

factured, are classifiable under Chapter 29 or Chapter 32 of the Central Excise Tariff.

(11) G.S.R. No. 1145(E), dated the 8th October, 1986, exempting rock phosphate, in any form, falling under sub-heading No. 2505.00 of the Schedule to the Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985 from the whole of the duty of excise leviable thereon provided it is used as fertiliser or as an input in the manufacture of fertilisers. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3139/86 for (1) to (11)].

IX. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure):—

(i) G.S.R. No. 1080(E), dated the 13th September, 1986 publishing the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 1986.

(ii) G.S.R. No. 1105(E), dated the 22nd September, 1986, publishing the Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Amendment, Rules, 1986.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3123/86 for (i) and (ii)].

#### **Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1986**

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir I also beg to lay on the Table under sub-clause (a) of clause (2) of article 123 of the Constitution a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Coal Mines Nationalisation Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1986 (No. 7 of 1986). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3121/86].

#### **CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**The security lapses and inadequate Security Arrangements for High Dignitaries at Rajghat, Delhi on October 2, 1986**

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman Sir, I call the

attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the security lapses and inadequate security arrangements for high dignitaries at Rajghat, Delhi on October 2, 1986 and the steps taken by the Government to revamp the entire security set up in Delhi.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Mr. Chairman, Sir, Government fully share the concern and shock of the Hon'ble Members and the people of the country at the attempt made on the life of the Prime Minister, when he had gone to pay homage at the Samadhi of Mahatma Gandhi on the 2nd October, 1986. Government condemn this dastardly attempt.

Government recognise that there were serious lapses in the security measures taken by the personnel of the agencies connected with the VVIPs' security and deeply regret the same.

Five Delhi Police personnel, including the Additional Commissioner of Police (Security), were placed under suspension for grave negligence of duty.

At about 6.54 A.M., the Prime Minister entered the complex and when he had walked a few feet the miscreant fired the first shot. While the President, the Prime Minister and others were returning from the Samadhi, the second shot was fired at about 8 A.M. In quick succession the third shot was fired. By this time the VVIPs had been taken out of the main gate of the Samadhi. The Security officials detected the presence of the miscreant, opened fire, surrounded the area and commanded him to surrender. He jumped down from the canopy and was apprehended by the security officials. He was arrested.

The miscreant first gave his name as Manmohan Desai. He subsequently

changed his name several times. On sustained interrogation he revealed his name as Karamjit Singh s/o Amar Singh, resident of 388 Sahid Uddham Singh Road, Sunam District Sangrur, Punjab.

Six persons received minor pellet injuries. Three of them belonged to police organisations.

A case was registered at the police station Daryaganj u/s 307 IPC read with sections 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act and sections 3/4 of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985. Investigation of the case has been entrusted to the CBI. After interrogation of the accused, 4 more persons were arrested in the case. The CBI is continuing its detailed probe into the matter.

A comprehensive review of the security arrangements for the PM has been carried out and measures to strengthen them have been taken.

A Committee headed by the Cabinet Secretary was constituted to inquire into the sequence of events leading to, and all facts relating to, the attempt on the life of the Prime Minister, to fix the responsibility for security lapses, and to suggest specific measures necessary for the strengthening of the security arrangements for the Prime Minister. The Committee has submitted its report on 31.10.1986. Follow up action on the report is being taken.

I assure the Hon'ble Members that no effort will be spared to ensure the safety of the President and the Prime Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when attempting to establish accountability for the Government's continued, repeated and serious security lapses, I find that I cannot any longer approach the task with only a sense of great disappointment. We have long passed the stage of being disappointed by anything

that this Government does or does not do, by its continuous, crass and near-criminal failures—criminal because this Government has failed in its primary responsibility of protecting the life, liberty and security not just of its ordinary citizens but indeed of high dignitaries of State as well. Sir, I am also beyond anger in approaching this task. This uncoordinated, directionless rabble mis-called Government is not deserving of our anger. I find that there is really only one way in which we can approach this task, when attempting to establish accountability for the repeated failures of the Government; there is only one approach which is befitting this Government, and that is contempt. And that is contempt. It is contempt at your total incompetence, contempt at your repeated inability to protect even your own party leader whom otherwise eulogise in fawning terms and whose feet you do not fail sycophantly to touch on every occasion, it is contempt at your failure to protect the ordinary citizen, it is contempt at your attitude that when an attempt is made on the life of the President of the Republic not a wrinkle appears on your smooth, well-fed, faces. When, therefore, we came to this House today after the break and a statement was made by the Government on as important an issue as an attempt on the life of the President and the Prime Minister of the country, we really looked forward to something more substantial in the statement than had already appeared in the newspapers. What you have stated in Parliament is actually what you are announcing to the nation, as your approach to that attempt on high dignitaries of State. What, Sir, is the track record of this Government? I do not want to go into the daily killings in Punjab or the failures in the north-east and I do not also want to go into the entire saga of the continued failures because it is on account of your failures that from 31st October 1984 from 1. Safdarjung Road, to 2nd October 1986, at Rajghat the path is littered with

[Shri Jaswant Singh]  
corpses of many eminent and not so eminent Indians—a Prime Minister of this country, eminent Members of Parliament, of this House and the other House, ordinary citizens of the country, a former Chief of Army Staff, a head of a political party; the list is endless. In the month of July this year had taken place a debate in this very House on the question of security in Delhi and the honourable Minister of State for Home—he was then holding the portfolio and he piloted the debate—answered some of the observations that some of us who then participated in the debate had made. And we had then occasion to point out to the honourable Minister that what characterises the entire security system, the entire security apparatus, in Delhi is its over obtrusiveness and its inefficiency; its ineffective and autonomous, not answerable to anybody; that in the kind of the system that is the system that prevails in Delhi. It is entirely VIP-oriented and yet it fails to provide security even to those very VIPs. Please reflect carefully and thoughtfully on just two examples. The latest status symbol in the capital city of India has become the number of security guards that accompany you. And the VIPs are not just content with the number of security guards that accompany them. There is a kind of unstated competition that only the Delhi Police is accompanying you, I am accompanied by commandoes, it is only commandoes that accompany you, I am accompanied by a police escort. One has to effect very deeply where we are bringing this capital city to. The second example is a photograph that appeared on the occasion of the late Prime Minister's death anniversary. It was carried by the *Indian Express*. I do not know how many in the Treasury Benches or how many in the Opposition or how many Indians, reflected on that photograph. It showed the Prime Minister and his family deep in meditation sitting where late

Mrs. Gandhi was cremated. That photograph is a telling example of the true face of India today. Between the members of the first family, behind every member of the first family of the country, there was one security man and behind them there was a screen of seven or eight men standing. If while paying homage to the late Prime Minister, the Prime Minister of India has to be accompanied by two dozen security men, then surely, if this is not the most telling example of where you have brought the security set-up of the country to, then I do not know where to find another example.

Just one other small illustration. After the 2nd October incident Doordarshan reports in its news cast somewhat like this and this is how the Doordarshan puts it:

“Attempt on the Prime Minister's life...”

—I am not quoting the exact words—“...Six injured. Dignitaries safe.”

Please reflect and reflect very deeply on what you are doing, what kind of a system you are creating. That is why I say that it is obtrusive, it is inefficient and it is ineffective and it is totally VIP-oriented whom too it fails to protect. Somebody met me last evening who has stayed in Manila. My friends on the Treasury Benches might be angered when I mention Manila. But I do beg of them to reflect on what I say. A gentleman who had spent some time in Manila came to Delhi and he tells me: “In Delhi, I find that there is the perpetration of the Manila Syndrome.” What, Sir, is the Manila Syndrome? The Manila Syndrome is that every house of any public official, of any holder of public office, becomes a barbed wire enclosure and in Manila, they had gone to

the extent of installing armoured cars inside the house! We are only slightly short of that. How can I treat all this as an example either of your success or the efficiency or the effectiveness of your security system?

In the honourable Minister's statement itself the phrase used is "VVIPs". We are perhaps the only country in the world to use this style who use the phrase "VVIP", and when we run out of emphasis, we say, "VVVIPs". Please reflect on what we are doing. The Government is coming forward with a statement on as serious and as important a matter as an attempt on the Prime Minister's life and it is not even worded in proper English! It says, "VVIPs" and then it ends by saying, "apologise for the same". This is the Government of India making a statement. You are now by this statement, for the first time, making an official pronouncement on what your reaction is and what the country's reaction is to that dastardly attempt on the life of our highest dignitaries, the President of the Republic and the Prime Minister of the land. I will go still further, Sir. Why is it that we have reached here? We have arrived here because of what I call the phenomenon of proliferating instrumentalities. For every crime you want to come forward with a new legislation and for every criminal, you want to come forward with a new force. It is a matter for all of us to reflect on: what a proliferation, what a bursting nova of multiplying forces! Nobody knows who commands which force, who is co-ordinating which force, who is responsible for what action and so on. Only in the last summer session of Parliament we had an occasion to witness something. In the Lobby of Parliament, a security guard was sitting because this is the only air-conditioned place in the whole of the Vijay Chowk area. He was sitting in the cool comfort of the Lobby of Parliament. Accidentally his finger pressed the trigger and there was a

1334 RS—9.

burst of fire. It is, therefore, that I put across that the securitymen themselves are most dangerous element inside Parliament. I say that the most dangerous elements inside Parliament are the personal security guards that accompany the Ministers as the latest status symbol. Not one recognises another and even the Ministers do not recognise them and they are the greatest symbols of inherent instability and insecurity inside Parliament. Sir, along with this phenomenon of the new instrumentality is what I call sequential polyandry. Why do I call it as sequential polyandry? For the same problem, when one force does not suffice, like a woman taking another husband saying, "It does not matter, I will take another husband." You create another force. And this all I call the phenomenon of sequential polyandry, and you are combining this proliferation of agencies, proliferation of new instrumentalities with sequential polyandry. And along with that what are you doing? There is a total absence of coordination, and there is a total absence of intelligence input—intelligence input in both its aspects: intelligence in the sense of inherent brain-power and intelligence in the sense of being able to deduce from what comes to you as information. It is little wonder, therefore, that we had a situation on the 2nd of October, which is Mahatma Gandhi's commemoration day; on the 2nd of October an attempt is made on the two principal servants of the country.

