I have been here, has said that so far as national security is concerned, there will not be any shortage of finances and financial support will be forthcoming. And this we have been assured by the Standing Committee also. The only thing is the financial implications wherever they have been mentioned in the report, on it I might have said something more, but that has to be looked into and very early. I think so far as the implementation is concerned, in this also there are many macro aspect and micro aspects. Here I think for both of them a very early action has to be taken and we have to take consistent and sustained steps. Practically, all the Ministries have to do this. That is why a mention is made of the Surface Transport Ministry when we talk of border security management. The other

thing that I would like to mention is with regard to the entire implementation process. Not only the entire implementation process, but even the changing scenario of environment is a very dynamic one, and it has to be watched. And then, with the participatory approach of NGOs, local institutions -- there is a reference made to all these things -- and the State Governments, an assurance ought to be given to the citizens that adequate attention is being paid to all the important issues of this country. I am also aware that something has been done. All of us, in this House, are aware, but we will, certainly, like, to know much more at a proper time; not only while the hon. Minister replies to this debate, but even subsequently, from time to time, as to what has happened. There is a report on international co-operation and there are a number of other things. I would also like to say that even in some of the problems, there are conflicting demands. When we look at the North-East, the border management will have to be taken care of. 'The North-Eastern States have to be opened up for trade, which would help in their economic development. All these issues, at one time or the other, have to be looked into. These kinds of conflicting situations also have to be resolved. I think, a range of potential solutions will have to be worked out, as they follow from the recommendations.

I am grateful to you for the time that you have given to me. But, before I conclude, I would certainly, like to make three brief comments, and they are general in nature. Had there been sufficient time, I would, probably, have gone into some of these specific matters. A mention has been made about money-laundering. The Money-Laundering Bill is before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. He has also made a mention about narcotic-terrorism. We have to be very firm, so far as investigation by the police agencies is concerned. I think we have to really revamp it. We have to revitalise it. We have to strengthen it and see that it gets all that is required. Along with it, we have to look into the judicial criminal system. No investigation - whether it is pertaining to revenue offences or economic offence or other offences -- becomes successful, unless the judicial criminal system keeps pace with the changing scenario. While our judiciary interprets the Constitution in different ways, according to the dynamics of the situation, I wish, they also take the dynamics of the situation in which the crime and the criminals today are flourishing at the international level. Here, I would like to say that even if I put it succinctly, this nexus of plutocrat-politician and the militants, which has arisen over the years, has to be broken, and I think there is a reference to this here. The other aspect of it, which we have very often talked about, is the nexus between the

plutocrat-politician and the bureaucrat. This has to be looked into because there is a reference to the Vohra Committee and many other things. But we find that the sense of urgency with which these have to be tackled, some how or the other, get held, up for one reason or the other. And, I think, the people expect from us an early and effective action on this.

The other aspect, which arises from the money-laundering, is one more kind of a nexus. It is the corporate-criminal-militant nexus, promoted by international organisations and militants. I need not dilate on this because very knowledgeable Members of the House can well interpret this particular aspect.

Lastly, if I may say so, we, the Members of Parliament, have to present ourselves not only in tackling these problems, but also in our conduct, from time to time, that will give the real sense of assurance to the people that we mean business and national security, whether it is internal or external or both, in the widest sense of the term, will be taken care of by those to whom they have entrusted this task. Thank you.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Sir, for allowing me to participate in the discussion on the security scenario, in the light of terrorist and other internal and external security threats. The dividing line or the line of demarcation between external security and internal security was very thin, and, in course of time, it appears, this line has totally been eroded and erased. Today, there are a number of insurgencies in the country. Internal problems are being instigated by foreign agencies. Till yesterday, the Khalistan Movement was there. No day passed without killings in Punjab. We are fortunate that we have been able to contain it. Now, there is terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir and other parts of the country. It equally worries the nation, as the weak economy is worrying us. These are two potential dangers that this nation is facing. Sir, sometime back, I think, a couple of weeks back, we discussed about the killings in Jammu and Kashmir and the Nagaland issue. Since then, a number of incidents have taken place. We have been reading all that in newspapers. As everybody is aware, this House is aware, the entire nation is aware, most of the insurgency in this country is revolving around the ISI. It seems to be a very powerful 'fantom'. We feel, it is a stupendous task to tackle it. It is true that it has got some international overtones also. Umpteen number of institutions like the Deendar Anjuman, which has been banned in my State, and, now, one more organization, SIMI, have come up. As hon. Pranab Mukherjee has said, fundamentalism is very dangerous. I think,

