

RAJYA SABHA

***SUPPLEMENT
TO
SYNOPSIS OF DEBATE**

(Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

Thursday, April 03, 2025/ Chaitra 13, 1947 (Saka)

GOVERNMENT BILLS

(i) THE WAQF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2025 - as passed by Lok Sabha - Contd.

(ii) THE MUSSALMAN WAKF (REPEAL) BILL, 2025 - as passed by Lok Sabha - Contd.

SHRI YERRAM VENKATA SUBBA REDDY: We should not forget the voices of the innumerable Muslims of India - represented by bodies like the All India Muslim Personal Law Board and Jamaat-e-Islami Hind. This Bill weakens the constitutional property rights of Muslims and interferes in religious matters, thus violating the freedoms sacred to our democracy. The YSR Congress Party opposes this Bill for the following reasons. First, it is unconstitutional because it violates fundamental rights. This Bill targets a specific religious minority – Muslims – by interfering with the management of their religious property without applying the same rules to other minority religious endowments. By interfering with the management of religious properties historically administered by the Muslim community, this Bill violates that right. My next point is about the inclusion of non-Muslim members. The inclusion of non-Muslim members in Wakf Councils and Boards is not only unnecessary – it is also unconstitutional. With regard to financial losses, reducing the annual contribution from 7 per cent to 5 per cent will undermine the financial sustainability of Wakf Boards. The next issue is the imposition of arbitrary restrictions on donations. Section 3(ix)(a) imposes arbitrary rules, stating that only those who have been practising Islam for at least five years can dedicate property as Wakf. This is unjust. The right to donate property is a fundamental right. We oppose this bill.

SHRI MUZIBULLA KHAN: I stand up to speak against this bill. Wakf lands were donated to the Wakf Board by our ancestors who had large lands so that some development work could be done on them. The Wakf Board in every state was run and managed by only Muslims, only minority Muslims and this has been going on till date. There have been irregularities in many states in which lands have also been usurped from other places, it is necessary to correct it and it is the responsibility of everyone to correct it. But the thing that has worried the Muslim community of India is that a non-Muslim person will be kept as a member in it. This has created distrust among Muslims and it is the responsibility of the

government to remove this fear from the hearts of Muslims. It is also mentioned in the Constitution that there should be no interference of any other religion in anyone's religion. In Odisha, we live with complete brotherhood. This can happen in the entire country as well. It is the government's responsibility to take people of all sections forward. There should be no restriction on offering namaaz. Our honourable minister said that many Christian religious leaders have written that they support the Wakf Bill. He said that some people have settled in some places in Kerala, which is the place of Wakf Board. To solve this problem, all of them have written that they support the Wakf Bill. If people of any religion have written and they are supporting this bill, then there is no doubt in it, every person has freedom. Any person can follow any religion. This is in our constitution. There is a clause in it that the fine will be only up to 50 thousand rupees. There are many people who have occupied land. They will be released by paying 50 thousand rupees. When the Sachchar Committee gave its report, it was said in its report that many people have illegal land and the government has the maximum land. Therefore, the Wakf land will go to the government. Right now everyone is very worried about one thing that a Muslim will have to tell about his practice, whether he has followed Islam properly for 5 years or not, for this there is a provision for him to give proof. This provision should be removed. How can he prove himself that he has been in Islam for 5 years, he has been practicing it for 5 years. You will have to give an assurance that after the passing of this bill, these lands will not be given to anyone else, the land of Waqf will remain with Waqf.

SHRI MANOJ KUMAR JHA: I will put my objections and criticism on this bill before the honorable minister. When we read any article in this book of the constitution, before that we should see its background that what kind of thoughts were kept in its making. If we look at the atmosphere of the country today, sometimes there is talk of economic boycott and sometimes some things are searched under an old mosque. In such an atmosphere, this bill raises questions. People of all religions have always lived together in this country. There is democracy here. Gifts are not given in democracy. In democracy, every penny belongs to the state exchequer and everyone has equal rights on every penny. Waqf is an Arabic word, which is derived from Waqfa. It means a holy work, charity, religious work. The mosque of Kaba was built in 622. It was the first Islamic Waqf. Before the concept of nation, rivers were not divided, institutions were not divided. They were reformed later. Baba Saheb Bhimrao Ambedkar ji had said that 'Democracy becomes inconsistent by isolating and ostracizing minority communities.' The Muslim community is being isolated. Their grievances should be resolved through dialogue. They are being looked at with suspicion. There should be people of other religions in the institutions of every religion. There are only 8 cases in 30 years. It is difficult to find evidence regarding how long a mosque has been in use. It is an old property and there is a lack of technical expertise, where would they get it from? Doing this will lead to disputes and a lots of cases. The DM has a lot of workload. DM is the nodal officer for all schemes. God did not create the caste system, so the worship system should not be in the hands of a particular caste but everyone should participate in it. Only then, the concept of our nation be realised. It should be sent for consultation again.

