

I shall now put the motion regarding consideration of the Jharkhand Appropriation (No.2) Bill, 2009-10 to vote.

The question is:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Jharkhand for the services of the financial year 2009-10, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2, 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI NAMO NARAIN MEENA: Sir, I move:

That the Bill be returned. The question was put and the motion was adopted.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER

Prime Minister's visits to Italy from 8-10 July, and to France and Egypt from 13-17 July, 2009.

THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I returned earlier today from visits to France and Egypt. Before that I had visited Italy for the G-8/G-5 Summit meetings.

Meetings of the G-8 and G-5 countries have become an annual feature. The agenda for this year's meetings was wide ranging, but the main focus was on the ongoing global economic and financial slowdown. The developing countries have been the most affected by the global financial and economic crisis. I stressed the importance of a concerted and well-coordinated global response to address systemic failures and to stimulate the real economy. There is a need to maintain adequate flow of finance to the developing countries and to keep markets open by resisting protectionist pressures.

As a responsible member of the international community, I conveyed to the G-8 and G-5 countries that we recognise our obligation to preserve and protect our environment but climate change cannot be addressed by perpetuating the poverty of the developing countries. I presented India's Action Plan on Climate Change and the eight National Missions which we have set up in this regard. We are willing to do more provided there are credible arrangements to provide both additional financial support as well as technological transfers from developed to developing countries.

India's participation as guest of honour at the French National Day was an honour and a matter of pride for us all. I wish to share with the hon. Members the pride I felt to see the brave men of our

Armed Forces from all three services leading the French National Day parade. We have a strategic partnership with France. In this spirit, in our discussions, President Sarkozy and I reviewed the entire range of our bilateral cooperation including counter-terrorism and defence cooperation. President Sarkozy was categorical in asserting that France is ready for full civilian nuclear cooperation with India.

In Egypt, I participated in the 15th Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement. NAM is the powerful voice of almost two-third of the world's nations. I recalled what Pandit Nehru had said about NAM being a moral force in global affairs. The Summit called for bringing decision-making processes in the international system, including the UN and international financial institutions, in tune with contemporary realities. I am glad that our views found widespread resonance and that the Summit heeded our call to strongly condemn international terrorism.

On the sidelines of the Summit, I met with the Presidents of Egypt, Sri Lanka, Vietnam and the Palestinian National Authority, and the Prime Minister of Bangladesh, Malaysia, Nepal and Pakistan. I found a uniform desire among all these countries to further enhance their relations with India. During my meeting with Prime Minister Gilani of Pakistan yesterday, we discussed the present condition of India-Pakistan relations, its future potential and the steps that are necessary to enable us to realise the potential.

I conveyed to him the strong sentiments of the people of India over the issue of terrorism, especially the terrorist attacks in Mumbai. We are reviewing the dossier of investigations into these attacks which Pakistan has provided to us. I also conveyed to Prime Minister Gilani that sustained, effective and credible action needs to be taken not only to bring the perpetrators of the Mumbai attack to justice, but also to shut down the operations of terrorist groups so as to prevent any future attacks.

It has been and remains our consistent position that the starting point of any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan is a fulfilment of their commitment, in letter and spirit, not to allow their territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities against India.

Prime Minister Gilani assured me that Pakistan will do everything in its power to bring the perpetrators of the Mumbai attacks to justice. He also told me that there is consensus in Pakistan against the activities of these terrorist groups, that strong action is being taken and that this is in Pakistan's own interest. The distinguished parliamentarians from different parties who accompanied the Pakistan Prime Minister also said to me that there was political consensus in Pakistan on this issue.

As the Joint Statement says, action on terrorism should not be linked to the composite dialogue process, and, therefore, cannot await other developments. It was agreed that the two countries will share real time, credible and actionable information on any future terrorist threats.

Whether, when and in what form we broaden the dialogue with Pakistan will depend on future developments. For the present, we have agreed that the Foreign Secretaries will meet as often as necessary and report to the two Foreign Ministers who will meet on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly.

5.00 P.M.

As I have said before in this House, India seeks cooperative relations with Pakistan, and engagement is the only way forward to realise the vision of a stable and prosperous South Asia living in peace and amity. We are willing to go more than half way provided Pakistan creates the conditions for a meaningful dialogue. I hope that there is forward movement in the coming months.

I have returned home convinced that these interactions with world leaders have served to further advance India's interests.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY (THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am sure the Prime Minister on both his visits had a very fruitful discussion with various heads of Government and the multilateral meetings that he attended. I note that in the Statement of the Prime Minister which was made in the House today, the hon. Prime Minister has said and I am just quoting two sentences from the statement, "I also conveyed to Prime Minister Gilani that sustained, effective and credible action needs to be taken not only to bring the perpetrators of the Mumbai attack to justice, but also to shut down the operations of terrorist groups so as to prevent any future attacks." The Prime Minister correctly notes, and I say correctly notes, "it has been and remains our consistent position that the starting point of any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan is the fulfilment of their commitment in letter and spirit not to allow their territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities against India." We have in the past, Sir, taken a position that our national stand is against cross border terrorism emanating from Pakistan. We have used expressions like State sponsored terrorism. We have said that we will not expect terrorism to become an instrument of State policy or that Pakistani soil is used by either State actors or non-State actors for engineering any form of terrorist attacks on India.