fundamentalism of any religion is dangerous to the country. It affects the peace. When we lack peace, there will not be any development. Sir, except what we read in the newspapers about the activities of the ISI, authentically, we are not aware of anything else. The Home Minister had promised to submit a White Paper on the ISI. I think it is yet to be done. Now, I am directly coming to the points because I am aware of the time constraint. The tentacles of the ISI has spread to a great extent. In this regard, I quote the hon. Home Minister. He was speaking to top intelligence and police officers in April, last year. He said that the biggest challenge seemed to be the threat posed by the activities of the ISI. He characterised it as 'waging a war'. He said, "I used the word 'war' deliberately." It is a 20-year old war, which has considerably obliterated the dividing line between the nation's external and internal security. It is a war, with a battlefield that extends from Kashmir to Coimbatore and from Mumbai to Manipur. It is a war in which every State of India is a border State." Sir, this signifies the intensity of the problem, of the role that is being played by the monster, ISI, in this country. Sir, this has been reiterated by the Home Secretary at an emergency meeting of the Coordination Centre for Anti-Naxal operations in which he alleged, "the Ministry of Home Affairs has definite indications that ISI seems to be extending all kinds of support to the naxalite groups active in A.P., Bihar, Orissa, Maharashtra and MP." This is the intensity of the problem; this is a monster which cannot be destroyed, without politically interacting with the neighbours, especially, with a country like Pakistan, which is said to be financing these activities. Sir, earlier also, I got an opportunity to speak on a similar subject where I made a proposal. This is a unipolar world. Earlier, it was bipolar. After the balkanisation of the USSR, it has become unipolar. And, the relationship between our country and the United States seems to be improving. There are such indications. When such is the case, why can't we exert influence on the United States so that it can, in turn, restrain Pakistan from financing the ISI, so that it does not indulge in subversive activities and encourage the insurgent elements in this country. Sir, it is a challenge to the country, to the nation, and I am aware that it has to be met through political initiatives only. Sir, it seems, a departure has been made. A shift from

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) in the chair]

the political initiatives of the previous two years to a decided military thrust is evident. There is a loss of confidence in political linkage. It indicates - or

one can infer - a loss of confidence in political leadership or of an abiding misplaced faith in the efficacy of a military approach. Sir, In Jammu and Kashmir, the ISI is very active; it is instigating, financing and abetting all insurgent organisations and indulging in cross-border terrorism. Recently, we have assumed more powers, as the Special Powers Act has been invoked. Sir, we welcomed it; we supported the Government on the invocation of this Act. I advised the Government --because we did not want to create any controversy on that day - that, " it is a special tool and an instrument which has to be used for a limited purpose and for a selective purpose; otherwise, you will not be able to repair the havoc the military is going to play in Jammu and Kashmir." Recently, I had been to Jammu and Kashmir. I had the privilege of talking to some local people. I had the privilege of talking to military officers. Sir, I found that it was very difficult to instil confidence among the people of Jammu and Kashmir. An inimicable atmosphere is prevailing between the Armed Forces and the civilians. Sir, unless this Special Powers Act is used only for the purpose for which it has been invoked, I think, it will result in inflicting more damage than achieving the objective set by us. That is the suggestion I want to make. Sir, our country is not threatened by just external and internal forces but also by naxalism. It is called extremism, and it poses one of the greatest dangers to the internal security of the country. Especially, in the State of Andhra Pradesh, we are facing a bigger threat from the naxalites.

We have received it as a legacy, because the people were suppressed prior to Independence, especially the areas like Telengana. We are still exploring all the possibilities to contain terrorism. But we want to remind the Government of India of its responsibility to come to the rescue of the Government of Andhra Pradesh and other States where Naxalism is prevailing. Unless you come out with a package, as you had done for the State of Punjab, for fighting terrorism, it is very difficult for the concerned States to solve all their problems. It is beyond our means, it is beyond the means of the States. Sir, umpteen number of times, we have made representations; our Chief Minister has made representations. At least, come to our rescue; provide the requisite armoury to the police; and try to share the expenditure that is being incurred by the States in combating terrorism. But, no positive response, no satisfactory response, has been received till date.