Sir, I would like to conclude and then come to my questions I will take only two minutes. I repeat, Sir, that the single greatest factor affecting the security of the dignitaries of this country is the Government of India itself. That is the single greatest factor affecting their security. A very eminent journalist some months ago had written that this Government comprises of one Prime Minister, one

[Shri Jaswant Singh]  
cousin and one school chum. Now, I am sorry to say that that cousin seems to be removed from the administration of Home Affairs, and, therefore, the Government has now been reduced to perhaps just one Prime Minister and...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There must be some relevance. I have been very patient. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Is it fair on his part to cast a slur on... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Go on.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Soon after the attempt—this is my first query—soon after the attempt, we believe that the Prime Minister gave a statement in an interview possibly to a journal brought out from Thailand, and in the Prime Minister's statement it was reported—the Prime Minister himself stated—that in the attempt that was made on the President's life there was an element of Pakistani collusion. I am sorry Sir, I would like to take just two minutes to elaborate this point because this is a very important, serious point. I do not for a moment doubt that Pakistan would be deeply interested in exploiting our domestic discomfiture in every respect; I would be extremely surprised if they do not do so. However, when the Prime Minister himself makes a statement, then it acquires a certain loadedness, a certain inherent value, which makes us all reflect very deeply. The Prime Minister has said that this attempt on his life was made with Pakistani collusion, by a man with that country-made system. This compromises the credibility of whatever other things he might have to say. Therefore, I would like to know: what is the correct information in this particular respect? What did the Prime Minister say what is the Government of India's information and what is your stand?

My second question. There are reports that appeared—some official spokesman referred to them—that preceding this event news-items had appeared in 'Jung', and there were some news-items in Karachi and there was a fluctuation in the currency values, and such other details in Pakistan. What are the details of these? We would like to be informed.

Third question. A news appeared soon after the attempt that the Intelligence Bureau had in fact before the incident warned the Government that it had a certain information that an attempt would be made on the Prime Minister's life on this day, that the attempt will be made at Rajghat by a man dressed as a 'mali', or some such other details. We would, therefore, like to know, what is the truth behind these reports that had appeared? If the reports are correct, what did the Government of India do about them? And thereafter who is responsible for this failure?

I have just one or two brief comments to make on the statement proper in addition to what I have already said. In para 4 of the statement, the hon. Minister says that the miscreant fired his first shot at about 6.54 A.M. Then he goes on to say that the second shot was fired at about 8.00 A.M. You have missed out the most important aspect of this whole sequence. What you say is that a shot was fired. If a shot was fired, what reactions took place? What did the security forces there do? How do you now say that it was a shot? A shot is fired at 6.54 A.M. and nothing happens until 8.00 O'clock when two more shots are fired. What happened in this period? What did the security forces do? What did the Government of India do to protect the two highest dignitaries of States?

Sir, my next question relates to the very next aspect. The security officials detected the presence of the miscreants. How did they come to know where the miscreants were hiding?

There are reports that the security personnel who were there were completely flummoxed. They had no idea from where the shots had come. You say that the security officials detected the presence of the miscreants. How? By what method? (*Time bell rings*) Sir, I will conclude in one minute. Then he says: "opened fire". It raises a very serious question. At whom did they open fire? Towards whom did they open fire? If there was one miscreant, by opening fire at him were they not going to destroy the evidence? Were they not going to destroy the whole aspect of who had perpetrated or who had wanted to perpetrate this crime? At whom was this fire opened? I do not want to go on to various other issues that arise except two things. One is that the Committee has already submitted its report on 31st of October and follow-up action on the report is being taken. I do not want the other details of the committee's report. But I would like to know whom has the Committee found responsible. Who is responsible for this event that took place on the 2nd of October? In the ultimate sense, you can dismiss, suspend and remove as many police officers as you might like. In the ultimate sense, the responsibility is that of the Government of India and the Ministry of Home Affairs. Why has the Minister of Home Affairs not been taken to task? Why has not anybody in the Ministry of Home Affairs had the sufficient moral courage to stand up and resign? I think it is only befitting and proper that the Home Minister, in recognition of the gross failure that has taken place on the 2nd of October, 1986, accepts his responsibility and resigns. That would be a befitting recognition of the failure of the entire security set up. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gopalsamy. The hon. Members will be brief and not repeat.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I shudder to think what

would have happened had Karamjit used a sophisticated automatic weapon or a hand-grenade on the 117th birth anniversary of the Father of the Nation? It would have been a blood bath and mass assassination of the dignitaries of the State at Rajghat on 2nd of October. Sir, our whole security system has become a laughing stock before the eyes of the world. The gaping holes and the monstrous lapses have been fully exposed. The blue book which contains detailed guidelines for the Prime Minister's security specifies that the place scheduled to be visited by him must be placed under surveillance at least 72 hours before his arrival. And then surveillance must be followed by an intensive search during the last 24 hours before the Prime Minister's arrival. But here, Sir, only 13 hours before, a search party entered the Rajghat area and after a cursory look at the bushes at the ground level, they went away. Sir, even a lay man would have looked at the creeper-covered canopy. When the first shot was fired, it is unbelievable that not a single one amongst the 250 security personnel

present from different agencies was able to make out as to what it was. Such a security system we have. But what happened to the bullet? A crudely manufactured one-inch diameter ball had fallen into a flowerbed behind the Prime Minister. One of the policemen present soon noticed it. But nothing happened. One of the dogs did show an abnormal behaviour near the concrete structure. Even then it was not taken seriously. Sir, it is an unpardonable criminal negligence of the police and the security that they did not check even after this the creeper-covered canopy where Karamjit lay waiting for his next opportunity. Sir, 60 valuable minutes have passed. There cannot be any reasonable explanation for the callous attitude of the Security there. The criminal acts of omission and commission gave Karamjit two more chances to

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]  
try his luck as if, I can say, some security agencies were keen that he succeeds somehow.

Sir, a report appeared in the 'India Today' of October 31, 1986 says like this and I quote:

"The security failure was all the more glaring because the Intelligence Bureau's Additional Director P. K. Mullick, had personally informed Gautam Kaul of an unusual tip-off from the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW) about a possible assassination attempt. The secret information, obtained in Ludhiana, had been passed on by RAW Director Ranjan Roy, on September 27 to all groups—including the SPG—responsible for protecting the Prime Minister. It read: 'According to an unverified report, an attempt would be made on the life of our Prime Minister when he goes to Rajghat on October 2, 1986, to lay a wreath on Gandhiji's samadhi. The would-be assassin, a clean-shaven Sikh, was victim of the Delhi riots. He is likely to approach the area in the guise of a mali (gardener) and would hide himself in the bushes nearby'."

What action was taken on this? I would like to know from the Home Minister whether such a report was sent by the Research and Analysis Wing. Then why was it not taken seriously? Even after this report, they have not cared to make a thorough search of the Rajghat area. And even the Prime Minister has said that people in Pakistan were enquiring about the assassination attempt even 20 hours prior to the episode; that shows the for eign power being involved in this tragic episode. Sir, why were the Prime Minister and the President taken again on the same route? I should get a categorical reply from the Home Minister because the principle of the Blue Book that was ignored was the planned unpredictability. As far as

possible, the Prime Minister must not follow predictable routes. Sir, here the Prime Minister came the same way again and the gunman could plan for it without any difficulty. Sir, even after the second shot and the third shot were fired, how the security people reacted? Instead of pouncing upon him to catch him alive they fired in panic. Fortunately he was not killed. Otherwise vital evidence would have disappeared outright.

Sir, after the assassination of Madam Gandhi it is clear that the life of our Prime Minister is in danger. Nineteen times the amount of expenditure has been increased in the name of revamping the security system. Today in Delhi, the capital city of the country, you can see police men all around. You can see them in every nook and corner. Wherever you go, you can see them. You have increased their number. I do not think in any democratic country, you will have such enormous security arrangements. I do not object to the expenditure aspect. But what is the use? There is no coordination between different agencies. You have the SPG, and national security guards and your famous black cats and commandos but their loyalty is divided. There is no proper coordination. Then there is the most ridiculous statement of the Delhi Police that they were overburdened because of the Indo-Australia Cricket Match. This is the behaviour of the Delhi Police. If it could be an excuse that they were overburdened because of the Indo-Australia cricket match, what will happen if riots, continuous riots take place in many parts of the country?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Were they interested in the cricket match or the security of the players?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What a ridiculous statement was made by the Delhi police. Sir, what are you going to do now? After this episode they have started completely destroying the bushes, gardens wherever the P.M. goes. When the rail accident took place some years back, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, the then Railway Minister, resigned, claiming res-

possibility. Is it not the responsibility of the Home Minister of this country, as Mr. Jaswant Singh has stated, and should he not have resigned? Now, instead poor Gautam Kaul has been sacrificed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Yes, I am concluding. Sir, the most ominous message to the country is identical to what the IRA terrorists gave to Margaret Thatcher after the Bristol Hotel explosions that to survive you need luck and success every time repeatedly but we need luck only once. That is the attitude of the terrorists. So, the country is fully disappointed at the security system. I would therefore demand that the Government should take the responsibility and the Home Minister should resign. It is my demand. For the earlier questions, I expect our Minister, Sri Chidambaram, to give an explanation.

