

today and the other topic can be taken up....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will see how the discussion takes place.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Yesterday the discussion continued and today I am expected to speak. Sir, I am making a Statement on Manipur.

Manipur is facing insurgency and militancy for many years. It is declared as a disturbed area. The Armed Forces Special (Powers) Act was used in the entire state. Some people in the state are agitating to see that the Armed Forces Special (Powers) Act is withdrawn. On 12th of August 2004, against the advice given by the Union Government, the State Government withdrew the Act from the city of Imphal and allowed it to remain in force in rest of the State. The State Government says that the Act did not meet the expectations of the people in the State. The agitation continued in a more forceful manner after the incident that had happened on 11th of July 2004 in which Kumari Th. Manorama Devi's body was found in a field, with bullet injuries on it. The allegation made in this respect is that she was killed by the Assam Rifles. The agitators are demanding that the Assam Rifles should be withdrawn from the area. The Armed Forces have started proceedings against those who are alleged to have been responsible for the incident. The State Government has also instituted a judicial inquiry into the matter. There has been no change in the situation even after the Act was withdrawn from the city of Imphal. The Union Government is watching the situation. It will take appropriate action to meet the situation.

The incident of bomb blast at Dhemaji district of Assam

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): Sir, a powerful bomb explosion took place at 08.50 Hrs. on 15th August, 2004 at the venue of the Independence Day function in the Dhemaji College ground, resulting the death of 13 persons (seven male and six female, including five school children) and injuries to few others. All the victims were spectators who had come to participate in the function. Critically injured persons have been shifted to the Assam Medical College, Dibrugarh. Preliminary investigations have revealed that the explosion was caused by an I.E.D. planted 40/50 meters from the rostrum near the

public enclosure. The explosion appears to be the handiwork of ULFA cadres. The Flag was hoisted by the Deputy Commissioner at 09.15 Hrs. at the same venue.

There were two other incidents in Assam on Independence Day. In one incident an I.E.D. explosion took place in the Dhakuakhaua, Normal School Field, Dhakuakhana sub division of North Lakhimpur District at 07.55 Hrs. In this incident an I.E.D. was buried just beneath the flag post. No casualty has been reported. The explosion was caused by timed device planted well in advance and ULFA cadre is suspected to be behind the act.

In the second incident an I.E.D. explosion took place after the Independence Day celebration function at the Gauripur Field in the Dhubri District at 13.20 Hrs. No casualty has been reported as public had already left the venue after the morning function.

The State Government has placed the Superintendent and Additional Superintendent of Police under suspension for the security lapses. The Deputy Commissioner is also being replaced. State Government has also declared an ex-gratia of Rs. 3 lakhs each to the next of kin of the deceased and Rs. 50,000/- each to the seriously injured. Rs. 10,000/- each will be paid to those who suffered minor injuries. All the medical expenses of the injured will be borne by the State.

State mourning was observed on 16th August and peace processions and public meetings condemning the dastardly acts and asking the militants to shun acts of violence are being held today. The Government of India shall provide all the assistance required by the State Government to counter the acts of violence and insurgency, perpetrated by the militants.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: First, we will take up clarifications on Manipur.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Sir, are we seeking clarifications on Manipur incident? Or, are we going to seek clarifications both on Manipur and Assam?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will take both the statements together. The hon. Minister also requested that both be taken up together.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, these, of course, are very distressing

and disturbing developments. I have no doubt that my good friend is a very efficient Minister of Home and will deal with the issue as effectively as the circumstances permit. I have not so many clarifications to seek, but to make, briefly, some observations. Now, Sir, these are two different incidents took place in two different States, and yet, they are linked and the linkage of what has happened in Assam or what is happening in Manipur is, of course, the factor of one of the most highly sensitive parts of India, which is the North-East of our country. We have witnessed in Assam, to my mind, the most unfortunate incandescence of terrorism. I will come to that later. This is ULFA-variety of terrorism and there can really be no words to condemn the dastardly attack on school children in which a number of school children, boys and girls, have really met this fate at so early in their life, and have been robbed of their life. I have witnessed enough of this in the last several terms that I have been in Parliament, but it is really horrifying how mindlessly children have been made targets or victims of this. But we do have a pure and unforgivable, but a recrudescence of terrorism in Assam. In a minute, I will come back to it.

In Manipur, we are seeing continuing insurgency, a challenge to India, combined with—I am very sorry to say—certain complicity by the State Government, which is a very distressing development because it is not only a challenge to the unity of our country, but is also a challenge to Constitution. These three incidence—one, at Dhemaji College, second at North Lakhimpur, and the third at Gauripur—are fairly separated parts of Assam. Gauripur, the last, has been the area of activity of the BODOs, while the statement of the hon. Minister speaks of the ULFA. I don't know if all the three are attributed to the ULFA or the Gauripur incident has some other hand that has perpetrated this act. But I thought to share with the hon. Minister and the Government that terrorism cannot be dealt with in a manner of traffic lights that we turn the red against terrorism and every now and then we turn the amber, and sometimes green. I have seen this happening in the case of Assam over the years. It has resulted in very unfortunate developments. I don't here wish to refer to it but there is, again, an indication that we are giving to terrorism and insurgency, what we have done in regard to the PWG. But I will refer to that later, not today, because it is not a subject of today. But in the ULFA's case it is a matter of, now, recognised history that on account of the great cooperation

that we received from His Majesty, the King of Bhutan, very largely, the northern command of the ULFA was completely decimated. And, it was an act of great statesmanship on his part that he himself personally, in cooperation with India, acted against the ULFA camps in Bhutan. All along, it was known that whereas this is the cooperation that Bhutan has given us. It is continued to be known that the Southern command of the ULFA is active, will remain active and continues to receive encouragement, assistance and support from Bangladesh. It is not a thing that is not known to the Government. And, it is, I have no doubt in my mind, that what we have been witnessing again. The ULFA, having virtually been silent in Assam for quite some time, is raising its head again. I take it very seriously. And, all that I can recommend to the hon. Minister and the Government is to take these three incidents seriously and not to let this great trouble-spot or this great source of trouble to Assam raise its head again, because here we are talking of Assam, which is just not simply a *Brahmaputra* Valley, but it acts as the kind of an anchor to the whole of North-East.

Sir, on Manipur, the hon. Minister's statement is clear. He has been good enough, Sir, as was the hon. Prime Minister, to consult us in this regard and we have shared our views with him. We are broadly in agreement with the approach that the Government is following, or, has so far followed because the situation in Manipur, in one sense, clear, but yet it is extremely complex. I would not go into the complexity of the situation in Manipur because that is a different debate altogether. But what is clear is, at least, three or four aspects of it. It is a continuing insurgency. It is a failure of the State, and it is a challenge to the unity of India and to the Constitution of India. And, it is a challenge that has been thrown to India, not now, it had been simmering there for quite sometime, and now we have this situation. I have also very sadly to observe, Sir, that what we are witnessing in Manipur is a kind of 'layered and twin blackmailing'. I do believe, Sir, the Chief Minister—I do not normally wish to refer to the Chief Minister of any State, but I do it since here we are discussing the condition in Manipur—is being pressurised into acting in a certain fashion, and I have very serious reasons to share with the hon. Home Minister, with some hesitation through, that I have an apprehension that the Government has been pressurised by the Chief Minister and, therefore, we have a situation in which there is 'layered blackmailing'.

I do not wish to refer to the party affiliation of the Government in Office in Manipur, but, Sir, we cannot continue with this 'layered blackmailing'. I will take only a minute to share with you, in a very personal fashion, one thing. A very eminent Indian, वे रहे नहीं। सर, परमेश्वर नारायण जी अक्सर मुझे कहा करते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान की मिलिक्यत में दो बहुत जरूरी उसूल हैं—एक है सुनवाई और दूसरा है इकबाल। Iqbal is almost an untranslatable word but, broadly, it is moral authority. जैसे 1857 में कहा जाता था कि कंपनी सरकार का इकबाल मर गया है। अभी भी कोई अच्छा खैर-खाह हो, तो कहता है कि हुजूर, आपका इकबाल बुलंद हो। मुझे लगता यह है कि मणिपुर में सुनवाई कहीं बंद हो गई है और सरकार का इकबाल डूब गया है। ये दोनों चीजें नहीं होंगी, तो मणिपुर की दिक्कतें पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की दिक्कतों में अपनी लाइन बनाकर चलेंगी और हमको दिक्कतें दिए जाएंगी।

I urge the Government to consider—I won't refer to other States—the questions that have been thrown up in Manipur. What is at stake is the unity of India.

Lastly, a word, a brief word. I have no doubt in my mind that the hon. Home Minister is fully conscious of it. When I use the words 'traffic light system of combating insurgency or terrorism', we don't use the traffic light system against the Armed Forces. It is possible, Sir, that I say this with a degree of parochialism and of the interests of the armed forces at heart, but you cannot have armed forces being asked to lay down their lives, and then, every now and then told, 'you would now go back to the barracks.'

My gallant and distinguished friend, Shri Shankar Roy Chowdhury, is here, and we started our military career together. It is a very open question, Sir, and we need to reflect on it, why does a man volunteer to die? The armed forces have gone there is discharge of their responsibility to the unity of India and we cannot, in any fashion, lower their morale or to call into question their relevance in combating insurgency.

Sir, there is just one concluding thought and I shall end thereafter. Here, the concluding sentence of the hon. Minister is that the Union Government is watching the situation in Manipur. This sentence is pregnant with all kinds of possibilities. I am sure the hon. Minister will accept that even human pregnancy cannot last beyond nine months; you have then, some very adverse consequences. May I appeal to him and to the Government, therefore, not to let the situation be watched in perpetuity.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR (Tripura): While seeking clarification on the statement about the situation in Manipur, first of all, I wish to share the feelings of the people there in expressing my condolences to the dreadful death of Thangiam Manorama Devi in the hands of some Army personnel.