Sir, the second aspect is, this alone will not solve the problem and contain the issue because, in those areas, the youths are being more

attracted to this sort of philosophy. It is happening because of under-development, because of unemployment, etc. So, more funds have to be pumped in the areas like Telengana. Sir, some parts of Bihar, some parts of Orissa, some parts of Maharashtra, some parts of Chhattishgarh, these are the areas where naxalite activities are rampant. The Central Government should come to the rescue of the State Governments; otherwise, the tentacles of extremism will spread throughout the country. Before it engulfs the entire nation, I request the Central Government to come to the rescue of the State Governments. Please don't think that it is the exclusive responsibility of the State Governments alone. The Central Government has got more responsibility or equal, as of the State Governments.

Sir, one more factor which is posing a threat to internal security is the caste war. It is more prevalent in States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, etc. There are organisations like Green groups, Ranbir groups or some other outfits. It is the responsibility of the State Government to maintain law and order. I do appreciate the constraints the Central Government is facing when the States are ruled by other parties. But that does not mean that we cannot enforce law and order. These caste wars are posing a very big threat to internal security. These areas have been continuously neglected by successive regimes. I think that is one of the reasons why the economic inequalities have grown. It is resulting these sorts of imbalances.

Sir, with regard to the North-East, I would say that this problem is there for the past four-five decades. Since 1954, the problem in Nagaland is very aggressive. We appreciate that the Government did not stand on prestige, but bowed down before the wishes of the people of Manipur, as far as the cease-fire is concerned.

My suggestion to the Government is to have a scientific review, of the problems that are being faced in these areas. Problems in the North-East, in particular, have to be studied by a group of persons who belong to this area and who are genuinely interested in the welfare of the people of the area. They must know the history, the topography and the aspirations of the people of the area. It is not that I am saying all this on the basis of newspaper reports. Being the Chairman of a Parliamentary Committee. I myself had visited the area. I am of the firm conviction that the amount of money that is being allocated to the area is not being properly spent there. The fund-utilisation machinery there has to be strengthened and streamlined to be able to create assets and improve the standard of living of the people there. Unless you do that, you will not be able to win the people back,

leaving the path of insurgency. The same thing applies to areas affected by the Naxalite problem.

I do understand the fund limitations on the part of the Government. One hon. Member said that the allocation of Rs.80,000 crores for the welfare of women and rural development in that area was not adequate. But, beyond that, the Government cannot afford. What is more important is judicious spending and proper utilisation of funds. Mere allocation of funds is not the solution. We should also ensure- that the developments like the recent Tehelka episode, do not bring down the morale of the Armed Forces. It is the paramount duty of the Government to see that their morale is kept high and that the people have faith in the Armed Forces.

With collective efforts and sincerity of approach, both the States and the Central Government can achieve this goal. Let us make a beginning. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this Short Duration Discussion is taking place after the Kargil Report and the Group of Ministers Report on National Security have been submitted to the nation. This is the first time after Independence that a comprehensive report regarding our national security system has been submitted.

Sir, the Opposition has tried to paint a gloomy picture and has tried to put the blame on the system of Government that we are having at present. I want to make it clear as to what the reality is. After receiving the National Security Committee's report, they have decided to have a quarterly review regarding the security system. Then, every three months, they have decided to make an Action Taken Report. Then, they have decided to submit a report to the Cabinet Committee every six months. Then, they have decided to have another national security management system after five years. There are some defence institutions. For that, they have decided to establish a university, namely, the National Defence University. After having taken all these decisions, the Opposition accuses the system of the Government itself as a reason for this with which I don't agree. They say, the coalition Government system is the reason for that. I don't agree with that. They are accusing the Government as if some new things have happened in these two years. They have mentioned that in Arunachal Pradesh, 90,000 KMs land is being claimed by China. But it is not after Mr. Vajpayeeji became the Prime Minister. This has been there from the beginning. They can just go through the map of China. After the intrusion in

Kargil, the Government headed by Mr. Vajpayeeji has not at all conceded even an inch of our territory to Pakistan. But when the Congress Government was there in power, we lost 38,000 square KMs. We should not forget that. In the Pakistan-occupied Kashmir, Pakistan have ceded some land to China. How much is that land? It is more than 5,180 square KMs. During the Congress regime, the people of India lost more than 43,000 square KMs, but not during this coalition Government. Therefore, they should not raise an accusing finger against us. When you raise an accusing finger against us, two or three fingers point against you. I tried to appreciate the speech delivered by Mr. Kapil Sibalji.