**श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश):** मान्यवर, दो अक्टूबर की घटना इस बात का प्रमाण है कि इस देश का साधारण सा व्यक्ति जिसकी कुछ उम्मीद भी ज्यादा नहीं हैं सारी प्रशासन क्षमता का, हमारे देश की जो सुरक्षा व्यवस्था है और सम्पूर्ण गृह मंत्रालय की असफलताओं का पर्दाफाश कर सकता है।

मान्यवर, दो अक्टूबर को घटना घटित होती है और जैसा कि समाचार पत्रों से जानकारी मिली है कि उस स्थान पर करमजीत नाम का व्यक्ति करीब करीब कोई कहता है तीन दिन पूर्व से कोई कहता है 5 दिन पूर्व से और यहां तक रिपोर्ट आयी है की करीब करीब एक सप्ताह पूर्व से उस स्थान पर बैठा हुआ था, टिका हुआ था। जब वह गिरफ्तार किया गया तो उसके पास से मच्छरदानी बरामद हुई है, उसके पास से कुछ दवाएं बरामद हुई हैं और साथ ही साथ उसके पास से एक दंसी पिस्तौल भी बरामद हुई है। इसके साथ ही कुछ खाने पीने की चीजें भी बरामद हुई हैं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर से संबंधित ब्लू बुक से कुछ जानकारी हमको मिली है। ब्लू बुक में इस बात का स्पष्ट प्रावधान

है कि जिस स्थान पर प्रधान मंत्री जी को जाना है उनके कार्यक्रम के कम से कम 72 घंटे पूर्व उस स्थान पर सैक्योरिटी को पहुंच जाना चाहिए और वहां की सारी चीजों की जानकारी छानबीन करनी चाहिए। राजघाट में यही एक ऐसा स्टक्चर था जहां पर कोई व्यक्ति अपने को छिपा सकता है। केवल इसी स्टक्चर को छोड़कर राजघाट में कोई भी ऐसा स्थान नहीं है जहां कोई भी व्यक्ति अपने को छिपा सके।

दूसरी इस बात की भी चर्चा हुई है, जसवंत सिंह जी ने चर्चा की है कि पाकिस्तान एक उच्च दैनिक समाचार पत्र निकलता प्रकाशित होता है कराची से। समाचार पत्र हैं दैनिक दंग से चार पत्र। जिस दिन यहां घटना घटित होती है दो अक्टूबर को उस दिन के समाचार पत्र में इस घटना की पूरी चर्चा हुई थी और इस बात को समाचार पत्रों के पत्रकारों ने बताया। इस समाचार के जरिये पाकिस्तान के अनेक समाचार पत्रों में इस बात की जानकारी करने कि कोशिश की गयी।

फोन के द्वारा कि क्या इस प्रकार की कोई घटना वहां घटित हुई है दो अक्टूबर को घटना घटित होती है। इसी दो अक्टूबर को वहां के समाचार पत्रों में इसी प्रकार के समाचार छपते हैं।

दूसरे वक्तव्य में इस बात को बताया गया है कि मामले की जांच पड़ताल केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो को सौंप दी गयी है। केन्द्रीय जांच ब्यूरो द्वारा इस बारे में जांच जारी है। दो अक्टूबर को प्रधान मंत्री, राष्ट्रपति मौजूद थे। वहां पर दिल्ली के उपराज्यपाल भी थे और अनेक मंत्रिमंडल स्तर के मंत्री थे। सारे मामले की अभी जांच वहां पर चल रही है। कैबिनेट सचिव श्री बी० जॉ० देशमुख की रिपोर्ट 31 अक्टूबर को प्रस्तुत कर दी गयी थी। लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आ रही है कि किस प्रकार से सरकार इस नतीजे पर पहुंच गई कि वहां पर जो व्यक्ति उपस्थित था वह केवल प्रधानमंत्री की ही हत्या कराने की नीयत से गया था। इस बात



[श्री सतन प्रकाश मानवोर]

को मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि वहाँ पर अनेक बी आई पी लोग मौजूद थे, राष्ट्रपति जी मौजूद थे। सारे मामले की अभी जांच चल रही है और 31 अक्तूबर को यदि 4 दिन पूर्व श्री बी जी देशमुख अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत कर चुके हैं। मैं जानना चाहूँगा कि कैसे सरकार इस नतीजे पर पहुँच गयी कि करमजीत जब वहाँ पर गया था तो केवल प्रधान मंत्री की हत्या का ही उसका उद्देश्य था। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि जो सी बी आई की जांच हो रही है वह निरर्थक है। इसमें तथ्य क्या है इसकी पूरी जानकारी हम चाहते हैं। सरकार अपने निर्णय को सी बी आई की जांच पर थोपना चाहती है।

तीसरे इस बात की जानकारी भी हुई है कि वहाँ पर एक कोई फोटोग्राफर था जिसका नाम था पुरुषोत्तम। हमारे देश में लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था है। लोकतंत्र में पत्रकारिता का एक महत्व है। एक फोटोग्राफर जो वहाँ पर उपस्थित था यह बात जानकारी में आयी है कि उसने इस घटना की फोटो ली थी तो किसी पुलिस अधिकारी ने उसकी फोटो रील को जब्त कर ली। मान्यवर यह बात बहुत ही गैर लोकतांत्रिक है और मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस प्रकार की घटना वहाँ पर घटित हुई थी या नहीं? किस के आदेश से पुरुषोत्तम फोटोग्राफर की जो रील थी उससे छीन कर जप्त किया गया?

इस देश में इस प्रकार की घटनाएं घटित हो रही हैं। गांधीजी की भी यहां पर हत्या 30 जनवरी, 1948 को की गयी थी। गांधी जी अपनी सुरक्षा में विश्वास नहीं रखते थे। उन्होंने मना कर दिया था कि मेरे लिये कोई 1.00 P.M. सुरक्षा व्यवस्था नहीं जाये। लेकिन फिर भी 31 अक्तूबर 1948 को दुःखद घटना घटी है।

अगस्त के महीने में जनरल बैथ की हत्या की गई और मुझे यह देखकर भी बहुत कष्टकर लगता है कि इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री हर वर्ष की भांति 15 अगस्त को कम से कम पिछले दो वर्षों से जब भाषण देने के लिए जाते हैं या किसी प्रजा-

तंत्री देश का प्रधान मंत्री इस प्रकार से अपना भाषण देने के लिये जाते हैं तो उनके आस पास एक दर्जन कमान्डोज स्टेनगन लिये हुए खड़े रहते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी के सामने शीशे का एक केज होता है जो बुलट प्रूफ होता है और प्रधान मंत्री जी बुलट प्रूफ जाकेट पहने होते हैं। जहाँ तक प्रधान मंत्री जी के निवास का प्रश्न है, इस देश की जनता उनके निवास स्थान की सड़क रोस कोर्स पर नहीं जा सकती है। वह रास्ता जनता के लिये बन्द कर दिया गया है। मान्यवर, मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री की सुरक्षा, इस देश के राष्ट्रपति की सुरक्षा के हम सब हामी हैं हम सभी चाहते हैं कि उनकी सुरक्षा की पूरी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। हमारा कहना सिर्फ यह है कि हमारे नौकर शाह जिनके हाथ में सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था है और जो इस सुरक्षा के लिए जिम्मेवार है कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं है कि राष्ट्रपति या प्रधान मंत्री को वे आप जनता से दूर केन्द्र बनाकर रखना चाहते हैं क्योंकि समाचार पत्रों से पढ़ने को वह मिला है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह सलाह दी गई है कि वे सार्वजनिक उत्सवों में जाने से मना करें और जो अन्य प्रकार के सार्वजनिक समारोह हैं उनमें कम से कम जाने का प्रयत्न करें। यह भी कहा गया है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी सार्वजनिक रूप से जिस प्रकार से लोगों के बीच में जाते हैं ऐसा प्रधान मंत्री को नहीं करना चाहिए। इसलिए मेरी राय यह है कि इस बात पर सरकार को गंभीरता से विचार करना चाहिए। कहीं ऐसा तो नहीं है कि इसके पीछे कुछ लोगों की साजिश हो।

अन्त में मैं तीन चार प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। क्या यह सत्य है कि उर्दू दैनिक जंग जो पाकिस्तान में छपता है, उसमें इस प्रकार का समाचार 2 अक्तूबर को करांची और सिन्ध हैदराबाद में प्रकाशित हुआ था या नहीं? दूसरा प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि क्या प्रधान मंत्री जी की सुरक्षा के लिए फौज की सुरक्षा व्यवस्था करने का प्रस्ताव है? क्या यह भी सही है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह वक्तव्य दिया है कि वे अपनी सुरक्षा की जिम्मेवारी स्वयं देखेंगे

क्या ऐसा प्रस्ताव सरकार के पास है या नहीं ? तीसरा प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि बी० जी० देशमुख कमेटी ने 31 अक्टूबर को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है और वह सरकार के पास आ भी गई है । क्या सरकार बी० जी० देशमुख कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से सदन को अवगत करायेंगी क्योंकि ठक्कर कमीशन की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको सरकार ने राष्ट्र हित में देश की जनता के सामने नहीं रखा है ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि बी० जी० देशमुख की जो रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की गई है, क्या मंत्री महोदय उससे सदन को अवगत करायेंगे क्योंकि उसके बारे में बहुत भ्रम पैदा हो रहा है और टेलीग्राफ में 1 नवम्बर को एक रिपोर्ट भी छपी है ।

"Sources said that the committee not only blamed the Delhi Police but also other agencies like SPG and NSG for the security failure on October 2. The Committee is also understood to have observed that there was a lack of co-ordination among different agencies responsible for the Prime Minister's security and that the Rajghat incident was not a merely human failure."