That has been our national concern. Now, all this appears somewhat inconsistent with what is stated in the Indo-Pak Joint Statement where it is mentioned and I quote it from the Statement, "Both Prime Ministers recognise that the dialogue is the only way forward. Action on terrorism should not be linked to a composite dialogue process and these should not be bracketed." Are we, therefore, to expect, in view of this Joint Statement that this de-bracketing of terrorism or action on terrorism, which has been done from the composite dialogue process, even if non-cooperation in the matter of action against terrorism is to continue, even if the non-co-operation in the matter of bringing the perpetrators of the crime on 26/11 in Mumbai is to continue, even if the State actors or non-State actors in Pakistan continue to misuse Pakistani soil for perpetrating terrorist attacks on India, all this is going to be now delinked from the composite dialogue process? The explanation which the hon. Prime Minister has given to the House today seems directly in the face of what is in the Declaration. They too seems patently inconsistent with each other. After all, India's national commitment is not going to be a statement made internally in India. But, after all, it is also going to be a Joint Declaration which India and Pakistan made. So, which of these two appears to be correct?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Sir, I have two points of clarification from the hon. Prime Minister's Statement.

Sir, the first one concerns the remarks he made on his participation as the Guest of Honour in the French National Day. Not only all of us, but the whole of India proud of the recognition that was accorded to India, We are all proud because, I think, modern democracy owes a lot to the French Revolution. In that sense also, it has been very nice to see our Prime Minister there. In that context, at the end of the paragraph, he said, "President Sarkozy was categorical in asserting that France is ready for full civil nuclear co-operation with India." Sir, it is very good. But, we have heard the reports that emanated from the G8 Summit that the G8 has put very stringent rules and conditions for transfer of technologies and equipment connected with nuclear reprocessing and enrichment technologies. And this, somehow, runs completely in contradiction with the assurances that the hon. Prime Minister himself gave to both the Houses of Parliament and to the country with regard to the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. We were promised that the Indo-US Nuclear Deal will give us full civilian nuclear co-operation. But the G8 reports suggest the contrary. So, our apprehensions from the Left are now proving correct as we had told you that such technology transfer will not happen. And, these are now not happening. If that is the case, we also heard a very disturbing report that the G8 is going to take up this matter with the NSG, so that it drafts new rules to make it conditional that only signatories to the NPT and the US's view that only the signatories to both the NPT and the CTBT as well as the FMCT be given or allowed this transfer of technology, if that is the case, Sir, the entire basis or the foundations of the Indo-US Nuclear Deal just collapses. So, we would like to have an assurance from the hon. Prime Minister on this.

The second point – the hon. Leader of the Opposition has also raised this – is this. I would like to read out three references to the discussions that the hon. Prime Minister has had with the Prime Minister of Pakistan. The first point is the second last paragraph of the Statement which I quote. I fully agree with this. It says, "India seeks co-operative relations with Pakistan, and engagement is the only way forward to realize the vision of a stable and prosperous South Asia living in peace and amity." I agree with this observation. But, this observation is preceded by two other observations which I find them in contradiction and a clarification would be beneficial to all of us and for the country. In paragraph 3 at page 2 of the Statement, Sir, the hon. Prime Minister says and I quote, "It has been and remains our consistent position that the starting point of any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan is a fulfilment of their commitment, in letter and spirit, not to allow their territory to be used in any manner for terrorist activities against India."

Underline the words 'the starting point of any meaningful dialogue'. Now, compare it to two paragraphs below. It says, "Action on terrorism should not be linked to the composite dialogue process and, therefore, cannot await other developments". Now, the starting point is a meaningful dialogue on the banning or elimination of cross-border terrorism. If the objective is to seek cooperative relations with Pakistan, then, to say that it should not be linked with the composite dialogue process, gives rise to a lot of conflicting or contradictory position. So, I would like to request the hon. Prime Minister to clarify on these points.

SHRI D. RAJA (Tamil Nadu): Sir, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister for his successful visit. Since the nuclear issue has been raised, I reiterate what has been asked by my colleague. But, coming to Pakistan, I do appreciate that India and Pakistan will have to