SHRI SURESH A. KESWANI (Maharashtra): At that time, you were with us.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Yes; you must thank for that. I want to tell you how the security system worked some five years back. There was the arms dropping in Purnea. Regarding this arms dropping, there was a message sent by the Scotland Yard police to Delhi. They have sent a fax message. But the same message went from Delhi to West Bengal in a few days, not in minutes. Therefore, the arms dropping had taken place. At that time, the Congress Party was in the Government. They have failed to take any action. Now, they are accusing us as if our Government has failed. How could they say that a coalition Government is responsible for the security lapses? I want to ask them: did you not try to form a coalition Government? Did you not give an assurance to the President that you will prove the majority? After having failed to prove majority, you withdrew. In these 50 years, I can tell you nobody has given any false promise to the President of India. This was the first time that the Congress Party alone gave such a promise to the President of India that they could prove majority. They gave an assurance to the President, but they failed to accomplish it. Now, they say that the coalition Government is a cause for that. I tried my best to appreciate the points made by Mr. Kapil Sibal, but in vain. *...1/interruptions*... Then, another accusation has been made. Perhaps, the hon. Minister will reply to that. *...(interruptions)*... What is that? I will yield.

SHRI LACHHMAN SINGH (Haryana): Be rest assured that there will be no President's rule in Tamil Nadu.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Naturally, after the judgement in Bommai's case.

They have also accused the Government as if the expenditure on Defence is very less. But, it is not so. It is not so. I will give you the figures. During the -last Congress regime, in 1990-91, the defence expenditure, as a percentage of the GDP, was 2.71; in 1990-91, it was 2.5 per cent; in 1992-93, it was 2.35 per cent; in 1993-94, it was 2.54 per cent; and in 1994-95, it was 2.30 per cent. From 2.71 per cent it had gone down to 2.30 per cent. The same party accuses us today. How are we spending on defence? In 1999-2000, it was 2.41 per cent of the GDP; in 2000-2001, the revised estimates were 2.50 per cent of the GDP; in 2001-2002, the budget estimates were 2.53 per cent. So, it went up from 2.41 to 2.50 to 2.53. This is the expenditure we are making. They say that we are spending less on defence. It is not so. If you come to capital expenditure, from about Rs.11,000 crores, it has increased to Rs.19,000 crores. If the capital expenditure goes down and the revenue expenditure goes up, then you can accuse us that we are not doing it properly. But it has increased from Rs. 11,000 crores to Rs.19,000 crores. In 1999-2000, the actual expenditure was Rs.47,000 crores. In 2000-2001, the revised estimates were Rs.54,000 crores. In 2001-2002, it was Rs.62,000 crores. From a revised estimate of 16.23 per cent, as a percentage of the defence expenditure to the total expenditure, it has increased to 16.52 per cent. How would you accuse us in this regard? Unfortunately, today, the defence issue, the security issue, is being politicised in this august House. This is what I feel. We need not worry about that. Why have they given a gloomy picture? They want to show that the governance is poor. While we need not worry, at the same time, there can be no complacency either.

We have to look into the internal issues. In Bhutan, in the National Assembly, they have passed a resolution that they will act against the militants who are actually coming from India, with the military force. This is a resolution passed in Bhutan. Our President has gone to China. It was reciprocated by Mr. Li Peng's visit to India. Don't you feel that some confidence building measures have taken place? I feel that the Coalition Government has not failed in any area. Therefore, do not accuse the system as such.