मान्यवर, इस बारे में मेरा यह कहना है कि देश की एकता के सामने जब आपने एक मंत्रिमंडलीय सचिव स्तर की कमेटी बैठाई है और उसकी रिपोर्ट सामने आ गई है तो उस रिपोर्ट की जानकारी सदन के माध्यम से कराई जानी चाहिए । चौथा सवाल मेरा यह है कि श्री पुरुषोत्तम फोटोग्राफर के संबंध में मैंने जो प्रश्न किया है उसको मैं होराने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझता हूँ । उसका भी आप जवाब दे दें ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Sukomal Sen.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal):  
Sir, I will speak in his place later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri K. K. Birla.  
He is not here. Shri Bhandare.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is sheer providence and good

fortune which saved the life of our revered Prime Minister on the 2nd October this year. By any standards and whichever way we may look at it, there has been a total failure and collapse of the security system. We learnt for the first time how vulnerable, how weak our security system was when late Indiraji became a martyr on the 31st October two years earlier. It is, therefore, a matter of some distress, anguish and, though my friend Mr. Jaswant Singh may not agree even a bit of anger that this situation persists and should not have really improved. I say so because when I speak here I speak on a issue which really cuts across all the party lines. It is a national issue, it is an issue in which every citizen of this country, whether he is a young boy of 10 years or an old man of 80 years, is equally concerned. Therefore, this grave concern, anxiety, anguish and anger should not be misunderstood by the Government at all and I think the Government would have done better if the statement—though they have been candid about admitting the correct position—contained fuller statements as I will explain a little later.

Now I would like to come to one or two things. Firstly, we are and we have always been a free and an open society. I have never handled at any time any weapon excepting for a short term when I was in the NCC or the UTC. I have never had any weapon in my possession and the only thing I have done by way of shooting is shooting with my camera. Hon. Mr. Jaswant Singh may have used weapons but I do not know for what purpose. Therefore, we are really not trained for these things. I move freely at any time of the day, at any time of the night. I do have fear in my mind. And a reference was made to Manila Syndrome and all that.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): You are not a VVIP.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I may not be a VVIP but if the people want to hit me, nothing can prevent them. It is only the

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

lack of fear in my heart which can see me through.

The point which I am making is this. On a debate like this, where we should be concerned with the security of some one who has become the symbol of national unity and integrity, why bring in petty politics? Why should you refer to Manila Syndrome and all that? You know, the conditions in our country are entirely diametrically opposite to what existed in Manila under Marcos regime (Interruptions).

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): That is what you have failed to realise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh has great patience and I think you must have also the same patience. (Interruptions).

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: He has said that he has contempt for the Government. I have not known of any Government where there has not been an attempt on life of the head of the State. In fact, we know very well that two decades earlier it succeeded in the case of President Kennedy. I had almost been itching to hear from hon. Mr. Jaswant Singh his contempt for the USA Government but I have never seen him, on the country I have always seen him praising and talking highly about that Government in spite of the fact that very recently there was an attempt on the life of one of the strongest and the popular President of the USA, Mr. Reagan. There has been an attempt on the life of Mrs. Thatcher where whole of the hotel was exploded when the bomb burst was there. So, this facile argument should not really cloud the real issue which is the issue of security. You cannot forget that we are going through a very very critical stage. Look at our vibrant democracy, look at our industrial growth, look at our scientific and technological advancement. We have at once become the envy of others particularly because of the leadership we have given to the Third World.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Vibrant democracy with a helpless government!

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I do not know...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ignore the interruptions.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: ... you can say that only because what I say is true. Therefore the whole question is, in fact I still remember that we could not conceive that any such thing could have happened to General Vaidya in Pune. And people in Bombay, people in Pune, people in Nagpur, wherever I went asked; why should you not have proper security? And I find that the hon. Member is objecting to the number of commandos. He looks at the photograph, this and that. Nobody likes that. I also do not like that. But I think the need of the hour is maximum security and not cheap popularity to say, "well, every thing is all right". No I think if you can have a security where the commandos are there but they are invisible, I would welcome it because I agree with what has been said that it is a status symbol and it is this status symbol which is really makings these V.I.Ps, lame ducks. The other day some appeal case is going on in the Delhi High Court, I found that one police guard was sitting with one rifle in his hand. His colleague who had another rifle had given his rifle to him to hold. So one police guard was sitting with two rifles and was supposed to guard the Judges who are hearing the Indira Gandhi murder appeal. And he was dozing like this. I do not know what kind of security we have. And I would really like you to have a periodical check. I remember in war time you had air-raid sirens just to check up whether there is black-out or not. I want to know whether you have any such exercise. Because what has happened is utterly—it puts our heads down in shame that the first shot was heard at 6.54 and upto 8'clock nothing happened, nobody was detected.

I will tell you one serious thing. You talk of foreign hand, and I have no doubt about it. The news about this had spread like fire in Karachi a day earlier. Even the currency—the Indian rupee—fell down. And when I asked the Foreign Minister as

to what had happened, on the 4th of October—this happened on the 1st of October—I am sorry that the hon. Minister, Mr. Natwar Singh, was here till now but he has left the House; I do not blame him for that—till the 4th nobody knew that a detailed telex from the Consul-General at Karachi had arrived in the Ministry. I would like the Minister to tell us whether this was brought to the notice of the Home Ministry and what action was taken by them. If so, at what time, when and what action was taken. I found nobody knew about it even in the Ministry of External Affairs. The external Affairs Minister himself had not read that telex till I raised the issue. I know we are not security-minded people. Negligent people like me would like to walk freely and openly. Even if I see a gun popping, I will just go and say “let me see where the gun is” not realising that it will hit me. For those who are in charge of security, these lapses are just not permissible.

There are many other things which I want to say. There is the investigation which is mentioned. But I think almost after a month something much more should have been said than merely saying that after interrogation of the accused four more persons were arrested in the case, the CBI is continuing its detailed probe into the matter. A month is a long time for investigation in one of the most serious security lapses, in one of the most serious attempts on the life of the Prime Minister and the President, and I think something more could be said. At least in this case where the whole nation is one and there is no division among the political parties on this issue, I think the honourable Minister ought to take this House and, through this House, the entire nation, into greater confidence. So also, since the matter is so important and since it brooks no delay, I do hope that in the matter of the report which has been submitted by Deshmukh Committee you will take action very-very fast. Forest everything, apply your mind, take the House into confidence and invite even the suggestions of the Members on the security steps.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: In action on the report ... (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: The House must be taken into confidence .... (*Time bell rings*) ....

Sir, there are one or two things. Sir, about the advance information, it has already been referred to. I learnt—I do not know whether it is true; it is for the honourable Minister to explain—that when the dog squad was brought there, and a dog picked up a pellet—A dog sniffs and he gets it from the smell and not by anything else—the explanation given by the security guards at that time was, “Well, this is some one year old pellet which must have been lying there for a year so.” I do not know whether this is true. But again, if you have a security which is doing these things, we have to do something else. I only hope that you will make this security insular to political interference. I had seen\*\* working in such a manner during elections and I find that he is no more in the security of the Prime Minister. I do not know the reasons for it. But the point which I am making is that the security system must be insular...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference to the particular person will go out of record.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I am sorry. I mentioned it because I had seen him during the elections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will not form part of the record.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I think the honourable Minister will give full explanation on all the points which I have raised. All that I will add in the end is to speak the unanimous voice of this House in congratulating the Prime Minister on his miraculous escape and I take this opportunity to wish him a

\*\*Name not recorded.

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

very long and healthy life in the service of our country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturanan Mishra.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) :  
समागति महोदय, सुरक्षा के मामले में अपने देश में एक असाधारण स्थिति पैदा हो गई है। ऐसा लगता है कि हमारी सरकार उसको जानते हुये भी उसका कोई इंतजाम करने में असफल साबित हो रही है। यह अत्यन्त ही दुःखद बात है। आम तौर पर युवा मंत्री चिदम्बरम तथ्यों से भरा हुआ बयान दिया करते थे और भाषण भी ऐसा होता था लेकिन इस बार जो उन्होंने बयान दिया है यह मोस्ट अनचिन्दबरम लाइक है। इसमें कुछ है ही नहीं। एक लाइन में कह देते कि अखबार में जो बात आई है वह पड़ लीजिएगा या पड़ ही होगी। इसमें कोई नयी बात नहीं रखी है। इस लिये ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार इस परिस्थिति को संभालने में विल्कुल असफल साबित हुई है। हमारे लिहाज से देश अनावनेबुल हो रहा है। सरकार को शास्त्र यह कहने की हिम्मत नहीं है इस सदन में कि उनके कामों के चलते ऐसा हो रहा है। मैं दो राज्यों की तुलना करके बताऊंगा कि कैसी स्थिति है? पंजाब के बारे में सभी जानते हैं लेकिन यहां मैं तीन महीनों के आंकड़े प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूं मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय इनके संबंध में बतायें। पंजाब में इस साल जनवरी महीने में 66 मर्डर केसेज हुई तो बिहार में 245 उसी महीने में, पंजाब में फरवरी में इस साल में 67 मर्डर हुये तो बिहार में 235 उसी महीने में, पंजाब में 87 मार्च महीने में कुल मर्डर हुये और बिहार में उसी टाइम में 279 हुये। हमारे कहने का मतलब यह था कि चारों तरफ जब ऐसा माहौल बन जाय, तब सिर्फ वी०आई०पी० की रक्षा नहीं की जा सकती है। अगर सारा देश अरक्षित हो, तो हम उनकी भी रक्षा नहीं कर सकते। मैं चाहता था कि रिपोर्ट में यह बातें आती कि किन मुद्दों पर हमारी सेक्युरटी असफल हो रही है क्योंकि यह पहली धटना तो नहीं है।

भंडारे साहब की बातों से मुझे बड़ा ताज्जुब लगा कि उन्होंने कहा कि अमरीका में भी राष्ट्रपति मारा गया, ब्रिटेन में भी ऐसा ही प्रधान मंत्री को मारने का प्रयत्न हुआ और दूसरी जगह भी ऐसा ही हुआ। इसलिये यहां भी हो जाय, यही एक ही वाक्य उन्होंने नहीं कहा...