Sir, it is stated here that after lifting the Special Power Act from Imphal, there is no change in the situation. We must be deeply concerned about the situation in Manipur that is deteriorating day by day. Sir, what is the slogan being raised? It is, to remove the Assam Rifles from the State and to lift the Special Power Act from the entire State. I would rather ask the Government to inquire whether, during such a state of unrest, the militants who are underground at present, are trying to take advantage of the situation. The slogans that people are raising are the expression of their feelings about the incident. You know about the situation in Manipur; the entire State was under the Special Power Act to contain militancy. And now, taking advantage of the situation, are these underground terrorists pushing the situation to such a state that no step of the Government can succeed in containing militancy? People's feeling should be honoured and respected. But, at the same time, the Government should see actually what is behind it. Sir, so far as the statement about Assam is concerned, I am to point out that that ULFA militants were once driven out by the Royal Bhutan Army from the land of Bhutan. When they were driven out of Bhutan, had the State Government or the Central Government given keen observation as to where these militants are now being concentrated; where are they re-grouping? The district of Dhemaji, I think, is situated far off from Guwahati and is near the border of Arunachal Pradesh. The entire North-East should be taken as a unit where the insurgency is going on? Whatever is going on in Arunachal Pradesh, we have seen that. Here militants are influencing the political powers. MLAs are going sometimes this side and sometimes that side, and militants are taking recourse to this situation. Dhemaji district is near Arunachal Pradesh. Did the Government take care to observe as to where these ULFA militants after being driven out from Bhutan are regrouping to get a further chance of attacks? The present Government has been in power for the last few months, so it ought to be done by the previous Government when the Army operation was going on in Bhutan against Indian militants. Militants of this region after being driven out from Bhutan are taking shelter in the neighbouring countries also, particularly the name of Bangladesh

may be mentioned. We have raised this question time and again here, but, I think, no effective step has yet been taken to demolish their hide-outs in Bangladesh.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please seek clarification. There are still 12 Members who want to seek clarification. So, please confine yourself to clarification.

SHRI MATILAL SARKAR: Sir, if we do not take the case in totality, lapses may be there in thinking in the right direction of how to combat, how to fight out this militancy. That is why I am giving references.

Sir, in case of Assam where school girls and boys had to lay down their lives at the hands of the militants, 8 ladies, the guardians of the children also died there in the bomb blast. It is really painful; it is inhuman. We have no words to condemn such a case of bomb blast. In that sense, I would like to give reference as to why the militants are intensifying their activities in Assam, Manipur, Tripura and all these States. The North-Eastern Region is a very resourceful region surrounded by some of the neighbouring countries. We have oil resources, we have forest wealth, and, it is very pertinent that the imperialist forces are behind all these militants who are encouraging them to destabilize our country.

Sir, coming to Manipur, the situation demands two-fold solution. The first is that at any cost normalcy should be restored. This type of lawlessness should not be tolerated any further. Normalcy should be restored. This is the first and foremost task on the part of the State Government as well as the Central Government. The second is to have open-heart discussions with the concerned parties, and, redress the grievances of the affected families. The lifting of the Act and all these things will take place only after consultation with all the concerned parties and maintaining co-ordination with all.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to seek four clarifications on the two statements that the Home Minister has made. Before I do so, however, let me say how pained I was to listen to the statement of the Leader of the Opposition who used, unfortunately, words like blackmail, and complicity of the State Government, which somehow did not do justice to the rest of his

statement, which was very statesmanlike. He also talked about that it is for the Government not to adopt a traffic light approach to combat terrorism ...*(Interruptions)*....

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): Sir, he is seeking clarification or. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: But I am commenting on his statement. I am sorry, I am entitled to that...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. No. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jairam, please seek clarification. It is not a debate.

श्री एस एस अहलुवालिया: उपसभापति जी, ये नए सदस्य हैं, इनको ज़रा बता दीजिए कि क्लैरिफिकेशन स्टेटमेंट पर है। अब विपक्ष के क्लैरिफिकेशन पर फरदर क्लैरिफिकेशन होगा तो फिर बहुत कुछ होगा।

SHRI SANJAY NIRUPAM (Maharashtra): Sir, at the most, he can seek clarification from the Minister ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I am entitled ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please confine yourself to clarifications only ...*(Interruptions)*...It is not a debate.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I am asking clarifications. But, I cannot let words like blackmail complicity of the State Government to be used and go ...*(Interruptions)*... I am sorry. I have every right to make that statement. You have held the House hostage for the whole day. So, let me speak for two minutes...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please confine to clarification.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: What is this ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, sit down ...*(Interruptions)*. Please, let us not involve in this ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He cannot say ...*(Interruptions)*. Why such a comment? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I am asking for clarifications, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, this is only for clarification. It is not a debate ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I am asking, Sir. I am asking for clarification only ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He should ask clarifications only ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, sit down. Please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: I am asking, Sir...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, seek the clarification. This is not a debate...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I am asking for clarifications ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He will tell how the Leader of the Opposition ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwaliaji ...*(Interruptions)*. You have said whatever you have to ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, he is teaching us all the time ...*(Interruptions)*. He is teaching us all the time ...*(Interruptions)*.

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): आप क्यों बोल रहे हैं, ये तो क्लेरिफिकेशन पूछ रहे हैं? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति: सरला जी, आप बैठिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*... Mr. Ahluwalia, let him confine to clarifications. Please, let him confine to clarifications. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, the point is very simple...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: It is not a simple point, Sir...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Why he said that ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have restricted him ...*(Interruptions)*. I have asked him to be confined to clarifications ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: What is this ...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ahluwalia, please, sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Jairam Ramesh, please confine. It is a statement

by the Minister. It is not a debate. Kindly seek clarifications only.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: Sir, I am seeking the clarifications, but I was sufficiently provoked by the ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no, you should not get provoked ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, he is ...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: No, I am sorry, it is my job ...*(Interruptions)*. Sir, the clarifications are the following. ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री दीपांकर मुखर्जी (पश्चिमी बंगाल): सर, यह सब क्या हो गया? मैं भी खड़ा हो जाता हूँ। ...*(व्यवधान)*... There is a limit ...*(Interruptions)*... Every time he stands and ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, he is taking up his clarifications ...*(Interruptions)*. Please, sit down. Mr. Dipankar, please sit down. Mr. Ahluwalia, if Chair is there, why are you ...*(interruptions)*.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: He is advising the Chair, Sir ...*(Interruptions)*. Sir, the first clarifications I want from the Home Minister is: What steps has the Government taken to provide adequate protection and adequate safety to the police and the Armed Force personnel and their families who are in the frontline of this movement to combat insurgency, militancy and terrorism in both these States? This is the first clarification that I would like to seek. Secondly, Sir, in the statement on Manipur, it has been stated that the Armed Forces have started proceedings against those who are alleged to have been responsible for the incident. Is there any timeframe envisaged for this inquiry? Thirdly, are there any steps that the Government is contemplating to engage in discussion with responsible civil society groups, particularly in Manipur, who are part of the democratic process, who want very much to remain part of the Indian union, but, yet, have been forced by circumstances and have been compelled to take positions at this particular point of time which may appear not to be in consonance with the Constitution? So, is there any move, is there any desire, are there any steps being contemplated for engaging in discussion with civil society groups which form a very important element of public opinion in this region in general and Manipur in particular? Finally, Sir, on Manipur, I would like to ask the clarification whether it is the reading of the Government, whether there is

evidence available with the Government to draw any form of link between the growth of insurgency and terrorist activities and what might be called narco-terrorism. This is an area, Sir, which, as you know, is in the centre of regional drug trade. Whether, in fact, there is evidence that the Government has been able to accumulate on the links between the terrorists and trade in narcotics and whether there is a viable strategy that the Government is contemplating to deal with this problem?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request the hon. Member to confine herself to clarifications because the hon. Minister has to go to the other House also.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तरांचल): जी बिल्कुल। उपसभापति जी, दो वक्तव्य गृह मंत्री जी ने सदन में दिए हैं, एक असम पर और एक मणिपुर पर। मैं केवल मणिपुर तक ही अपनी बात सीमित रखूंगी। मणिपुर पर बहुत छोटा वक्तव्य आया है, पंद्रह वाक्य से भी कम का है, लेकिन हर वाक्य से एक प्रश्न उभर रहा है। अगर आप अंतिम वाक्य पढ़ें, जिसे मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना चाहूंगी, “केंद्र सरकार स्थिति पर निगाह रखे हुए है, सरकार स्थिति से निपटने के लिए उपयुक्त कार्रवाई करेगी”, मैं गृह मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहती हूँ कि वे आखिर किस चीज का इंतजार कर रहे हैं? यह वाक्य पढ़कर शिवराज जी मुझे ग़ालिब का एक शेर याद आता है, ये तो माना कि तगाफुल न करोगे, लेकिन खाक हो जाएंगे हम तुमको खबर होने तक। मणिपुर जल रहा है। न्यूड प्रोटेस्ट, नग्न प्रदर्शन हो रहे हैं, आग लगी हुई है, लोग सड़कों पर हैं। आखिर आप किस चीज का इंतजार कर रहे हैं? क्या होना बाकी है? कब तक आप स्थिति पर निगाह रखे रहेंगे? क्या कार्रवाई करेंगे और कब करेंगे? दो बहुत खूबसूरत लफ्जों में मेरे नेता विपक्ष ने मणिपुर की दशा का वर्णन किया है कि वहां सुनवाई बंद हो गई है और इक्बाल समाप्त हो गया है। उपसभापति जी, इक्बाल की समाप्ति तो इन्होंने स्वयं स्वीकार की है। दूसरे वाक्य में लिखा है कि 12 अगस्त को केंद्र सरकार के परामर्श के विपरीत राज्य सरकार ने अधिनियम इम्फाल से वापस लिया। केंद्र सरकार के परामर्श के विपरीत। केंद्र सरकार किसी और की और राज्य सरकार किसी और की नहीं है। इनकी अपनी राज्य सरकार है, कांग्रेस की सरकार है। इस इक्बाल के बारे में मैं जसवंत सिंह जी से कहना चाहूंगी कि यह इक्बाल केवल मणिपुर में ही समाप्त नहीं हुआ है, बल्कि ऐसे इक्बाल की समाप्ति पहले पंजाब में भी हो चुकी है। वहां भी सरकार इन्हीं की है। लेकिन केंद्र सरकार से पूछे बिना जिस तरह पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री ने एक अधिनियम पारित करा दिया और बाद में परामर्श मानने से इंकार कर दिया, उसी तरह मणिपुर में, स्वयं लिखित वक्तव्य में गृह मंत्री स्वीकार कर रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान) ... गृह मंत्री स्वीकार कर रहे हैं केंद्र सरकार के परामर्श के विपरीत अधिनियम वापस हुआ। अगले वाक्य में यह भी स्वीकार कर रहे हैं कि अधिनियम वापस लेने के बाद भी स्थिति में सुधार नहीं हुआ। गृह मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे पूछना चाहती हूँ कि जो भ्रामक स्थिति