I do feel that the internal security cannot be maintained only by the actions of police and military. If you want law and order to be maintained, people have to come along with the Government, whoever may be ruling. For that, there should be distributive justice in the economy. Economic development is there. A new phenomenon observed throughout the world,

7.00 P.M.

in the last ten years, after the WTO came into existence is that the the growth of the jobless is taking place. As we proceed, there is economic development. But, at the same time, the gap between the rich and the poor widens. In case it widens further, we cannot cope with the internal security position. Internal security is not maintained only with the gun. Internal security also means that the people must have confidence in the system, what we are pursuing, cutting across party lines. To achieve that, we have to see that distributive justice is rendered properly to the people. That does not mean only the per capita income. It means the availability of food; it means seeing that the gap between the rich and the poor does not widen, but is actually bridged.

If it widens, automatically, there will be more problems. Suppose the employment opportunities are reduced. If the people who are working in offices are not trained, if the employees who are working in factories are not retrained or redeployed, if there is a population explosion, if there are less employment opportunities, if there is a difference in the rate of growth of population and the rate of economic development, ultimately, it will have its own repercussions on the minds of the common people, on those who are actually on the street. They do the maximum possible to earn two square meals a day after exhausting their whole energy. What we have to see is that more and more employment opportunities are created in the agrarian sector. We have a different society. In America, only 2 per cent of the total population is engaged in agriculture. In Western Europe, only 5 per cent of the entire population is engaged in agriculture. In Eastern Europe, 22 per cent of the total population is engaged in agriculture, but, in India, more than 72 per cent of the people are relying upon the agricultural income. What is the agricultural income today? Twenty-nine per cent of the total GDP comes from agriculture. With a limited income, they are leading a life. India actually lives in the villages. Unless and until the allied agricultural industries take their own route, unless and until small-scale industries are protected under the rules and regulations prevailing in the country, it is very difficult for us to satisfy the educated people because they find some jobs in other countries, but not here in India. In America, we find some slow-down of the economy. They have lost more than 8 lakh jobs within one year. Actually, they have lost 8,37,000 jobs. But Japan has opened the avenues for the people who have IT knowledge. Fortunately, Japan has made a faster development in hundred years. They said, "The people who are having IT knowledge can come to Japan and have the job."

This is the first announcement made three months ago. It is a good sign, but we can't rely upon the jobs in other countries. What is the situation of the global economy? The capitalist countries require a free flow of capital whereas the developing countries require a free flow of labour. When they demand for a free flow of capital, we should demand for a free flow of labour. If they deny this facility, then we should not allow the entry of those people. But, unfortunately, we do not have money for equity. We are going in for the capital. When they are coming with FDA, they put some pressure indirectly on the developing countries. They agree to it that they will spend at least 0.7 per cent of the National income, but they do not adhere to that. All the G-8 countries did not adhere to the promise that they had made to the developing countries. So, we should not expect anything from them. With this constrained position, what I feel, Sir, is that we should not pave the way for religious fundamentalism, whichever quarter it comes from. We should protect the minorities. In the Jarkand report what they have stated is: "We are not for the economic development. We want some sort of cultural identity." In the Jarkand report, the main issue is the cultural identity. Therefore, we should not allow the religious fundamentalism to grow, from whichever quarter it comes. A person who belongs to a majority community in one area, may belong to a minority community in another area. Therefore, throughout India, we must full protection to the minorities, and we, Members of the DMK, are second to none to protect the rights of the minorities as well as the weaker sections. That is all.

Then, Sir, as regards the narcotics, our law itself has to be strengthened.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): You have to wind up now because we have to finish the debate at 8 o'clock.

SHRI SURESH A. KESWANI: Sir, he has covered all the points which we want to make!

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): It is good; it seems that you are withdrawing your name. You have given your name so late. Obviously, you don't want to speak!

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, I compliment him. He is more intelligent than me; I cannot pre-empt him! In the case of narcotics, there is a lacuna in the law. Under the Narcotics Act, the property of the person who indulges in illegal narcotic trafficking can be confiscated, only if he is

convicted for five years or more. Otherwise, we cannot confiscate his property. This is the lacuna.

Secondly, smuggling of weapons and explosives automatically takes place, unless the border security is proper and intact. A national feeling should be developed in the citizens of the country. This is another thing. I think we are able to contain cross-border terrorism to the maximum possible extent. Still we have to go further. Therefore, we must see that some improvements take place in the following areas; (1) economic strength; (2) internal cohesion; and (3) technological prowess. If we improve in these areas, I hope the internal security will be further strengthened. I hope there is no partisan politics on this issue. If any challenges come from outside, forgetting our party lines, we will stand united and oppose them. We will stand for the unity and integrity of the country and the unity and integrity of the country will be protected by all, cutting across party lines. With these words, I conclude and thank you.