श्री जगेश देसाई : उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं कहा।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : नहीं, नहीं, हमने कहा कि यही एक वाक्य उन्होंने नहीं कहा। उसका सारांश यही निकलता है।

इसलिये मैं कुछ प्रश्न पूछता हूं, जिसके बारे में मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय जवाब दें। क्या यह सच है कि इंटेलिजेंस विभाग के ज्यादातर हैड्स को व्यक्तिगत वी०आई०पी० की सेक्युरटी में लगा दिया गया है और अपराधक्रमियों की गतिविधियों की जांच के लिये एडिक्टेड हैड्स अवेलेबल नहीं हैं? क्या यह सच है और नहीं तो मंत्री महोदय आंकड़ा देकर प्रस्तुत करें कि कितने सेक्युरटी हैड्स को वी०आई०पी० में उन्होंने लगा दिया है और उनकी आम गतिविधियों की जांच करने वाली हमारे पास कितनी फोर्स है?

दूसरी बात हम जानना चाहेंगे - कराची पेपर की बात सबों ने कही, हम उसकी दोहराना नहीं चाहते हैं। लेकिन क्या हमारे विदेश मंत्रालय की कोई सूचना वहां से आई है कि नहीं क्योंकि एक दिन पहले वहां के अखबारों में यह बात आ चुकी थी?

तीसरी, बात हमारी समझ में नहीं आती है कि राजघाट में क्रमशः देशी बंदूक लेकर हमला करता है। यह समझ में नहीं आती है क्योंकि जब इतनी बड़ी साजिश की बात थी, तो फिर उन्नत हथियार क्यों नहीं उसने लिया? यह भी तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि इसका क्या कारण है?

चौथी बात मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सच है कि उस समय हमारे

इन्टेलिजेंस सेक्यूरिटी चीफ, सी०बी०आई० के चीफ दोनों देश से बाहर थे ? तो क्या बारी-बारी करके ऐसा होता है कि एक बार मंत्री लोग बाहर जाते हैं और दूसरी बार आफिसर लोग बाहर जाते हैं ? इसके बारे में हम लोगों को बताया जाए कि सच्ची बात क्या है ?

एक अखबार—इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में यह बात आई है कि सेक्यूरिटी गार्ड जो वहां मुसतैद किया गया था—

“The security man had strayed from his post.”

क्या यह सच बात है कि ऐसा हुआ था वहां, या नहीं हुआ था ।

फिर मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि “स्टेट्समैन” के फोटोग्राफर ने जो छापा है, कि उसने बहुत पहले फर्स्ट शाट की आवाज सुनी और सेक्यूरिटी के लोगों ने उन्होंने कहा और जाने की इजाजत भी मांगी कि हम लोग देखें, लेकिन सुरक्षा के लोगों ने स्कूटर की आवाज समझ लिया उसको ।

तो क्या सेक्यूरिटी और कमांडोज के एक्सपर्ट्स जो हैं, वह गन शाट की आवाज और स्कूटर की आवाज, दोनों में भेदभाव नहीं कर सकते हैं ? अगर इतने एक्सपर्ट्स आप लोग रखते हैं कमांडोज में, तब तो भगवान ही आप को बचाये और मुल्क को भी भगवान ही बचाये दूसरा तो कोई सहारा लगता नहीं है । वैसे मुझे भगवानपर बहुत कम भरोसा है ।

पांचवीं बात मैं यह कहूंगा आप से कि जो कमांडोज वगैरह का है—फिर मैं एक बार कहता हूँ—इसके पहले जनरल वैद्य के मर्डर होने पर इस सदन ने चर्चा की थी उस पर और उस वक़्त भी मैंने कहा था कि हमारे कमांडोज जो हैं, उनकी बात हमको समझ में नहीं आती है कि आप लोग जो रेकूट करते हैं, जब जो कानून कहते हैं, वह कानून बना देते हैं, जितना पैसा मांगते हैं,

उतना पैसा दे देते हैं, जितना सुरक्षा का इंतजाम चाहते हैं, वह भी आप ही करते हैं, उसको भी हम लोग मंजूरी देते हैं, लेकिन आउटपुट जो होती है, वह एक पर एक प्रधान मंत्री की हत्या और इम्पार्टेन्ट लोगों की हत्या में होता है । तो जो कमांडोज हम बहाल करते हैं, सो इन्दिरा जी के टाईम में जो कमांडोज थे, तो उसका माथा गड़बड़ा गया, जनरल वैद्य के टाईम में जो कमांडोज थे, उसका पैर लड़खड़ा गया (समय की घंटी) जस्ट टु कम्प्लीट इट—उसका पैर लड़खड़ा गया, ललित माकन के टाईम में उसका हाथ गड़बड़ा गया ।

तो क्या मंत्री महोदय, आप ऐसे कमांडोज को खोज सकते हैं इस देश में या नहीं, जिसका माथा, पैर, हाथ-तीनों दुरुस्त हों? ऐसा आपको कोई मिलता है या नहीं ? या ऐसा ही मिलता है जिसका यह तीनों दुरुस्त नहीं है ।

यही मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ ।

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: This Rajghat incident underlines not merely the lapse, but actually the collapse of security administration of the Central Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Shall we sit till 2 O' Clock and finish this?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, the sense of the House is in favour of sitting till 2. Yes, you go ahead.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: As per the information from your Secretariat, the Call Attention Notice is to be disposed of before lunch.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Reply has also to be there. It has to be a longish one. How can we finish this before two?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is all right. I have not taken note of it. Yes, Mr. Ghosh, please continue.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, I have already stated that this Rajghat incident, which we are discussing, underlines not merely the lapse of security, but collapse of security administration of the Central Government. This cannot be viewed in isolation from the other incident that had taken place the very next day inside the headquarters of the Punjab Armed Police in Jalandhur, when a daring attempt was made on the life of DG Police, Mr. Rabeiro; sometimes afterwards there was a news item appearing in the newspapers that a hundred or so uniforms bought for the purpose of Black Cat commandoes were lost in transit and nobody could say where had they gone.

We are talking about the security lapse and what is in this statement which has been given by the hon. Minister of State for Home Affairs? It is a kind of product of the people becoming wiser after the event. What he has suggested in the Statement itself is nothing but a reactive measure. This incident exposes once again the extent of infiltration in the Central Administration of the forces that want to destabilise our country at the behest of imperialism. It is not merely a question concerning the attempt on the life of certain VVIPs alone, it is a question about what would have happened had the attempt been a success. There would have been a further catastrophe, a further disaster. So, we must try to comprehend the conspiracy. It is not a question of getting rid of certain inefficient people inside the security system and revamping it. Every time we hear that so many people were caught inside the President's Secretariat or the Prime Minister's Secretariat or certain other high officials have been caught selling the secrecy of our country to a foreign country in exchange of a certain amount of money. So, when we talk about the danger, danger from outside, when we talk about the danger to the

national unity and integrity, we have also to consider what kind of administration we are having at the moment, and whether it is capable of meeting such danger.

Mr. Bhandare compared this incident with the happenings in foreign countries and said how Kennedy could be killed how an attempt could be made on the life of Mrs. Thatcher and also on the life of President Reagan. But my question is in what situation and in what circumstances Kennedy could be killed? Was it done in such a situation as was in Rajghat on October 2, 1986.

Shri Chaturanan Mishra has stated that we are having the security people who could not distinguish between the sounds of a scooter backfire and the shot of the firearms; and with these people we boast of our country facing the foreign conspiracies.

Of course, I do not say you don't take action against certain officials who are directly responsible, but suspending certain DCPs or ACPs or some Inspectors or sub-inspectors is not enough. This is not so simple a thing. Actually this is our experience. Our administration is completely infiltrated by the agents of the enemies who want to destabilise our country at the behest of imperialism. Many a times in the past in this House we have forewarned about this thing. From my party I have said about this thing and our other colleagues also have forewarned. The people who are holding the power have not drawn any lessons from the past. They could not protect one Prime Minister. Now they have completely failed to protect the present Prime Minister, the President and other VIPs. A Government which cannot protect a Prime Minister, we feel, it cannot protect the country also. In the statement the Minister has said that a committee was constituted to enquire and to submit its report and the report has been submitted and follow up action is being taken. I want to know: what follow up action would

be taken? I think certain heads will roll down who managed the security. They will take some administrative actions. But this is not merely an administrative problem, it is all the more a political problem. Therefore it needs to be tackled politically. We know that Home Ministry is responsible for providing security arrangements for various VIP people. But the Home Ministry cannot evade its responsibility by simply suspending certain officials. I know that hon. Member, Mr. Bhandare belongs to the ruling party and he had only hoped that something would be done. Nothing else he could say excepting hoping. My demand is that the report of the committee should be placed on the Table of the House and Parliament should be given an opportunity to discuss that report. Simply this does not involve the security of certain VVIPs like President, Prime Minister and certain other persons but the security, unity and integrity of the country. Therefore, Parliament must have the right to discuss that report and suggest remedial action. My specific question is: whether the Minister is prepared to place that report on the Table of the House? This will give an opportunity to Parliament to discuss the report and take action against those who are responsible for this situation. Thank you.

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:**  
 Mr. Chairman, Sir, the incident at Rajghat was not only extraordinary, but very shameful too. Before I make my comments on the incident and its ramifications, I would like to offer my felicitations to the Prime Minister on his providential escape. It was really a providential escape. It was not Mr. Chidambaram's Ministry or Mr. Buta Singh's Ministry or the Delhi Police which saved his life. But it was only his instinct and God which had saved him. The incident reveals gross negligence, callousness, inefficiency, incompetence and above all the stupidity of those people who are entrusted with the onerous responsibility of protecting the highest in this land. When Mrs. Gandhi was assassinated we were

assured in this House and the Government came out with the statement that they were making fool-proof arrangements for the protection of the Prime Minister. We have expressed our anxiety more than once in this House about the security arrangements for the Prime Minister and others. Every time the Government came forward with the statement that they had made all necessary arrangements. But again this incident has revealed that even the much touted security arrangements are capable of being breached. It is a warning and we should take note of this thing.