3.00 P.M.

मणिपुर में बनी हुई है - तकाजा तो यह था कि केंद्र सरकार इस भ्रम की स्थिति को समाप्त करती, लेकिन हो यह रहा है कि आप अपनी ओर से भ्रम की स्थिति को बढ़ा रहे हैं। असम राइफल्स पर एक बयान गृह मंत्री का आता है कि हम असम राइफल्स को विदड्डा करेंगे, दूसरा बयान रक्षा मंत्री का आता है कि विदड्डा करने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता। रक्षा मंत्री को पता नहीं कि गृह मंत्री क्या बोल रहे हैं, गृह मंत्री को पता नहीं कि रक्षा मंत्री क्या बोल रहे हैं। यह जान-बूझकर किया गया विवाद है। मेरे आपसे क्लैरिफिकेशन्स हैं। पहला तो यह है कि आप किस चीज का इंतजार कर रहे हैं और आप कब कार्रवाई करेंगे? दूसरा असम राइफल्स के बारे में आप लोगों ने क्या तय किया है? तीसरा, जो सवाल भी है और सुझाव भी, सुझाव इसलिए क्योंकि इस तरह की जटिल परिस्थितियों में हम कोई दलगत राजनीति नहीं करना चाहते, इसलिए मैं आपसे पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या आपको नहीं लगता कि अब समय आ गया है कि जब इस पर एक पोलिटिकल डायलॉग प्रधानमंत्री के स्तर पर शुरू होना चाहिए? पहले मरहम लगाने की जरूरत है। अगर एक पोलिटिकल डायलॉग आप यह कहकर शुरू करें कि पहले वे लोग वहां का एजिटेशन सस्पेंड करें, एक बार टेबल पर आएँ, बात करें, किसी को लगे तो सही कि कोई उन्हें बुला रहा है। राज्य सरकार के मुख्यमंत्री ने एक दिन अधिनियम वापस लिया तो परसों उनका बयान आया कि वह एक्ट लगाया भी जा सकता है। क्यों इस तरह की दुविधा की स्थिति केंद्र सरकार और राज्य सरकार के बीच में बनी हुई है? मैं आपको एक सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर अपने स्तर पर वहां एक पोलिटिकल डायलॉग शुरू करें। यह अजीब बात है कि वहां न प्रधानमंत्री गए हैं, न गृह मंत्री, केवल गृह राज्य मंत्री वहां का दौरा करके आए हैं। उस पोलिटिकल डायलॉग में हम एक्ट के रिपील की नहीं, कम से कम एक्ट के रिव्यू की बात तो कर सकते हैं। आखिर इतने वर्षों से यह एक्ट वहां लागू है, इस एक्ट से क्या लाभ हुआ, क्या हानि हुई, इसका एक आकलन किया जाए। इसके साथ-साथ यह भी देखा जाए कि कौन से ऐसे प्रावधान हैं, जिन कारणों से ऐसी घटनाएं हो जाती हैं? क्या उन में से कोई डिस्मिशन, कोई मौडीफिकेशन की जरूरत है, कोई अमेंडमेंट की जरूरत है? अगर कोई संशोधन या परिमार्जन कर के स्थिति बच सकती है तो रिव्यू करने की भी बात हो सकती है। लेकिन मैं आप से जानना चाहूंगी कि क्या इन तमाम बातों पर आप ने कोई विचार किया है या केवल निगाह रखे हुए हैं और उपयुक्त कार्यवाही करने का इंतजार कर रहे हैं? धन्यवाद।

SHRI SHANKAR ROY CHOWDHURY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank the Home Minister for his statement on these two issues. I wish to seek a few clarifications on the statement made in respect of Manipur. I am aware of the fact that inquiries are going on. So, perhaps, the hon. Home Minister may not be in a position to give clarifications on

this issue. I appreciate that. In para 3 of the statement, it has been stated that some people in the State are agitating to see that the Armed Forces Special (Powers) Act is withdrawn, and I supplement Mr. Jairam Ramesh's query. Is there any evidence of these some people being connected with the drug, extortion or timber mafia? Secondly, I pass over the question of the Union Government and the State Government. That is an issue to be decided between the Governments themselves. But I would like to ask a few details about Manorama Devi case from the Home Minister if he can answer them. I am aware again of what I told you. Firstly, is it a fact that all available intelligence indicates that the late Th. Manorama Devi was a member of the Peoples' Liberation Army? She had received training in Bangladesh and she was an ED expert, who was responsible for earlier explosions in the State? My questions are based on news-items, which have appeared in the Media. Is it correct to state that on 11th July, 2004, Th. Manorama Devi was arrested at 3.30 a.m. in the morning by a party of the Assam Rifles, acting on information received? Thirdly, is it correct that the Assam Rifles party, which arrested Th. Manorama Devi, gave an arrest memo, acknowledging that she had been taken into custody by them? Fourthly, is it correct that when Th. Manorama Devi was arrested, a call was made to the police station in Imphal to send a woman constable at 3.30 a.m. in the morning which the police station was unable to send? Fifthly, is it correct that Th. Manorama Devi indicated to the arresting party that she had hidden an automatic weapon somewhere and she wanted to hand it over to the Assam Rifles, and she offered to take them to the spot? Is it correct that his automatic weapon was never found in spite of being taken to various places? Is it correct that when Th. Manorama Devi was being brought back after this, shall I say a fruitless exercise, she expressed the desire to relieve herself? Is it correct that when Th. Manorama Devi was released to answer the call of nature, she made an effort to escape, and the escort shot her down? Is it correct that a subsidiary post mortem examination has established that rape was highly unlikely? According to this statement, Th. Manorama Devi's body was found in a field. Is it correct that it was not found in a field? The Assam Rifles Party was with the body, and they were waiting for the Police to come and collect it.

I move on to the subsequent paragraph. "The Armed Forces have started proceedings against those who are alleged to have been responsible for the incident." It appears that a decision has been reached

regarding the guilt in this case. Is this a disciplinary proceeding or is this a proceeding of inquiry?

And lastly, Sir, I would ask the Home Minister as to whether the agitation in Manipur is confined in the region of Imphal to only the Meiti community or has it spread to the Naga areas of the hill district?

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I wish to seek a clarification only on one point. Manipur was a disturbed area, and the Government thought it necessary to have the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act. Now, as a reaction to this Act, we have an agitation which appears to be going out of control. The point on which I want to seek a clarification is—because I do not know the precise contents of the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act—if the Home Minister were to compare the Special Powers Act with the POTA, which is applicable in the rest of the country, which one would he consider as more potent, more comprehensive or stronger or, you can say, more draconian? On the basis of that judgment, I would be able to form my opinion about the decisions that the Government might eventually be taking about both the Special Powers Act and the POTA. Thank you very much, Sir. (Ends)

श्री संजय निरुपम (महाराष्ट्र): आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, पहले पंजाब और उसके बाद मणिपुर। ... (व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: असम और मणिपुर पर कन्फाइन कीजिए।

श्री संजय निरुपम: सर, मणिपुर में जो घटनाएं घटीं, वे सिर्फ मणिपुर के लिए चिंता की बात नहीं है बल्कि पूरे देश के लिए चिंता की बात है। मैंने मणिपुर से पहले पंजाब शब्द का इस्तेमाल इसलिए किया कि ठीक है, यह बिल्कुल उसी तरह की घटना नहीं है, लेकिन सार एक ही है, भाव एक ही है। केन्द्र सरकार के खिलाफ या देश के संघीय ढांचे को एक रखने की भावना के खिलाफ जिस प्रकार से पिछले दो महीने से, एक महीने से अलग अलग राज्य सरकारें अपना एक स्टैंड लेने चली हैं और उसके रिएक्शन, उसकी प्रतिक्रिया में जिस प्रकार से केन्द्र सरकार लगभग चुप्पी साधकर बैठी हुई है या फिर इस प्रकार का बयान दिया जा रहा है कि केन्द्र सरकार स्थिति पर निगाह रखे हुए है, सरकार स्थिति से निपटने के लिए उपयुक्त कार्रवाई करेगी, उससे निश्चित तौर पर बहुत चिंता बढ़ गई है।