SHRI DRUPAD BORGOHAIN (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving this opportunity to raise a few points on the national security issue. Shri Pranab Mukherjee had raised a very pertinent issue and this is an important issue to the nation as a whole. Actually, there is a danger to India both from the internal and external forces. Therefore, we should be serious about the internal and external security of India and we should do certain things. The feeling of both internal and external security is lacking in Jammu and Kashmir. There is a lack of internal security in some other parts of the country also. Some of the North-Eastern States are also suffering from internal security. In most of the States extremists of one hue or the other are working in such a manner that the internal security is in danger. Most of our people feel insecure in this country. The position differs from State to State. There is one position in Jammu and Kashmir and another position in the North-Eastern States and, yet another position in Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Bihar, etc. There are different situations in different States and because of that the seriousness of internal security is different in different States. Why is it so? In the case of Jammu and Kashmir, both economic and political causes are there. These problems have been there since independence. Economic backwardness, poor development of industry and lack of infrastructure, business and other developmental activities are the main reasons for this problem. The people feel that they are being neglected. Therefore, they can't consider the Government as their own Government. In Jammu and Kashmir, there is

only one industry, that is, the tourism industry. No other industry has developed there due to lack of facilities. Today, even the tourism industry is suffering from terrorist activities. People are losing their livelihood. In the context of the present situation in Jammu and Kashmir, it is sufficient to make them anti-Government, which may, ultimately, lead to anti-India sentiments. To check cross-border terrorism and to remove the external and internal threat, it is necessary that the Government should look for a political solution and also economic solution. The economy could have been improved there had all the State Governments as well as the Central Government taken up the task of generating more power and other infrastructures for industrial development in Kashmir. Perhaps, then such a thing would not have happened.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): Please be brief and conclude.

SHRI DRUPAD BORGOHAIN: Sir, I shall try to be brief. Let me come to the North East Region. The North Eastern States are a paradise for the extremist forces. Why is it so? It is due to sheer negligence on the part of the successive Union Governments shown towards proper and quick development of these States. There are some political causes which are rampant due to the history of the Region. But the dissatisfaction in the minds of the people, basically, comes from poor economic development. Infrastructure is also very poor. Markets have not been developed. Agriculture techniques are outdated. Industry is a big zero in many States of the North Eastern Region. In such a situation, people from East Pakistan and modern Bangladesh began to migrate. These illegal migrants are quite sizeable in number in some of these States, particularly in Assam. Ethnic problems are already there in these States. The illegal migrants are creating new problems and adding fuel to the fire. The successive Central Governments have failed to understand the mood, sentiments and interests of the people of this Region. The present Government has also failed tremendously in this regard.

Let me quote the latest example. Take the case of extension of ceasefire with the NSCN(IM) without mentioning territorial jurisdiction. This created a serious tension in whole of the North Eastern Region, particularly in Manipur. This decision is a very immature one signed by the so-called matured negotiator, Shri Padmanabhaiah. Who had sent him there whether the Home Ministry or the PMO? He has not understood the sentiments of the people of this Region. As a former Home Secretary, he

might understand certain things. But this time he has failed totally. He did not understand the things properly.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Please wind up.

SHRI DRUPAD BORGOHAIN: Most of the people have supported the ceasefire. They want peace there. But they are against the ceasefire with the NSCN(IM) without territorial limits. So it has created trouble in Assam. Most of the people are feeling alienated. That is the difficulty. The aspirations of different ethnic groups should be considered. Different ethnic groups have different aspirations in this Region. The Government should consider it seriously. If the Government considers it seriously, perhaps some solution may be found. Unless the Government reconsider its policy for the North Eastern Region, it would be very difficult to solve the problem there. Thank you.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 27th August, 2001.

Sir, I lay a copy of the Bill on the Table of the House.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION ON SECURITY SCENARIO

In the light of Terrorist and other Internal and External Security Threats and the Remedial Measures taken by Government in this regard - Contd

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, even though our country is passing through a severe financial crisis, our top priority has been to safeguard the security of our nation. Our Government is spending a huge amount on defence, so as to provide adequate security