Sir, this incident has shaken the confidence of the people, in the entire system, because today the question in the minds of the people is: if this Government could not save a Prime Minister earlier and could not prevent such an incidence now, how can they save the country and how can they save the common man in this country? Sir, today, as you know, the Prime Minister on the advice of the security people, and he has been forced to live in fortresses—whether, it is in his house or in his office. We do not grudge it because there is a threat to his life and we understand his predicament. Never in the history of free India the Prime Minister has been made to restrain his movements so much as the present Prime Minister has been made to. We do not grudge it. But in spite of that, if these people cannot protect him, then it is really a sordid affair and it is very unfortunate.

Sir, as you know, we are subjecting ourselves, many of us are subjecting ourselves to humiliating treatment. M. Ps are being checked. We are forced to pass through metallic detectors. We are made to wear chains with number plates whenever we meet the Prime Minister in his house. We never minded it because we know the difficult situation. Even the ordinary people also are subjected to such things. Press people are being harassed. Photographers are being thrown out but all this is being understood



[Shri Parvathaneni Upendra]

and tolerated only because the Prime Minister's life is involved, his security is involved. But today, this incident has revealed that these people are not capable of ensuring the safety of their own leader. They are there to harass the law-abiding people and in this context, Sir, I am reminded of Mrs. Gandhi's remark in 1980 while addressing the Inspector Generals of Police.

She said, "I am not interested in security because the people they are trying to restrain are people who, I could swear, would never do anything wrong, whereas I see people whom I would be suspicious but nobody is bothering about restraining them."

Sir, still the situation, after six years, remains the same. This whole Government has become a laughing stock after this incident! As my predecessors have pointed out rightly. I do not want to go into the details of the incident, how that man could be there for a week, how could he make regular visits for a week, how could he stay there for two days, how could he erect a tent there, how could he carry all these goods there and why the rule that the combing operation should be done 24 hours in advance was flouted and only at the fag end of the day at 4 PM on the previous day, the operation started? All these questions remain unanswered today and we do not know what the report contains and whether it will have the same fate as the Thakkar Commission's report and whether it will see the light of the day? We do not know what the report contains also. But the reactions of the people concerned at the time of incident was really strange. There was utter confusion there. People started ordering about and the man was being fired at. Instead of catching him alive, people were giving order to shoot him and ultimately, the farce is, his pants were pulled down. That was the greatest achievement of the security people there and if you see the photograph, you find a nude man

being taken to the police station. This is the type of behaviour of the highest security system which has been entrusted with this responsibility.

Another point I would like to know is, why the earlier warnings were ignored? There are concrete evidences about it. People mentioned about the cable from our High Commissioner in Pakistan. Even the External Affairs Minister did not know about it. On 3rd October I had a meeting with him. He did not know on the 3rd till that time that a cable came from Pakistan. Sir, I had read in a magazine, the INDIA TODAY and I quote:—

"The secret information, obtained in Ludhiana, had been passed on by RAW Director Ranjan Roy, on September 27 to all groups—including the Special Protection Group—responsible for protecting the Prime Minister. It read: "according to an unverified report, an attempt would be made on the life of our Prime Minister when he goes to Rajghat on October 2, 1986, to lay wreath on Gandhiji's samadhi. The would-be assassin, a clean-shaven Sikh, was victim of the Delhi riots. He is likely to approach the area in the guise of a mali (gardner) and would hide himself in the bushes nearby."

Sir, this is almost a photographic description of what was going to happen. I would like to know from the Minister whether at all this report is correct? If it was received on September 27, so many days earlier, what action has been taken when the incident exactly corresponded and corroborated with this report? And what action have you taken against those who have ignored this report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next point.

SHRI PARAVATHANENI UPENDRA: One minute; I have not finished. One more thing which is repeatedly pointed out is that too many agencies are involved in this security system here. You have got the Special

Protection Group, the National Security Guard and the Delhi Police, these three. I am told that there are conflicting loyalties, there are jealousies and there are divided commands because some people are getting higher salaries than the others. Everybody is trying to pass on the buck. There is no accountability and responsibility from any side. Therefore, it is very necessary to overhaul this entire system, not only for the protection of VIPs out also for the protection of other citizens. The Minister has only said in his statement;

"A comprehensive review of the security arrangements for the PM has been carried out and measures to strengthen them have been taken."

What are those measures? The statement is silent about it. You have repeatedly said the same thing, even after Mrs. Gandhi's assassination.

Another thing is that there are far too many people today whom you are protecting. A re-assessment is necessary. I can understand your taking special measures to protect the President, the Vice-President and the Prime Minister who are really VVIPs. But today every junior Minister, even an ordinary MP, is being given the same facilities of commandos and escorts. Is it necessary? Why should 270 people in Delhi be given this facility? I ask this because this results in dilution of arrangements and there is no concentration of effort on the real people whom you have to protect. As somebody has said, it has become a status symbol. You have to see whether it is necessary to provide such facilities for those people. It is an occupational hazard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to conclude.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Two minutes. If a Minister thinks that by becoming a Minister, his life is going to be threatened, let him leave the ministership. The pressure on

Ministership will be less and the Prime Minister will be happier. Let them serve the people in some other capacity. The moment he becomes a Minister, he cannot expect all facilities of commandos, escorts and all that, stretching the limited resources of the Government.

The final point which I would like to make is that there are many suspicions also, and I do not want to subscribe to them, as to whether at all this incident was really meant to kill the Prime Minister or it was only to settle some scores among some people in the hierarchy. I do not know. I would like to quote a report before I conclude. Three persons were sent to Raj Ghat for investigation—I do not know by whom; by the Prime Minister or somebody — Mr. Fotedar, Mr. Sharada Prasad and Mr. Sitaram Kesri. This is a quotation—it is not a report—from *Current* of October 13. It reads:

'Sharada Prasad: "But why would the police do so? After all, Gautam Kaul was in charge of the whole security."

Fotedar: "That is the whole bloody trouble. God alone knows who to believe and who not to. But police involvement can't be ruled out. How can that man, what's his name. Karamjit Singh, get on top there and camouflage himself in the face of hundreds of hawk-eyed policemen, commandos and intelligence men? But he was there in full view of the entire Rajghat. What does it indicate?"

Then Mr. Kesri says:

'Kesri: "From what I know of police guts, perhaps they formed a chain with some political administrators under whose influence they work. It is all so queer."

Sir, this aspect also requires investigation whether internal jealousies,

[Shr Parvathaneni Upendra]

internal rivalries have led to this incident where somebody wanted to score a point over the others.

Finally, this enquiry report which has come must be made known to Parliament. Parliament and the people should be taken into confidence as to what it contains because last time also we demanded similar publication but the Government refused. This time we demand that this report must be placed before Parliament. We should know what really happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurupadaswamy. Absent. Mr. Chitta Basu. Absent. Mr. Nagen Saikia.

SHRI NAGEN SAIKIA (Assam): Sir, it is a serious incident that has taken place within a span of two years since the assassination of Mrs. Gandhi. This is not an isolated incident. We think that it is part of continuous incidents of the like. Moreover it shows clearly the non-intelligence and inefficiency of the intelligence department...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Mr. Gopal-samy, take care about passing between the Chair and the Speaker.

SHRI NAGEN SAIKIA: ...and the security forces. It has proved that the security forces did not have the capacity to protect the Prime Minister at that time and they did not take the measures they were expected to take. Moreover, we have seen when Mrs. Gandhi had been killed by the extremists, when General Vaidya had been killed, when hundreds of people in Punjab have been killed and are being killed, no measures could be taken by the Government, by the Home Ministry, to protect the lives of these people. When the life of the Prime Minister cannot be protected by the security forces of the country, how can the ordinary people keep confidence in the Government that the Government would be able to protect their lives? Therefore, the Home Minister should resign from his office. These VVIPs, the Rashtrapati, the Uprashtrapati and

the Prime Minister, represent the whole country and at any cost we should try to protect the lives of these people. In many places extremist forces are raising their heads and we have seen that the incapability and inefficiency of the security forces has been encouraging those extremist forces to raise their ugly heads. The Government should seriously take into account all these incidents. I demand that the inquiry report should be placed before the House so that Members can go through it and know who the forces are behind these incidents. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni not here. Next, Mr. Valampuri John.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, we share the shock as well as the relief reverberated in this House on the dastardly attempt on the life of the Prime Minister. It is not only a question of the life of Prime Minister, it is the honour of the nation, which is involved. And more than the honour of the nation we find after this kind of a series of attempts on the of insecurity, is enveloping the whole nation, and once this kind of insecurity settles permanently in the minds of the people, the whole system will collapse. Therefore, it is not only a question of the life of the Prime Minister, not only the honour of the country, it is the sense of insecurity in the minds of the people which has to be considered. Here I would ask only three questions. In the entire security system we hear very high sounding names of agencies. There are different agencies in the security system but these agencies do not do their specified job. This is the accusation which the press has been making for six months now. I would quote one example. Repeatedly the press has been harping on this and there is no one to take notice of this. I take, for example, one agency, the Border Security Force. Most of the men in the Border Security Force have been positioned in the Rashtrapati Bhavan. Yet it is true that they have not been assigned their

job. Your security system is a nebulous structure; because it is nebulous, because there are loose ends, there is no coordination, there seems to be no control at all. It is Border Security Force in the case of the Rashtrapati Bhavan. I would draw your attention to another stark reality. When Mrs. Gandhi was killed, we know for certain that at the gates were posted personnel of the Indo-Tibetan Border Police. Safdarjung Road is not on the Indo-Tibetan border. But it is the Indo-Tibetan Border Police which was on duty on Safdarjung Road. This is a serious lapse. It is a nebulous structure. There are different agencies and their duties are not related at all. My point is in this nebulous structure there is no correlation, there is no coordination, at all between the agencies, between the jobs they do. There have been 150 men from the Delhi Police and 250 from the Security Forces. There is a serious charge against this Government. These 150 and 250 men are not people who have been assigned the specific, real, job of protecting the Prime Minister or the President or other dignitaries. I would like to have a very specific answer to this. They say that they are not the people. I say this because earlier this has happened in the case of Rashtrapati Bhavan as well as in the case of the former Prime Minister. Shrimati Indira Gandhi's murder. So,