उपसभापति जी, सुषमा जी ने जो बात रखी थी, बिल्कुल उसी बात को मैं आगे बढ़ाना चाहूंगा कि आखिर वह वाचिंग सिक्यूरेशन का मतलब क्या होगा? आखिर सरकार कब तक

वाचिंग सिचुएशन की ओर ध्यान देती रहेगी? आखिर सरकार एक्शन क्यों नहीं लेती? केन्द्र सरकार के परामर्श के खिलाफ वह जो विशेष अधिनियम था, उसको राज्य सरकार ने इम्फाल शहर से बाहर कर दिया, इम्फाल शहर से वापस ले लिया और केन्द्र सरकार चुपचाप तमाशा देख रही है। यह 11 जुलाई को मनोरमा देवी का शव प्राप्त हुआ, जनरल साहब कह रहे थे कि प्राप्त नहीं हुआ बल्कि वहां पर असम राइफल्स के जवान भी थे। अब इस बारे में गृह मंत्री जी अधिकृत तौर पर सही स्थिति बताएं।

उपसभापति जी, 11 जुलाई को यह वाकया हुआ और उसके बाद पूरे मणिपुर में एक प्रकार से धरने, प्रदर्शन, नग्न प्रदर्शन हुए। मैंने अखबारों में तस्वीरें देखी हैं कि मनोरमा देवी की इस घटना के विरोध में मणिपुर की महिलाओं ने, या कहें किसी एक संगठन की महिलाओं ने सचमुच अपने पूरे बदन से कपड़े उतार करके प्रदर्शन किया, मेने ख्याल से असम राइफल्स के जो स्थानीय कार्यालय थे उसके सामने। रोज लगभग इस प्रकार की घटनाएं घट रही थी। 12 अगस्त को यह अधिनियम वापिस लिया गया, तो 11 जुलाई से लेकर 12 अगस्त, यानी एक महीना एक दिन तक केन्द्र सरकार ने क्या कार्रवाई की यह मुझे सबसे पहले क्लेरिफिकेशन के तौर पर जानना है। निश्चित तौर पर मनोरमा देवी एक एक्टिविस्ट थी। उसके बारे में यहां तक कहा गया है, जैसा कि अभी जनरल साहब ने बताया कि उसको तीन बजे सुबह गिरफ्तार किया गया। जानकारी यह है जैसा हमें अखबारों के जरिए सुनने को मिला, पढ़ने को मिला कि उसे पिछले कई महीनों में कई बार गिरफ्तार किया गया और एक प्रकार से अत्याचार की बात भी कही जा रही थी, बलात्कार की बात भी कही गई। अपने जवानों के मनोबल को तोड़ने में मेरा कोई विश्वास नहीं है। लेकिन जवानों को अगर अधिकार दिया गया है तो उस अधिकार का दुरुपयोग नहीं होना चाहिए और जवानों को कोई अधिकार नहीं है मानवाधिकारों के हनन करने का। इस बारे में भी अगर गृह मंत्री महोदय बता सकें कि मनोरमा देवी उस दिन पहली बार गिरफ्तार हुई थी या उससे पहले भी उसे कई बार गिरफ्तार किया गया था और उसके साथ किसी प्रकार का दुर्व्यवहार किया गया था? तो ऐसी स्थितियों पर एक नजर रखने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। क्या राज्य सरकार मणिपुर की स्थिति को संभालने में एकदम से पूरी तरह से विफल हो गई है। जब कानून व्यवस्था पूरी तरह से हाथ से निकल चुकी है, बिखर चुकी है तो ऐसे में क्या केन्द्र सरकार, क्या गृह मंत्रालय संविधान की धारा-356 का इस्तेमाल करते हुए मणिपुर में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने के बारे में विचार कर रही है?

SHRI RISHANG KEISHING (Manipur): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I want to seek clarifications on a few points. Firstly, Manipur people's demand for removal of Assam Rifles, I think, is from Kangla Fort. The Government has given a categorical assurance that the Assam Rifles will be shifted from there by 31st December. As far as the other battalions

are concerned, I think there are over a dozen battalions posted in Manipur and they can't possibly shift their own base area. So, there is no conflict in saying that the Assam Rifles will not be shifted. But the Assam Rifles will be shifted from the Kangla Fort in Manipur. I think the hon. Minister can further clarify this.

Regarding the death of Manorama, it is a sad thing that she was picked up alive in the presence of her family members and her dead body was thrown away somewhere in the jungle. Since the fact was that she was picked up alive, she should be returned alive or she may be imprisoned or she should be somewhere else alive. But killing is the least thing to be done. There are over a dozen custodial deaths in Manipur now. This is happening from time to time. I think this is causing a lot of anxiety in the people. There is a very strong resentment among the people. So, this point should be looked into. Nobody would expect that those, who are picked up, whether they are extremists or suspected people, would be killed and their dead bodies would be returned. They are all our own citizens. They have been misled or they have gone astray. All the efforts that we are making are intended to bring them back to the mainstream. So, killing is the least thing to be expected and it should be completely stopped. In Manorama's case, till today I don't know whether the persons—the case is being tried—have actually been identified, apprehended and brought to book. It is too long. A few of them came and picked her up. We don't know in what manner they killed her. But it is a fact that she was killed and her dead body was recovered. The punishment should not take such a long time. Had he been booked or had they been booked, I think, this movement would have been subsided to some extent. The delay in punishing them itself is causing a lot of problem. I would like to know how soon this trial or this court martial would be completed.

The State Government has set up a Commission headed by a retired judge, Shri Upendra. The Commission has summoned the Assam Rifles. But the Assam Rifles is not cooperating with them. I do not know how the Government would direct them to cooperate with the Commission. Why are they not appearing before the Commission? What is the reason? I think that again is bringing a conflict between the civilians and our own Armed Forces and Paramilitary Forces. That should be avoided. I would like to know from the hon. Minister: How will the Ministry stop this conflict?

There is no doubt that Manorama was a PLA cadre. I have come to

know that one PLA cadre, a man, who had some differences with Manorama, deserted his cadre and surrendered to the Assam Rifles. I think this man, perhaps, might have led them to Manorama's place. What is his role in the killing of Manorama? I have come to know from very reliable sources, from the most trustworthy people, that this man is the key. He should be found out. What was the role of this man in the murder of this lady?

The tension which is going on there to be subsided. I would be good on the part of the Government to invite these people or organisations, who are sponsoring this agitation for a discussion. Some of them can be invited. They may or may not come, but they should be invited. If they have anything to discuss, they should come and discuss it. Or somebody can go from here and invite them for a discussion. In this way, you can pacify them to a great extent.

Now the core insurgent group who are underground, I most respectfully request the Government, as has been done in the case of NSCN, Bodo people and Mizo people, that the insurgents should be called a dialogue. Whether they come in a group or individually, the Government of India should be ready for a dialogue with them. It will help us a lot. That will induce the people to pressurise them to accept this offer of a dialogue. In this way, you will be able to pacify them. That is my belief.

Lastly, charging this man or that man and saying that this man is involved in insurgency or having something with insurgency, is not going to solve the problem. My most respectful submission is, we should not deal with these insurgents in this part of the country. In our desire to expand our party activities, we should not take the help of these people. This has happened in the past and that gives a lot of encouragement to them. If anybody wants to have the details, I can submit those details and I can substantiate that. My appeal to all the political parties is, no party should deal with any insurgent for the sake of expanding its organisation. Thank you.

श्री उपसभापति: प्रो० रामदेव भंडारी। आप सिर्फ क्लेरिफिकेशन पूछिये।

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी (बिहार): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने मणिपुर और असम में हो रही घटनाओं के बारे में बयान दिया है। मणिपुर और असम दोनों नार्थ-इस्ट के बड़े ही सेंसेटिव स्टेट्स हैं। इन दोनों राज्यों में उग्रवादी और अलगाववादी ग्रुप

लगातार सक्रिय रहे हैं। जो भी सरकारें आई हैं, उन्होंने प्रयास किया है कि या तो उन्हें देश की जो मुख्य धारा है, उससे जोड़ा जाए या फिर उन्हें मजबूती से, सख्ती से दबाया जाए। मणिपुर को अशांत क्षेत्र घोषित किया हुआ है और सम्पूर्ण राज्य में सशस्त्र बल (विशेष शक्तियाँ) अधिनियम लागू है और उसी को वापस करने के लिए वहाँ आंदोलन हो रहा था। टी० एच० मनोरमा देवी का शव मिला और उसकी हत्या का आरोप असम राइफल्स पर लगाया गया। मांग की जा रही है कि असम राइफल्स को इस क्षेत्र से हटा लिया जाए। महोदय, मणिपुर के बारे में केंद्रीय सरकार भी बहुत चिंतित है, सभी देशवासी चिंतित हैं, इसलिए सशस्त्र बलों ने उनके विरुद्ध कार्यवाही शुरू कर दी है और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट ने मामले की न्यायिक जांच भी प्रारंभ कर दी है।

श्री उपसभापति : आप क्लैरिफिकेशन पूछिए।

प्रो० रामदेव भंडारी : मैं इसमें सिर्फ एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी कार्यवाहियाँ की जा रही हैं, मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूँगा कि जो घटनाएँ हो रही हैं, अगर बात करने से रास्ता निकल आए तो अवश्य निकालें या जिनकी गलती पाई जाती है, उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही की जाए, और इसमें शीघ्रता करनी चाहिए।

जहाँ तक असम का सवाल उठता है, जब पूरा देश आज़ादी का जश्न मना रहा था, उस दिन असम में तीन घटनाएँ हुईं। वहाँ उल्फा उग्रवाद, अलगाववाद लगातार सक्रिय रहा है, हिंसात्मक घटनाएँ करता रहा है। आपको स्मरण होगा कि जिस समय रेलवे का वहाँ इंटरव्यू हो रहा था, बिहार के छात्रों के साथ भी उल्फा उग्रवादियों ने हिंसात्मक घटनाएँ की थीं। सबसे पहले तो मैं इसकी भर्त्सना करता हूँ। स्वतंत्रता दिवस के अवसर पर जो हिंसात्मक घटनाएँ उन्होंने कीं, उसकी जितनी भी निंदा की जाए, वह कम है और मैं सरकार से यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह के अलगाववादी तत्वों से, उग्रवादी तत्वों से मुकाबला करने में पूरा देश आपके साथ है और असम और मणिपुर में इस तरह के तत्वों से सख्ती से निपटना चाहिए, धन्यवाद।

SHRI DINESH TRIVEDI (West Bengal): Sir, a lot of clarifications have already been sought. Especially, General Saheb has put pointed questions. That does not leave much scope for any further clarifications. So, I will take not more than perhaps a minute-and-a-half.