engage themselves in a meaningful dialogue. For me, it appears mutual accommodation of concerns on terrorism. The 'composite dialogue' should not become a conditional one. It should continue. Resumption of composite dialogue process, that way, is a positive thing to maintain relations with Pakistan. But, since the Prime Minister had talks with several Heads of the States, particularly with the President of Sri Lanka, I would like to seek one clarification. I don't know whether the Sri Lankan Tamils will be able to get any political solution to their problem; I do not know whether they will have, in the near future, a peaceful co-existence on the basis of equality in the island nation. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister raised these concerns with the President of Sri Lanka.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his intervention as well as the intervention of Shri Sitaram Yechury and Shri D. Raja. Let me be very clear and I repeat what is there in my statement, "It has been and remains our consistent position that the starting point of any meaningful dialogue with Pakistan is a fulfilment of their commitment, in letter and spirit, not to allow their territory to be used, in any manner, for terrorist activities against India." From that point, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has gone on to question the intent and what is stated on page 9, where I have stated that the joint statement says, "Action on terrorism should not be linked to the composite dialogue process, and, therefore, cannot await other developments." This only strengthens our commitment that meaningful process of engagement cannot move forward unless and until Pakistan takes effective measures to control terrorism. It does not mean any dilution of our stand. It only strengthens our stand that we would like Pakistan not to wait for the resumption of the composite dialogue, as and when it takes place. But take action against terrorist elements regardless of these processes that may lead to the resumption of the dialogue.

Sir, Shri Sitaram Yechury raised the issue of full civil nuclear cooperation. I believe, in my absence, Shri Pranab Mukherjee had made a statement either in this House or in the other House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sir, he made a Statement in this House.

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Well, if there is an opportunity, I will clarify that position in great detail. I did raise this issue with President Sarkozy and President Sarkozy was, absolutely, in fact, emphatic that France is eager to enter into full civil nuclear cooperation with India, meaning to emphasize the word 'full' to include E&R technologies. So, therefore, as far as the French position is concerned, I was very re-assured by what President Sarkozy told me. I have a Statement regarding what is purported to be the decision taken at the G-8 meeting; maybe, I think, it is too late in the day, on another occasion, I will be very happy to clarify that.

Now, with regard to what Shri Raja has said, I spent a very considerable amount of my time in my meeting with His Excellency President Rajapakse, discussing the Tamil problem. I expressed to him our concern about the plight of Sri Lankan Tamils. There are nearly three lakh people who are internally displaced persons living in 33 camps and I emphasised to him that he must take all effective

measures to provide meaningful relief and rehabilitation, but that is only the beginning of the process. Sri Lankan Government has to create conditions whereby the Tamil people's legitimate political aspirations for a life of dignity and self-respect can be met and the successful process of devolution as envisaged in the 1987 Accord with India can be implemented. So, I can assure you, Mr. Raja, that bulk of my time with the President of Sri Lanka was spent in discussing the plight of Sri Lankan Tamils. We are very deeply concerned. I explained to him that we have a legitimate concern about the well being of Sri Lankan Tamils. It has a bearing on Sri Lanka's relations with India, and, therefore, I urged him to do all that he can to satisfy the legitimate political aspirations of the Sri Lankan Tamil community. I thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up Special Mentions. Shri Santosh Bagrodia.

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Demand to remove apprehensions about the alleged rigging of electronic voting machines in the country

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA (Rajasthan): Sir, I rise to draw the attention of this House to the allegations made by certain persons and activists about the possibility of rigging through EVMs. It has been claimed that the EVMs could be manipulated to favour a particular party or person with the use of particular software. While it is inconceivable that in the 21st Century, certain groups can scandalize a tested technology, yet I seek urgent attention of the Election Commission and the Government to this controversy. Though the Election Commission has reposed faith in the efficient and foolproof working of the EVMs, yet a vocal section of public and activists are still unconvinced of the EC's response. It has also been claimed that certain European countries are withdrawing EVMs to ensure transparency. Prior to recent revelations, two technical Committees were set up by the Election Commission in 1990 and 2006, headed by Prof. Indresan, which, on both the occasions expressed satisfaction over safety measures installed in the machines. I would ask the Election Commission to set up another Committee of Experts to interact with these activists and technical experts and come out with conclusions. It has also come to light that the production and accreditation of the EVMs was outsourced to private companies by the concerned PSUs BEL and ECIL. I would like that the Election Commission should issue guidelines on the outsourcing by the PSUs and report to this House within a stipulated time. The EC should formulate elaborate voting system guidelines like in the USA.

Demand to increase the Haj Quota for Andhra Pradesh

श्री मोहम्मद अली खान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): महोदय, मैं विदेश मंत्रालय का ध्यान हाजियों खसूसन आन्ध्र प्रदेश के हाजियों को पेश आने वाली मुश्किलात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ। हर साल हिन्दुस्तान से तकरीबन डेढ़ लाख लोग हज पर जाते हैं। पिछले कुछ बरसों से इन डेढ़ लाख में से सिर्फ एक लाख सीटें ही हज कमेटी के जरिए जाने वाले हाजियों को दी जाती हैं और बाकी पचास हजार सीटें प्राइवेट टूर ऑपरेटर्स के हवाले कर दी जाती हैं, जिससे सिर्फ पैसे वाले लोगों को ही फायदा होता है। गरीब मुसलमान हज कमेटी के जरिए हज पर जाने से महरूम रह जाते हैं, जिसमें खर्चा भी कम होता है। भारत सरकार ने हज कमेटी के जरिए जाने वाले एक लाख हाजियों के लिए हर सूबे का अलग अलग कोटा मुकर्रर किया है। निहायत अफसोस की बात है कि विदेश मंत्रालय ने आन्ध्र प्रदेश के