I would like to have a very categorical and specific answer. There are countries where such things have happened. Most of the Members have been making a mention of this and they have said that others have been murdered and attempts have been made in different parts of the world. There have been successful attempts and there have been unsuccessful or abortive attempts also. Though terrorism is an international phenomenon now, there is a difference between what is happening in our country and what happens in the other countries. I say that there is a difference in the design, in the pattern, of what happens in this country and what happens in the other countries. India is perhaps the only country in the world where we

are offering the precious life of our Prime Minister on a silver platter to the criminals, to the deadly criminals. On many occasions this has happened. I would like to say one more thing here. It has been reported that the dog squad had identified earlier and they had communicated it to the security men there and it was mentioned that the dogs were behaving very strangely. There is a very strong reason for this, and there was something strange about the dog. But, while there was effective communication from the dog squad man, why was that not taken seriously? Why have they not taken it seriously? What action has the Government taken so far? I am asking this question because no one has even been dismissed. This is not a Press report alone. Though we are Members here and rely on Press reports, the Government should not simply brush aside our questions saying that we are having only the newspaper information. We have our own information as you have your information. May be yours is superior because there is bungling, because there is failure. Sir, I would like to make a fervent appeal: The Minister should give a categorical answer. Why was this had not been taken seriously why squad men not taken seriously and, if this had not been taken seriously, why no one has been dismissed so far?

Again we find, on the route of the motorcade from here to the airport, whenever the Prime Minister goes, there is a policeman or a security man every fifty yards. But there is the possibility of some extremist taking on the attire of a policeman or impersonating him. Very easily this can happen and anywhere they can come and take the place of policeman putting on his dress. Can you identify such people? Is there a single senior officer who can really identify all his men and who can really say that they are his men? Our information is that there is no superior officer who can really come and say that they are his men. They cannot identify at all. So, what kind of a security arrangement you have been making?

[Shri Valampuri John]

On the long route from here to the airport, at every fiftieth yard, you have a policeman or a security man. There is every possibility of danger and there is an element of danger in this. Suppose something happens. Of course, whatever we say here, because this is only a chamber for ventilating grievances, goes into the thin air.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only one minute more.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Sir, I am coming to the next question now. I would like to know one thing. The Prime Minister has taken this very lightly because the reports say that as he was escorting the President, he had said that this was the second one, the first one was a welcome shot and the second a send-off. This is the comment of the Prime Minister on the kind of threat that was there. He has said: "The first one is for welcome and the second is send-off". I do appreciate that the Prime Minister has got the valour, has got the spirit of valour. This is the spirit of valour of a hero, of a soldier, and we do welcome it. But, Mr. Minister, kindly answer me on one thing. This kind of valour, this kind of a sense of valour, this kind of display of heroism, should be a part of our Prime Minister for which we have got great appreciation. But does it not tend towards an element of carelessness? I am asking this question because, in the days of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru—we have read in history—on so many occasions whenever he was mingling with the crowd, he had been physically removed. Now in this country it is not possible with our present Prime Minister. What was possible with his grandfather is not possible with our revered Rajiv Gandhi now because we find yes-men everywhere. I can understand and appreciate the Prime Minister's attitude, "Come what may." This is the spirit of a hero and a soldier. I welcome that. But this kind of a come-what-may attitude can lead to carelessness. Does it not lead to carelessness? I would like the honourable

Minister to answer this. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kulkarni has forfeited his chance by his absence. Now, the Minister should reply.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, I was here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. When I called you, you were not here.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Minister.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I have listened with great patience and care to the views expressed by hon. Members on the very grave issue arising out of the security lapse at Rajghat on the 2nd of October, 1986. Sir, I sincerely hope that the House will appreciate the spirit with which we have drafted the statement and made the statement. We have apologized to this House and through this House to the nation about the lapses on 2nd of October. It was, in every sense, an unpardonable lapse. But I would only crave your indulgence to kindly look at the situation which has developed over the last two years and how certain things have overtaken our systems of Government. We are an open society. We have had Governments in this country headed by Prime Ministers who travelled far and wide, mingled with the people, and we took pride in being an open society. In the last two years a sea-change has come about in the security environment in this country. And let me very honestly say that our administrative structures have not yet prepared themselves to meet these sea-changes. Neither Ministers, nor Members of Parliament, nor even senior police officials, nor ordinary security personnel of various ranks, are able to quite comprehend the kind of change that has come about in our security environment. In fact, as one hon. Member said, we are not a security conscious nation. And even today

when we request that we accept certain restraints, certain discipline in our way of functioning, what do we find? We find resistance. We find people say: this is an insult to my office, this is humiliating me. People are still unwilling to accept even minimal restraints placed upon them. It is in this background we have to understand the kinds of system we are introducing.

Our policemen are reasonably good in controlling a law-and-order situation. They are reasonably good in detecting crime. But they are not yet trained in the manner they should be trained for security against terrorism.

Sir, Mr. Jaswant Singh said that this Government does not deserve his anger but only his contempt. Sir, I cannot afford anger on an occasion like this, and I am too small to show contempt to any man or any idea. But if we must summon anger, our anger must be directed against those dark and evil forces which spread the message of hate and bitterness. We must show contempt to those who occupy high seats of so-called learning but yet spread the message of hate throughout this country. What has happened in this country in the last 2-1/2 years is a matter of great shame to all of us. Some people openly proclaim that they will not rest until they have killed the Prime Minister of the country, until they have killed certain other persons in this country. It is in that kind of environment that I think for the last 2 years we have struggled to build a security system. What happened on the 2nd of October 1986 showed up the grave lapses in the system. The Government admit their responsibility as any responsible Government must do. But is the answer to call upon someone to resign? It would, indeed, appear to be an act of an assumption of great moral responsibility. But let me say with humility that it will also be an act of cowardice in the face of this threat. We must show determination

to stand up to this threat, improve our security systems and fight the forces which are preaching this message of hate and death. Let me assure you, Sir, and let me assure the hon. Members that we are determined to do that very thing. I know that the hon. Members have by and large relied upon what has appeared in the newspapers and I do not blame them. The case has been entrusted to the Central Bureau of Investigation. I think it is one police organisation in which many many people and the State Governments have reposed a great deal of faith. It is an organisation with a great deal of credibility. The investigation of the case has been entrusted to that organisation and even within that organisation, to officers of high integrity and great capacity. I have not, for obvious reasons, shared with you all the information that we have been able to collect in the last 30 days. We have arrested four more persons apart from Karamjit Singh. We still have to make a few more arrests and we have to tie up all the loose ends to complete the story behind the attempt on the life of the Prime Minister. I assure you, Sir, and I assure this hon. House that the investigation is proceeding with great speed. It is being monitored on a daily basis and we shall bring to book the culprits involved in the attempt on the life of the Prime Minister on the 2nd of October. Simultaneously we requested the Cabinet Secretary to conduct an in-house inquiry to pinpoint where the lapses were. The scope of this inquiry was to identify where the lapses were and who was responsible for the lapses. The report has been submitted on the 31st of October and if the hon. Members read with care my statement they would notice that I have not made a promise that action will be taken. I have said that action is being taken. In fact, even before the report came, on the basis of information gathered during that inquiry and on the basis of the information available to us through the C.B.I., we had taken several steps. The day after the report came, we took several more steps that

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

would be necessary. All the short-term steps that would be necessary consequent on the report will be taken in the next few days. Sir, I can assure you and I can assure the hon. Members that this is a matter which will not brook any delay. On my part and on the part of the Ministry of Home Affairs, we are determined to take the follow-up steps within a very short time.

Sir, the hon. Members have asked me specific questions relating to the case. I must ask your indulgence, Sir, because I cannot disclose certain things and I cannot give specific answers to those questions because the case is still under investigation. But I can paint a fairly broad picture. The broad picture that emerges is that Karamjit Singh did have the counsel and advice of certain other persons and that he had planned the attempt assassination with a certain amount of care to detail in the days proceeding the 2nd of October. As far as the administrative lapses are concerned, the security lapses are concerned, we find that while the systems were good on paper the systems did not have enough fail-safe procedures under which failure in one sub-system would have alerted everybody to an eventual failure of the whole system. Not enough fail-safe procedures were built into the system. Sir, it is true that number of agencies are responsible for the Prime Minister's security. But that is because of the nature of their functions. It is, perhaps, not possible to avoid more than one agency to look after the Prime Minister's security. But the point made by the hon. Members is well taken and I accept the point that we will have to bring about a better co-ordination. As Mr. Dipen Ghosh said not only at the administrative level but at the political level also. We have to bring about a better co-ordination and a better direction and a better management in the management of the security system. However, I must add a word of caution. Not all that has appeared in the newspapers is correct. In fact, the day the enquiry was entrusted to the CBI, we instructed the

CBI, not to speak anything to newspapers. And they have not done so. Some information has come out of the first information report which was a public document. Some information was disclosed when four persons were arrested and a formal announcement was made. But most of everything else is based upon intelligent guess work. And in view of what happened on the 22nd of October, in full view of many, many people, it was not impossible to do some intelligent guess work and publish reports.