It is fact that the statement raises more questions than answers, and there are no simple answers as well. I am aware of that. Sir, the beginning of the statement confesses—this is true and we all know this—that this is not a simple law and order problem of Manipur. It is a problem of insurgency and militancy. If you look at the media reports, there is a general impression being created around the country that it is the Assam Rifles which is at the focal point of all the controversies and

agitations. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this is a fact.

Sir, the statement also makes certain things very clear. When you use the word 'allegation' or 'allege', it means that nothing, at the moment, is clear as to what really was the role of Assam Rifles.

All I am trying to say is that we are very proud of our military and, I am sure, everybody in the House and the country will agree on this. So, it is about time that some kind of national clarification must come on the view and the information that the Central Government has on this. Sir, it is also very clear that the State Government has not adhered to the advice of the Central Government when it comes to the withdrawal of the Act from the city; it was done against the Centre's advice. One clarification that I certainly would like to have is this: To what extent was this agitation triggered off by politics and especially the downsizing of the State Ministry as per the norms laid down in the new Act? How much of it is true that that was the beginning of the recent agitation, which had intensified? Lastly, it is also very clear that there has been no change in the situation even after the Centre or the State has done many things. Like many of my other colleagues have asked, what is the next step of the Government and how long will that take? When would you share with this House and the country the information which the Central Government has on the actual ground reality in Manipur.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Sir, I will limit myself to seeking clarifications alone.

I am reminded of the situation that was created in Manipur in June, 2001, when the Assembly was burnt and when the entire Manipur was throbbing with protests against the decisions of the then Central Government. A number of people had been killed. If I remember correctly, 15-16 people had been killed in Police firing. The situation had become very tense at that time. Today, I am finding a similarity between the two situations. In fact, I remember that on the 16th or the 17th of July, after this demonstration—that has been referred to as 'nude demonstration', perhaps, for the first time in our country—I had requested the hon. Chairman of the house to allow a discussion, and if not a discussion, at least the permission to raise the points. However, that could not be, because of some pressing reasons. I am sure the hon. Home Minister will agree with me that the situation in Manipur has become extremely

complicated. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he could identify or locate some organisation. Of course, my hon. friend, Shri Rishang Keishing, knows much more because he has been the longest-serving CM of Manipur. But he will agree with me that the political situation, the economic situation, everything, is in bad shape. So, could the Home Ministry identify some group or some organisation which was of representative character and with whom a dialogue could be started. To my knowledge, Sir, the situation is not like the one in Mizoram or even in Nagaland where you have NSCN(K) and NSCN (I-M), the two groups; you can talk to and you can try to settle the issues; it is a different thing whether you are able to settle or not. But in Manipur, I believe, there are around 29 groups of insurgents. Each tribe has got one insurgent group. Meitei is the dominating ethnic group; and perhaps, they have got two or three. I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Home Minister. Now, the Armed Forces Special Powers Act was enacted in 1958; it was amended in 1972; it was promulgated in Manipur in 1980. Since 1980 to this day, in these 24 years, Manipur has been under President's Rule for quite a considerable period of time. To my knowledge, the number of insurgent groups has got increased. In fact, in Manipur, the peace-loving people, the ordinary people—it has been there for a long time, it is not a new development in the State—are sandwiched between the Armed Forces and the insurgent groups. The Armed Forces excesses are very common in Manipur. There have been a number of such reports. It is not a new development, Sir. There have been a number of reports in this regard. For the last three-four years, I know it for certain that many civilians have been killed. We also raised this question in this House, without respite. So, to my mind, instead of taking care of the problem and looking after the good people, the peace-loving people, the Armed Forces Special Powers Act has rather complicated the situation in many respects. The hon. Home Minister would correct me whether I am right in saying this. It is the State Government that decides from time to time, from year to year, about the continuance of the Armed Forces Special Powers Act.

[The vice Chairman (Shri Dinesh Trivedi) in the Chair]

The responsibility rests with the State Government to promulgate or to withdraw it. So, I believe, the State Government, perhaps, is not under any obligation to seek the opinion or the permission of the Central

Government to revoke it fully or revoke it partially. I don't know whether I am correct or not in stating this situation. This is number one.

Secondly, the Home Minister would be welcome to kindly clarify whether there is any discrepancy in the seizure list. Everybody is saying and I am also convinced from the press reports that Th. Manorama Devi was involved in extremist activities and militant activities. I don't know what was her degree of involvement. But, between the copy of the seizure list—it is reported in the press and that is something offensive to me—which was given to the family of manorama Devi and the seizure list which exhibited afterwards, there is a difference. In the original seizure list, her brother, Dholendra Singh, was shown, and there is no mention of grenades or some arms or some ammunition being seized from her house at the time of arrest. And that seizure list was countersigned and witnessed by Dholendra Singh and the left hand thumb impression of manorama Devi's mother was also taken. But, I am told that the seizure list that was shown afterwards in the judicial Inquiry Commission contained only the purported signature of manorama Devi and that contained... (Time-bell) Yes, I am concluding. They could also trace some grenades or some other arms. I want to know whether it is a fact. I am of the opinion, I must say, and I am sure that the hon. Home Minister would also be holding the same opinion that even if she was an insurgent element, even if she was the most dreaded insurgent element, the police or the Army authority is under no right to kill her from the back or to kill her from the front without trying her.

Sir, here I am reminded of the Ahmedabad incident of 15th of June killing of Ishrat Jehan. The Ahmedabad Police told that they had fired 42 rounds. The four persons died in that firing were all attributed to Pakistan. Ishrat jehan was also killed summarily. They alleged that there was an encounter. In fact, none of the police officer was hit. Even their uniform was also not anyway hit by bullets, whereas they alleged that some 42 rounds of bullets were sprayed from AK-56. However, I am not going to comment on that extensively. I would just like to know from the hon. Home Minister about this issue of killing of Manorama Devi and whether she was trying to escape and what exactly the incident was. But, whether, the killing could have been avoided, and when the Army or the Assam Rifles were knowing that she was a proven fugitive, they should have taken adequate care before advancing to arrest her because her

arrest must be a premeditated move. It was not at the spur of the moment that she has been arrested. But, it appears to me that the police party or the Assam Rifles party which was deputed for arresting Monarama was not adequately prepared to take care of this fugitive formidably. That is why these lapses have taken place. Would the hon. Home Minister be kind enough to advise the Assam Rifles or for that matter any such force that they should have adequate preparation before launching such programmes? This is about Manipur. I would certainly bring it to the notice of the hon. Minister that the Manipur situation is extensively bad situation, complicated situation and delicate situation too. On 14th of August, as you all know, Sir, they have celebrated their independence. They unfurled their own flag. It is a question of seceding from the Union of India and the anti-Indian feeling are precipitating in Manipur. We should be extremely careful. Personally I feel and I submit to you that there should be a comprehensive discussion in this House because it is Council of States. We should have a comprehensive discussion on the situation in Manipur in particular and North-East in general. We should have a comprehensive discussion whereby we can really give our opinion extensively. This is all about Manipur. I would just seek one clarification from the hon. Home Minister on the situation in Assam. Three blasts were there; one in Dhemaji College, one in North Lakhimpur and the place is Dakhuakana and the other is in Dhubri District and it was in Gauripur. These blasts were of similar nature. Sir, I would seek one clarification from the hon. Home Minister that only recently the Bhutan Royal Army-some months back, of course, - in cooperation with the Indian Army, I am told flushed out these elements, insurgent elements and their camps were destroyed. ULFA, Bodo militants, even Kamtapur liberation organisation one militant group of West Bengal, rather North Bengal, were all flushed out. After being flushed out, after their camps were destroyed, they are perhaps desperate in re-establishing themselves as a formidable militant group. It is a usual practice and we have seen in cross-border terrorism also that when some action is taken against them, they want to demonstrate their being; their existence and it may be a desperate attempt to express, to establish their existence. I would like to know whether the notes have been sent to the State Governments of the North-East and whether the Central Government is taking adequate care so that they do not act in such desperation and destroy common lives and property of the people of this country. Thank you.