Sir, some questions were raised about what was published in two newspapers in Karachi. It is true that two newspapers in Karachi on the 2nd of October, 1986 published reports that there were rumours circulating in Karachi about an attempt on the life of the Prime Minister of India and enquiries were made in those newspaper offices. But this information was available only when the newspapers were published on the 2nd of October. And when that information came to us, what had happened in Rajghat had already happened in the morning...

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :**  
The cable came on the 1st night.

**SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM :** Sir, a reference was made to a cable received in the Minister of External Affairs. That is a matter on which I am not in a position to give any answer at the moment. But I have made a note of it and I shall try to find out about that.

**SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :**  
He has not found out so far....

**श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) :**  
मेरा पॉइंट आफ़ आर्डर है । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सरकार की संयुक्त जवाब देही नहीं है । ऐसी महत्वपूर्ण सूचना के बारे में माननीय राज्य मंत्री गृह मंत्रालय के कहते हैं कि फ़ारेन विभाग की केबल क्या आई ? तो क्या सरकार का संयुक्त दायित्व नहीं है ? अगर संयुक्त दायित्व है तो इस तरह का जवाब क्या ये दे सकते हैं ?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA : One month has passed. Is it fair to say after one month that I do not know about the cable.

SHR K. MOHANAN (Kerala): He is in over-all charge of this administration and monitornig.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What can he do? The Minister says that he has not got that information....

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is not a question of not knowing. When he has come to give reply to the questions in Parliament, he should be equipped himself with all types of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to have a long discussion (*Interruptions*) Please sit down. Nothing will go on record. You have all been Members of Parliament. And you raise certain points and at that time it is not that the Minister has information on all the subjects. This is one of the subjects on which he says, I have no information on this matter. He does not shut it out. He says, "I will look into it and I will then give it". It must be fair.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA : This issue was not raised today. This issue was not (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: This issue was not raised for the first time in the House today. This appeared in the newspapers and it was a part of the inquiry also whether the cable came or not. The Minister must have verified.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am sorry, this issue....

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Sir, I raise a still more important issue. I just want to know what is the procedure by which such things are brought to the notice of the Home Ministry and the security agencies in our country. I would like to have some explanation on that.

SHRI CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, if any information is sought on any communication received in the Ministry of Home Affairs then I would be failing my duty if I did not give an answer immediately or attempted to get an answer when the point was made. The question relates to an information received in the Ministry of External Affairs. But before a venture to answer I would have to get the correct information so that I do not give wrong information to the House.

SHRI RAM AWDESH SINGH: Why not?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Do you want to give wrong information to the House?

SHRI RAM AWDESH SINGH This is the most irresponsible statement. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: This is the inefficient way the Government is functioning. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the answer given here is that a communication has been received by the Ministry of External Affairs and I would have been in a position to give the information if it had been received in the Home Ministry. But, Sir, the Minister has always the right to say that he does not know and he shall find out. Here the objection from the opposition is that we are discussing the issue of the attempt on the Prime Minister's life and we expect that after one month the Government will come prepared fully



[Shri Lal K. Advani]

with explanation at least of all that has been published in the papers very prominently. The papers tell us that on October 1 a cable was received in the Ministry of External Affairs and after that if a question has been asked I would think that it is the responsibility of the Government to give the correct reply. He cannot take shelter...

MR. CHAIRMAN: He does not refuse to reply. He has said that he does not have the information and that he will find out and then give the information. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: He has come so unprepared.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No Minister is omniscient.

SHRI RAM AWADESH SINGH: This is the most unsatisfactory answer.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, the hon. Members may use very strong language to describe whatever they think of me but the fact remains that I have said earlier and I say now that you are referring to something...

SHRI RAM AWADESH SINGH: Such a Minister has no right to continue who cannot give the information. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have said that a dozen times. Please sit down now.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: This is our criticism against the Government.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Therefore, Sir, I was saying that we have to bring better management in the system not only at the administrative level but at the political level also and this is what

we are attempting to do. Let me say one thing in conclusion that we have...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: If you would please do me the courtesy for a minute. Sir, he is saying, in conclusion, but there are still a number of specific queries that I have made with regard to the statement made by him...

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a number of points that have been raised and they are under investigation by the CBI. He has said that he cannot give these details now but whatever is possible.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am not referring to those matters which are currently being inquired into by the CBI. I am referring to a clarification sought on the Minister's own statement, as for example, what happened between 6.54 and 8 a.m.? What about the Prime Minister's statement that he has made to Thai papers that there is Pakistani collusion? (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a part of the inquiry.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: On a point of order. I quoted a specific RAW report said to have been submitted. I wanted to know whether the Minister will confirm it or deny it, whether he has received it.

SHRI RAM AWADESH SINGH: We are not demanding details; you may say yes or no; whether you got it or not. You are in possession of the report or not. We are not asking for details.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: As I said earlier, I can say only this much. On the one hand, there is a criminal case under investigation by the CBI and I think it would be doing something totally

wrong, under the procedures known to criminal law, if I begin to discuss every aspect of that investigation. Sir, you will kindly bear with me that I should not do it and hon. Members should not press me to do something which is clearly wrong. On the other hand, about administrative enquiry, I have candidly stated, yes, the administrative enquiry is complete; the report has been given and we are taking action. We will complete action in the next few days. Once action is completed, whatever information can be shared with the people, will be shared. But this is not the time to disclose the action taken on a report submitted barely three days ago when we are concerned with something so sensitive as the security of the President and the Prime Minister. And I am not asking for a long time; I said we will take action in the next few days.

You will bear with me that your specific questions fall between these two statements and I can only repeat these two statements.

Let me say one more thing in conclusion. Government is convinced that certain dark forces in the country have thrown a challenge and they have not really disguised their objectives. We know what happened only three days ago when certain resolutions were passed. We are not going to run away from this challenge. We are going to face it squarely. We are going to strengthen our security system even if it means imposing greater restraints, greater constraint on certain people and certain institutions. We have to face this challenge; but this challenge can be faced only with the willing co-operation of everybody. Hon. Members have said about our resources. It is not as though these are resources which can be doubled and trebled overnight. We cannot get trained men overnight. We cannot double the number of trained men overnight. We cannot double our security systems overnight. We will have to do it quickly. We will have to upgrade them rapidly. But the point is, the level of the threat keeps constantly increasing.

We have to match it with the level of our security; this is the effort now.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Who will match?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: We will match. But I am not in a position to disclose what we will do because what happens is, this kind of sometimes uninformed discussion in the press and sometimes indiscriminate speculation gives the enemy more information than what he should ordinarily have. We are not going to disclose what we are doing; but we will do it. I can assure the House and I can assure you...about that.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You assured even after 3rd October 1984... (*Interruptions*). You said in the same language and with the same passion and emotion.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: Two years have elapsed. What have you done all this time? We are not asking for a change overnight.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You should be ashamed of saying the same thing. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: It is all right for people to get worked up, to become passionate about it. We are equally concerned about the security of the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Sir, he has not answered my question.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned till 3.20 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twenty-one minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at twenty-two minutes past three of the clock,—the Vice-Chairman (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA) in the Chair.

**THE CHILD LABOUR (PROHIBITION AND REGULATION BILL, 1986**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI P. A. SANGMA):** Sir, I move:

“That the Bill to prohibit the engagement of children in certain employments and to regulate the conditions of work of children in certain other employments, be taken into consideration.”

The problem of child labour has emerged as one of the very serious issues facing the country today. While the percentage of child workers to the total child population has remained more or less the same, 4.7 per cent, in absolute numbers, the population of working children has risen substantially from 10.74 million in 1971 to 17.58 million in 1985. This is a cause for concern.

In India, as in many other developing countries, children belonging to the poorest families contribute in substantial measure to the income of their families. In these circumstances, it would neither be desirable nor possible to impose a total ban on all child labour. On the other hand, there can be no two opinions on the point that in certain employments/industries, the employment of children is hazardous in the extreme and should, on no account, be allowed.

As of today, the employment of children in certain industries/occupations is prohibited under the law. The Constitution of India stipulates that children below the age of 14 years should not be employed in any factory, mine or hazardous employment. Labour laws, like the Factories Act and the Mines Act, prohibit the employment of children below a certain age in factories and mines. The employment of Children Act prohibits the employment of children in certain industrial occupations and processes. In other Acts also, like the Plantations Labour Act, the

Merchant Shipping Act, the Motor Transport Workers Act, and the State Shops and Establishments Act the employment of children below a certain age is prohibited. However, there is no uniformity in these Acts, nor is there any procedure laid down for deciding the employments from which child labour should be banned.

In most of the areas where child labour today is not banned by law, children work without the benefit of protection of labour laws. There are no maximum working hours, no periods of rest, and no holidays prescribed for these children. Consequently, many children work under conditions of exploitation.

It is to take care of these aspects that the present Bill has been introduced. It will, on the one hand, ban the employment of children below 14 years from employment in certain specified occupations and industries considered hazardous, and will set up a procedure for identification of further employments/occupations which are hazardous for children and where their employment needs to be banned. One of the reasons for the existing restrictions on child labour not being effective is that the penalties prescribed in the different Acts are not stringent enough. They are also not uniform. Several employers who have been found guilty of employing children in violation of the provisions of different Acts, have, therefore, got off with light sentences. To ensure that the penalties have a more deterrent effect on employer, the Employment of Children Act, 1938, was amended in December, 1985, enhancing both the fine and the imprisonment prescribed. It is our opinion however that the offence of employing and exploiting child labour is an extremely serious one and therefore the penalties need to be further enhanced. Accordingly, this Bill proposes to make the penalties extremely stringent. The penalty for the first offence, now proposed, is imprisonment from 3 months to one year or fine from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 20,000, or both, and for a second offence, mandatory imprisonment for a term of not less than 6 months and upto a period of two years.