DR. K. MALAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, unlike other speakers, I will finish in a minute or at the most in two minutes by putting one or two clarifications. At the outset, I am very much disturbed to touch upon the disturbed area, Manipur. The hon. Home Minister has given a statement to the effect that the State Government has gone against the advice given by the Government of India on the withdrawal of the Armed Forces Special Powers Act. Against the advice given by the Union Government, the State Government withdrew the Act from the city of Imphal and allowed for the rest of it. What is the great logic in it? They have confined it to one portion and did not keep it on the other. According to the State Government, People are not satisfied with the working of the Act; Hence it was withdrawn. If this is the case, then they should have withdrawn it stock lock barrel. What is the great logic in it by keeping it for one portion covering certain area and withdrawing it from another area? I would like to submit to the hon. Home Minister that you have given advice and your advice has been thrown to the winds. what are you going to do? You are supposed to be an all-powerful body. In Centre-States relations, you are more powerful. You are giving an advice, but the State Government is not listening. What is your further action to deal with them? That is my first clarification to seek. Secondly, coming to the killing of Manorama Devi, it looks as if it is the handiwork of the Assam Rifles. Now the State Government has come forward to constituted a judicial inquiry. Okay, it is well taken. But to mitigate the gravity and smoothen the situation, is it enough to go for a judicial inquiry, which is a time consuming process? To keep the people alert of the situation and to mitigate the situation, what they could have done is some short-term measures by placing some suspected under suspension or something like that. That is what I am trying to say. As a student of management, I have been taught that any single problem will have more than one solution. Why do they confine to judicial inquiry alone? Why don't they think of something else also? Then my third point of clarification is: they have said that 'we are watching the situation and we will take appropriate action to meet the situation'. When? Sir, this is a very evasive answer on the part of the Central Government. I could understand that this is the language of the bureaucrats who put words to be very safe. What are you going to do? This is a problem. This problem of insurgency and militancy is not a micro level problem; it is a macro level problem. It is not confining to one State. It is going to cover several States. If that were the case you have to act. Just 'watching the

situation' and 'taking appropriate action' is not enough at all. On the other hand, macro level approach should be there and you should see the root cause of the situation and do something concrete. This is what I wanted to ask. One of our friends has said that other than the Armed Forces Special (Powers) Act can they use POTA Act also, Now, you have decided to withdraw POTA. This is what we hear from the Press. In that case are you going to propose to withdraw the Armed Forces Special (Powers) Act also? Sir, this is another point which I want to ask. My final point is relating to bomb blast. You can see that the explosion of bomb blast was caused by an IED planted 40 to 50 metres from the rostrum. This is the first blast. Secondly, the IED was buried just beneath the flag post. The bomb blast occurred beneath the flag post and very close to the rostrum. What is the system they have got? I would like to know whether the system is a total failure or whether it is a human failure. This is the point which I would like to ask. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL):
Sir, I am grateful to the Members who have expressed their views in the course of seeking clarifications on the Statements that I have made over here. I am thankful to you also Sir, for allowing these two Statements to be discussed at one and the same time. Mr. Jaswant Singh, the Leader of the Opposition, has not asked for the clarifications but he has made his views known to us on the situation that are prevailing in Assam and Manipur. Allow me to say that he has made very responsible statements and his stand is really statesman. It is not partisan, it is not political but it is something which will help us to keep the situation in the country under control and the country united. We value his statement. May I assure him that we are examining all aspects relating to the insurgency in the country in very great details and we are keeping watch of what is happening in all parts of our country. We would take his advice to be serious in examining all these aspects very carefully. We would certainly not lower our vigil, we will certainly use all the methods available to us to see that there is no insurgency, the peace and tranquility is established in the disturbed areas and the people are helped in many ways to develop their economic conditions and their social status. I do not think that there is anything more to say than this on the statement made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the floor of the House. Mr. Matilal Sarkar has condemned the death of Ms. Manorama Devi. He has done it very rightly. Any citizen

in the country losing his or her life does deserve the sympathy from all of us—from inside the House and from outside. We would also like to condemn the deaths of those who are participating in the terrorist activities, because of misguided views. They are also our brothers and sisters. More than that, Sir, our brothers, men and officers of the Armed Forces, are living thousands of miles away from their homes and from their places and exposing themselves to all kinds of dangers that are involved in countering insurgency in the country. They have laid down their lives. They have made supreme sacrifices. We also have to salute their sacrifices and condemn their deaths. It is not only terrorists and the armed forces who have lost their lives, but also thousands of innocent people lost their lives. They also deserve our sympathy and we should also offer our condolences to the kith and kin of those persons.

We have been talking about the human rights. I do think that India values human rights. It is in the culture of this country to respect the human rights. We do not harm even an insect in the country. We respect trees and animals. We see divinity in every human being and that is the value of human rights. But, when we talk about the human rights of one kind of person, we should not forget that others also have the human rights. If the person killed has human right, the person facing has also got human right and the innocent persons who are sacrificing their lives have also got human rights. So, this aspect has to be kept in mind.

Sir, some questions were asked about the kind of assistance we have been receiving from our neighbours while discussing what had happened in Assam and what has been happening in Manipur. We are grateful to the Government and the King of Bhutan for having given us the assistance to see that the terrorist groups, which were living in the territory of Bhutan, were removed from there and action was taken against them. We would, certainly, expect the same kind of assistance — if not the same kind of assistance—the same kind of sympathy and understanding from other neighbouring countries also. We are getting some assistance from other neighbouring countries—probably, some less assistance. We expect that all our neighbours understanding our difficulty and extend the assistance which they can extend to us. It has to be realised by all of us, in South-East Asia and in South Asia also, that terrorism is a double-edged weapon and it can be used against those who are suffering, and against those also who are just not paying enough

attention to control them in their territory. So that kind of expectations we do have from our neighbours.

Sir, Shri jairam Ramesh asked what kind of steps are taken by the Government to protect the members of the families of armed forces. Well, we have many rules and regulations, laws and schemes, which are used to extend help to the family members of the armed forces personnel, when they are on duty. We assist and help them even when they come back. Steps are also taken to help them when they lay down their lives in the service of the nation. I don't think it is necessary for me to go into all the details.

I was asked what is the timeframe within which the enquiry started by the Assam Rifles would be concluded. We know that the principles of natural justice do require that it is not only the prosecution which has the authority to ask for the postponement of the hearing of the cases, but the defence also has the right to do it. In the process, it becomes very difficult to give a particular timeframe within which the prosecution can be completed. But the endeavour would be to see that the prosecution, the enquiry, and the decision-giving would be done in as short a time as possible.

I was also asked whether the Government of India would be willing to talk to the people. Hon. member, Shri Jairam Ramesh, and many other hon. Members also asked whether the Government of India would be willing to talk to those who are willing to talk to us. The policy has been made very, very clear by this Government, and probably, the previous Government also was following the some kind of policy. At least, in the last few months of their governance, it had become very, very clear. And recently, the hon. Prime Minister, while speaking to the nation from the ramparts of the Red Fort, had said that the Government of India was willing to talk to anybody who was willing to talk. From the Home Ministry, we have been saying that we are willing to talk to anybody. That is why we are trying to have dialogue with the people in Kashmir. We did have dialogue with the people in Nagaland. And, we have made it very clear that if the State Governments are willing to talk to the Naxalites, in their States, they would be given all the assistance that is required for this purpose. That is why the Chief Minister and the Government of Andhra Pradesh are discussing these matters with the Naxalites in that State. Now, the same kind of offer has been made by me, not once but many

times. And, I would like to make the same kind of offer on behalf of the Government of India. Reinforced by the Statement made by the Prime Minister from the ramparts of the Red Fort that the Government of India is willing to talk to anybody who is willing to talk with India to see that the peace is strengthened, the injustice, which is done to some people, is done away with, and to see that the militancy and insurgency of any kind is not allowed to continue, as it is continuing in our country and in other parts of the world also. We would like to talk to anybody. And, the intension of talking to anybody is to see that the peace and tranquillity is strengthened, opportunities are given to the members to develop their economy, to do social justice to them..... and to indicate to them that it is better to talk and get their grievances removed rather than to take the arms and shed the blood and get nothing at the end. Now, that is our policy. And, so from this House also, I would like to make it very, very clear that the Government of India is willing to talk to anybody who is interested in strengthening peace and weakening militancy and insurgency and doing justice to everybody in the society.

I was also asked whether terrorism has anything to do with drug peddling, timber and arm running and things like that. Well it is known to all of us that those who are in the business of creating terror are earning money by using illegal means. They are printing fake notes. They are in the business of drug trafficking, gun running and selling the forest produce also and making money, and then abducting and kidnapping the innocent persons and making money. They are doing it. The nexus between the two is very clear, and it is not necessary for me to elaborate more than that on this point.

Sushmaji was very, eloquent. Hardly there are any who can compare with her eloquence in Hindi especially. And, then she talked about Intzar and Ikbal and so many things. Well she is sitting in the Opposition Benches and she is doing her duty, and the same kind of things we were doing when she was sitting in the Ruling Benches and we were sitting in the Opposition Benches. I do not find any fault with her मगर बहुत अच्छी हिंदी में उन्होंने कहा कि तुम्हारा इकबाल खत्म होता हुआ नजर आ रहा है, और कितने दिन इंतजार करोगे? मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम तब तक ही इंतजार करेंगे जब तक इंतजार करने की जरूरत है और उसमें से कुछ अच्छा निकलता है, तो उससे ज्यादा हम इंतजार नहीं करेंगे किसी बारे में। मगर इतनी भी जल्दबाजी नहीं करेंगे कि जिसकी वजह से थोड़ा सा भी बनता हुआ काम

4.00 P.M.

बिगड़ जाए। दोनों ही चीजें नहीं करेंगे और आप अच्छी तरह से जानती हैं, सरकार में आप रही हैं, अच्छी मंत्री भी नहीं हैं, आप अच्छी तरह से जानती हैं कि सरकार में जब हम रहते हैं तो जैसे razor's edge पर चलना होता है, वैसा हमारा चलना होता है। तार से ऊपर जैसे हम कदम उठाकर चलते हैं, वैसा हमारा चलना होता है। इस संबंध में भी मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे मणिपुर के लोग हैं, जो innocent लोग हैं, वे भी और जो टेररिस्ट्स के नाते वहाँ पर कुछ कर रहे हैं, वे भी और पुलिस फोर्स के लोग भी - वे सब हमारे भाई-बहन हैं। एक भाई है, जो गुस्से वाला है, हाथ में बंदूक लिए हैं, दूसरा भाई है जो समझता है कि अपना-अपना काम करना है और तीसरा भाई है जो कहता है कि किसी पर अन्याय नहीं होने देना है, उसकी रक्षा करनी है, वहाँ पर वे रहे हैं। हम उसी दृष्टि से उनकी तरफ देखते हैं, दूसरी दृष्टि से नहीं देखते हैं। वहाँ पर किसी ने बंदूक उठाकर-खून-खराबा करके वहाँ के हालात को बिगाड़ने की कोशिश की है, तो उसके लिए हमें जो भी अपना कर्तव्य, दायित्व निभाना है, वह हम निभायेंगे। उसमें डरेंगे नहीं। हमारे जो सुरक्षा बलों के लोग हैं, भाई हैं हम सब लोग हैं, आप लोग हैं, उस कर्तव्य में हम कोई गलती नहीं करेंगे। मगर वही एक तरीका नहीं है, दूसरा एक तरीका आपने भी बताया, दूसरों ने भी बताया-बात करो, उनसे चर्चा करो - उसको भी हम अमल में लाएंगे और कानून जो है, वह इस प्रकार से बनाओ कि जिसकी वजह से वहाँ के लोगों को ऐसा न लगे कि वहाँ कुछ गलत हो रहा है। अगर ऐसी जरूरत है तो उसको देखा जा सकता है, मगर सिर्फ इस प्रकार की मांग हो रही है, इसलिए देखा जाए और अपनी जान पर खेलकर, अपनी छाती पर जो गोलीयाँ होल रहे हैं, उनको हवा में छोड़ दिया जाए, ऐसा नहीं किया जा सकता। तो मैं आपको यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा इकबाल इतना छोट नहीं है कि गायब हो जाए। हमारा इकबाल सिर्फ सरकार का इकबाल नहीं है, वह देश का इकबाल है, आपका, हमारा, सबका इकबाल है और वह खत्म नहीं हुआ है और न ही होने दिया जाएगा और अपने भाई-बहनों को हम वहाँ पर दुरुस्त रास्ते पर लाएंगे।

आपने कहा कि कुछ मिनिस्टर्स में कुछ बातचीत हो रही है, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर एक बात कहते हैं और होम मिनिस्टर कुछ बात कहते हैं। मैं आपको बड़ी नम्रता के साथ कहना चाहूँगा कि न डिफेंस मिनिस्टर, न होम मिनिस्टर और न हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर या जो हम इधर बैठे हुए लोग हैं, इस प्रकार की बातें एक दूसरे के खिलाफ नहीं कर रहे हैं। अगर ऐसा कहीं नजर भी आया, किसी ने कहा कि ऐसा हुआ है तो मैं उनको बड़ी नम्रता के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इससे कुछ फायदा नहीं होने वाला है। हम इसकी वजह से झगड़ा नहीं करने वाले हैं। हम यह भी कहेंगे कि आपको इस बात को एक हद से ज्यादा लेने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है क्योंकि इससे कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। आपने जो सुझाव दिए हैं, यह बिल्कुल सही बात है कि इकबाल की जरूरत है। गवर्नमेंट हथियार की मदद से या कलम की मदद से, कानून की नजर से नहीं चलती, बल्कि प्रतिष्ठ से भी गवर्नमेंट चलती है, प्रेस चीज से भी गवर्नमेंट चलती है और इकबाल से भी गवर्नमेंट

चलती है। हम इसको कायम रखने की कोशिश करेंगे, बढ़ाने की कोशिश करेंगे और जो हालात बिगड़े हुए हैं उनको भी दुरुस्त करने की कोशिश करेंगे। मैं जनरल शंकर राय चौधरी का शुक्रियादा करना चाहता हूँ कि इन मामलों की जितनी जानकारी इनको है शायद, उतनी जानकारी यहां हम लोगों को नहीं है। इन्होंने दोनो तरफ से देखा है। इधर से भी देखा है और इधर से भी देखा है कि ऐसे काम कैसे किए जाते हैं। इन्होंने इसके अंदर बहुत सारे प्रश्न पूछे हैं। मैं बड़ी नम्रता से कहता चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो इतने सारे प्रश्न पूछे हैं, उसके बारे में मैंने भी सुना है। मुझे भी कहा गया है और मैंने भी ये सारी बातें सुनी हैं। कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि यह बिल्कुल सही बात है और इस बात को नजर अंदाज किया है।

But then, it is very difficult for me, when an inquiry is going on, to say that what you have said is correct and anything else is not correct. So, I would not be audacious enough to say whether these kinds of allegations made against the individuals are correct or incorred. I would just leave it at that. But I would say that I did hear these kinds of allegations from many quarters. I am not relying on these allegations, nor am I saying that they are baseless. All I am sayng is, let the inquiry proceed, let the judge conduct an inquiry, and if the inquiry being done by the Assam Rifles establishes these facts, and once these facts are established, we would either accept or reject them. I will just go to that extent and no beyond that. शरद जोशी साहब ने बड़ा पेचीदा और अच्छा प्रश्न पूछा है। इसका जवाब आज मुझे देने की जरूरत या नहीं है, इसका मुझे पता नहीं है, 'Is POTA more draconian than the Armed Forces Special Powers Act?' यह क्वेश्चन उन्होंने पूछा है। अब इसके ऊपर तो काफी चर्चा करनी पड़ेगी और उसी के बाद उसका जवाब दिया जा सकता है, मगर मैं इस बारे में थोड़ी सी बात कहता चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि Armed Forces Act, Armed Forces Special Powers Act जो है, वह क्या है? वह दो पेज का एक्ट है। 'disturbed area' or 'armed forces'; ये दोनो जो अस्तित्व में आए हैं, ये देश की एकता के लिए अस्तित्व में हैं। मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो कानून अस्तित्व में आए हैं, वे National Integration Council के रेकमेंडेशन्स के बाद बनाए गए हैं और नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के लिए बनाए गए हैं और ये 1960 में बनाए गए हैं तब से ये अस्तित्व में हैं। यह जो Armed Forces Special Powers Act यह इतना ही कहता है कि अगर आर्मड फोर्सेसज को किसी प्रांत में कानून और व्यवस्था बनाए रखने की जिम्मेदारी दी जाए तो वे क्या कर सकते हैं असल में कानून और व्यवस्था बनाए रखने की जिम्मेदारी पुलिस की हुआ करती है। उसके लिए Indian Penal Code; Criminal Procedure Code; or Evidence Act; वगैरह-वगैरह हैं और Police Force; एक्ट भी हैं जिसके तहत वह अधिकार दिए जाते हैं, मगर जो Armed

Forces paramilitary forces हों या चाहे वे तो defence forces हों या जब उनको civilian काम करने का, लॉ एंड आर्डर करने का उत्तरदायित्व दिया जाता है तो उस समय उनको वही अधिकार प्राप्त होते हैं, जो पुलिस को प्राप्त होते हैं। पुलिस के दूसरे कानून में यह कहा गया है कि अगर एक जगह पर भीड़ जमा हुई है और एक घर को जला रही है, किसी आदमी को गोली मार रही है तब भी उनको कुछ नहीं करना है, सिर्फ वे सेल्फ डिफेंस में अपनी गोली चला सकते हैं। मगर किसी का घर जल रहा है, दुकान जल रही है, तब ऐसे कभी नहीं कर सकते हैं, क्योंकि इसके लिए मजिस्ट्रेट की परवानगी की जरूरत होती है। मगर आर्म्स फोर्सेस एक्ट कहता है कि जब परिस्थिति है तो उनको यह दायित्व दिया जाता है। उस परिस्थिति में, जब आप देखते हैं कि किसी का घर जल रहा है या किसी पर गोलियां चलाई जा रही हैं, तो आप अपने हथियार से उनकी रक्षा करने का काम कर सकते हैं। अगर इसमें कोई एक्सीडेंट हो गया या किसी की जान चली गई, तब इसके लिए आपको जिम्मेदार नहीं ठहराया जाएगा। एक तो यह प्रोविजन है और दूसरा यह है कि किसी के पास ऐसे हथियार हैं, बम हैं, एक्सप्लोसिबल हैं, घर में रखे हुए हैं और आपको घर में जाकर देखना है, तो ऑर्डिनरी लॉ के लिए भी आपको मजिस्ट्रेट की परवानगी लेनी पड़ती है, लेकिन आर्म्स एक्ट यह कहता है कि डम्प परिस्थिति में, बिगड़ी परिस्थिति में, डिस्टर्ब परिस्थिति में, अगर आप इसे करना चाहते हैं तो इसे कर सकते हैं। यह दो पेज का एक्ट है। इन सारी चीजों को निकालने के बाद अगर आप डिफेंस फोर्सेस से, आर्म्स फोर्सेज से कहें कि वहां जाकर हालात सुधार कर आइए, वे सुधार सकेंगे या नहीं सुधार सकेंगे, इसे लेकर मेरे मन में शंका है और यह बहुत सारे लोगों के मन में शंका हो सकती है। क्योंकि उनको हथियार उठाने के लिए और घर की जो जांच-पड़ताल करनी है, उसके लिए भी मजिस्ट्रेट की परमिशन लेनी पड़ेगी। यह अंतर उसमें है। पोटा के अंदर बहुत सारी चीजें हैं। पोटा के अंदर एविडेंस का ज्यूरिस प्रूडेंस पूरा बदला हुआ है। ऑनस ऑफ प्रूफ एक्ज्यूज्ड से प्रोसिक्यूशन की तरफ लाया गया है। इसमें बेल के प्रोविजन बहुत कड़े कर दिए हैं और उसकी वजह से बहुत से लोगों को नुकसान हुआ है। कितना हुआ है और पोलिटिकली कैसे इस्तेमाल किया गया है, यह आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, इसकी चर्चा यहां पर बहुत सारे लोगों ने की होगी, उसकी चर्चा मैं नहीं करूंगा। मगर इस संबंध में इससे ज्यादा बोलने की आवश्यकता है, ऐसा मुझे नहीं लगता, जब वक्त आएगा तो इसके ऊपर और गहराई में जरूर चर्चा हो सकेगी। रिशांग कीर्शिग साहब चीफ मिनिस्टर रहे हैं, बहुत जिम्मेदार रहे हैं और हम सबके मन में उनके लिए आदर की भावना है। वे जो भी बात कहते हैं हम बहुत आदर से सुनते हैं, वहां के लोग भी सुनते हैं। उन्होंने यहां पर कुछ बातें पूछी हैं, उसका जवाब शायद इनको मालूम है, मगर वह सब लोगों को मालूम हो जाए, शायद इसीलिए उन्होंने पूछा है। He has asked whether the Assam Rifles would vacate the Kangla Fort. Am I right? Did you ask this question?

SHRI RISHANG KEISHING: That is the demand of the people of the State, and the State Government has been given assurance for the same.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: There were three demands made by the people when the agitation was started. One of the demands was that the Assam Rifles should move away from the Kangla Fort, and from the Government side we had assured them that the decision is taken to take the Assam Rifles from that Fort to a place where the barracks are constructed where they can go and live. The hurdles in that place were that connecting road was not ready; electricity and water was not available. So, it was difficult for them to vacate the Fort and go to the new place. I don't think there is any difficulty now and that is being done. The second demand was that the accused should be punished and we had said that it is our bounden duty to see that the morale of the Defence Forces is not allowed to be tampered with. But it is also our bounden duty to see that if any innocent person has been harassed or has been treated improperly by the Defence Forces, the members of the Defence Forces will not be allowed to go scot-free. The human rights are applicable to all; the principles of human rights are applicable to all, and so we had given an assurance that strict action will be taken against those persons who are found really guilty. Now that kind of assurance has been given and I would like to repeat that assurance on the floor of the House also. But, at the same time, if anybody is asking that 'you punish the persons just next day', it is not possible. If you are saying that don't take into consideration the post mortem report which is given by one doctor, then there are two post mortem reports which are given. Now, both the post-Mortem reports will be taken into account. The eyewitnesses' evidence will be taken into account. The circumstantial evidence will be taken into account, the Court of inquiry will come to a conclusion, and, whatever will be the decision, we will implement that decision, the Defence force will implement that decision.

On behalf of the Armed Forces, I would like to inform this House that in many-many cases, hundreds of cases, the officers and men of Defence forces have been punished. People are saying that no punishment has been awarded to them. That is not a fact. If you ask a particular question, we can collect the information and give you the information as to how many people have been sentenced for life, how

many have been sentenced for ten years' imprisonment, how many have been sentenced for many-many years. That kind of information can be given, and, I can assure you that if any wrong has been committed, we will not allow it to go unchecked.

But, at the same time, it is our bounden duty to see that the morale of the Armed Forces also is not allowed to be attacked, and, those who are there to protect their brothers and sisters, when their families are living in other parts of the country, we cannot let them down also. You have talked about the custodial deaths and all those things. I don't have the information about this thing, but the same principle applies to this thing also.

Now, you have also asked as to what is the time-frame within which the inquiry can be completed. I am not in a position to give that information. But, we would certainly ask them to conclude the inquiry as soon as possible.

There is one more question which was asked and that was about the judicial inquiry started by the State Government, and, the appearance of the officers and men of Armed Forces before the Judge for the judicial inquiry. I have collected the information on that point, and, on the floor of the House, I would like to give that information. The Armed Forces take a stand that they are subject to the laws applicable to the Armed Forces, and, because of that, they are not required to appear in any inquiry, which is conducted by other than the Armed Forces, and, yet, they have said that they would appear before the civil inquiry being constituted by the State Government. The only thing they are saying is that if the officers are going there and if it is not an in-camera inquiry, then it becomes difficult for them to protect their prestige also. That is why they are asking for holding the in-camera inquiry. The accused would be there, the lawyer or the prosecutor would be there, the Judge would be there, and, some others would be there, but it would be in-camera inquiry. and they have said that if it is not possible to hold the in-camera inquiry then send a commission to take the record evidence of these officers, and, the lawyers can go and examine and cross-examine, and, try to extract any information from them to find out as to what actually happened. That is the second thing.

The third thing they have said is that they are willing to give evidence on affidavit also. Now, I don't think that this stand of the Armed Forces is

illogical, irrational, and, should not be accepted.

Now, if it is possible for them to go and appear before the Judge who is enquiring into the matter, they can go there and appear before the Judge, but if it is not possible, and, if we are interested in doing justice, then, these methods which are allowed by law, ordinary law as well as the laws applicable to the Armed Forces, should be used to get the information. So, this is all as far as the judicial inquiry is concerned.

Now, you have asked about a person moving with Manorama, and, all those things. Well, I have heard these things, but it is not possible for me to say as to whether it is true or not and that can come out only after the inquiry. There are so many stories, which are floating in the air. I would not subscribe to any of these stories. I will leave this matter to be decided in the inquiry. Again, you have said, "If the people are willing to have a dialogue, are you willing to have a dialogue"? Now, I would like to say that you are one of the most respected politicians in that area and through you if it becomes possible for us to have a dialogue with any group of persons over there, we are willing to do that. With you or without you, if anybody wants to talk with us, we are willing to talk with him and we are willing to discuss anything. Conditions, we will not have; decisions, we will take. The agreement will be there. The agreement will be on the basis of what we decide. But, we are willing to talk. If we are talking to the people in Kashmir, if we are talking to the people in Andhra Pradesh, if we are talking to the people in Nagaland, if should not be difficult for us to talk to the people in Manipur also. And, I would say on the floor of the House that it is a kind of invitation we are giving to those who want to come and talk with us. One question was asked: How much of politics is there in this insurgency and how much insurgency is there in politics? I think, Mr. Dinesh asked this question. I am not in a position to reply to this kind of a question. I could say that we have to find out how much of politics is there in insurgency and how much insurgency is there in politics. Only the facts which will come to notice, we will say. But, these kinds of rumours we do hear from many quarters. A question was asked: What is the logic in withdrawing the law? Well, we did ask this question of the chief Minister also, and we advised him not to do it. But, he said that 'if you want to have a dialogue with them, at least accept their demand to some extent' and things like that. Whether this logic is correct or not, I have a doubt in my mind. But, he is trying his best and we would not like

to let him down also. But at the same time, if he is not acting in the interest of the country also, we will not fail in doing our duty. I don't want to say anything more than this. On the one hand, we will not let him down, and, on the other, we will not accept any stand which goes against the interest of the country as a whole. I need not say anything more than that. I think, Jaswant Singhji has put forth his views; he has his views and we respect his views. Our views are not different from his views and yet he has understood the stand that we have taken and we are giving the chance to the elected representatives of the people there. That Government may belong to this party or that party. There are Governments belonging to different parties. And, we have not taken action against the Government which belongs to different parties, nor will we excuse our own Government if it has to be done in the interest of the country as a whole. But, we will not do it because we are angry with them; we will do it because it is a duty we have to do. And there, we will be very, very careful. The Chief Minister is trying to see that he is in a position to talk to the people and improve the situation that is prevailing over there. The situation is difficult. We are concerned about it, but we are not afraid of it. Let me tell you this thing. We are not afraid of situations like this. We are concerned, concerned for our brothers and sisters who are living there. But we are not afraid of this situation. And, if any elected representative of the people is trying to see that the situation becomes less difficult and more amenable to law and order and tranquility over there, we would not like to create problems also for him. This is the kind of stand we are taking. I am happy that by and large you have understood the stand we have taken.

We are not saying that we are only correct; we are not saying that we are going to do something different immediately, but we are saying that we are giving an opportunity to the elected representatives of the State to do their duty over there in whatever fashion they like, and if they fail in doing their duty, the nation will do its duty.

Mr. Sanjay Nirupam has spoken about human rights. I have already said that the human rights are important. We will do everything to protect the human rights of not one section of the society, but all sections of the society. We will protect human rights of even those who have taken arms in their hands and are responsible for bloodshed and some terrorist

activities. Their human rights will also be protected. Naturally, we will protect the human rights of the defence forces also, and certainly the human rights of others also. I do not think, Sir, there is anything more than this that I can say on this point.

Once again, I would like to thank the hon. Members of this House for having expressed their views in a very, very responsible manner. I assure the hon. Members that we will bear in our mind all that they have said for action in Manipur to see that normalcy is established and the situation improves there.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the reply to the discussion on the flood situation.

SHRI MANOJ BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Sir, who will reply?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Home Minister.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Sir, I would be very, very grateful to the house if it can be adjusted for tomorrow, because I am expected to reply to this debate in the Lok Sabha and probably they are waiting for me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, Thank you, very much. Now, we will take up the short duration discussion on population control.

SHRI A. VIJAYARAGHAVAN (Kerala): It is a very, very important discussion, so we shall take it up tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. The House is adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow, the 18th August 2004.

The House then adjourned at twenty-three minutes past
four of the clock till eleven of the clock on
Wednesday, the 18th August, 2004.