DR JOHN BRITTAS: In the 2014 election manifesto, the party had pledged to stop encroachment of Waqf properties. This bill affects the basic principles of the Indian Constitution Therefore, we are strongly opposing this law. Through this bill, God is being separated from God. Discrimination is being done among people. Now discrimination has started even among gods. The Waqf Council or Waqf Board has been made a non-Muslim administrative body. It is a statutory body. It is also audited by the CAG. Some mutawallis were involved in malpractices. Now, the power to control the malpractices of these

mutawallis has also been neutralised. Alienation of waqf properties should have been stopped. An attempt is being made to facilitate alienation of waqf properties. This is the essence of this bill. The Supreme Court had said that to protect the board of a particular religion, the board should be operated by people of the same religion. Through this law, Muslims are being separated from the Waqf Board. The Waqf Board is just a custodian of properties. Every day, Christians are being attacked in North India. This law should be withdrawn for communal harmony.

DR. SARFRAZ AHMAD: I do not support the Wakf Amendment Bill. They have been in power for 11 years and today they are remembering Muslims to do some good for them. If you talk about their livelihood, education, it will be good. According to Article 26, any religion or sect has the right to form its own institution. The Waqf Board does not usurp anyone's land. They created a ruckus by saying Waqf-Waqf. Whatever income is generated from Waqf will be used for the welfare of the society. It seems that Waqf has usurped all the land in India and these people are trying to get it freed. Today, many people have occupied the Waqf land. Markets, malls and even cinema halls have been built on it. Crores of people from all over India have given suggestions to JPC, how many of them have been included in this bill. Scrutinize and see how many of them are in favor of this bill and how many are against it. Other assemblies have rejected it and sent it back. You did not tell the number, but the number should be discussed. Along with this, I would like to say again that this bill should be sent for reconsideration once again.

SHRI SANJAY RAUT: I can see that since yesterday there is a lot of concern for poor Muslims in both the houses. Even Barrister Jinnah did not worry so much about Muslims as you are doing since yesterday. This bill is a strategy to divert people's attention. You are talking about poor Muslims, You are the people who call Muslims thieves. Now you people have become the protectors of the property of Muslims. You have just become the new mullahs of Hindutva. The Home Minister is saying that we will not touch the mosques, madrasas, dargahs built before 2025, but will sell the vacant lands for the welfare of poor Muslim women. So finally you have come to the point of buying and selling. Your objective in bringing this bill is not clear. This bill is not in the interest of our society, not in the interest of our country. With this, I oppose this bill.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELAFARE; THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS AND LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAGAT PRAKASH NADDA): I support Waqf Amendment Bill, 2024 and I am hopeful that the House will also support this bill. The Government of India under the leadership of respected Modi ji has brought this Waqf Bill with great hope, the government is moving forward by fully following democratic norms. Now let me talk about the procedures. When the Joint Parliamentary Committee was formed for this Waqf Bill in 2013, it had only 13 members. The Joint Parliamentary Committee formed in Narendra Modi ji's government had 31 members. Jagdambika Pal ji went to 10 states with the entire committee. If I talk about stakeholders, 284 stakeholders were engaged in debates and during the UPA regime, discussions were held with 18 stakeholders. We would also like to point out that discussions were held with 25 State Waqf Boards, 15 State Governments, 5 Minority Commissions and hundreds of MLAs, MPs and Ministers. During the UPA regime, when the bill came in 2013, discussions were held with only 13 states and the bill was brought to the Lok Sabha. I can confidently say about my government under the leadership of Modi Ji that this Bill is in the interest of the nation and we have brought it for that. This is not in the interest of any party, this is not in the interest of satisfying any vote bank, this is in the interest of the country. Now these are the properties of the Waqf Board. Rijju sahab told that this comes after railways and defence. Shouldn't it be managed properly? Should they be accountable to

the people of India, their Muslim sisters and brothers or not? India's dream under the leadership of Modi ji is that there should be development for all, there should be efforts for all and we should take everyone along. I want to tell you that you have experimented for 70 years and still sit there. Despite the Supreme Court's decision on triple talaq, the UPA government continued to sit idle. Various Muslim countries abolished triple talaq, while India delayed its abolition. My question is, why were Muslim women considered second-class citizens in India? Prime Minister Narendra Modi took a historic step for Muslim women when he abolished triple talaq and granted them equal rights. We have not just supported them with lip service but with real service. Various Muslim countries have brought Waqf properties under state control, ensuring better management and transparency. Examples include Turkey, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, and Indonesia, where Waqf properties were managed and used effectively.

I support the government's efforts to improve the management of Waqf properties and say that this will benefit the Muslim community more. The Waqf Act of 2013 was against the Constitution and the Indian legal framework. Now, the revised bill will safeguard this and ensure that Waqf properties are managed properly. Through this bill, the misuse of Waqf properties can be stopped, and it is a positive step for the Muslim community. Additionally, I emphasize that this bill does not violate constitutional rights but ensures that Waqf properties are managed legally and transparently. I want to say that this bill is a progressive step for Muslim society, and it is necessary to implement it correctly.

This bill gives the Collector the authority to decide who the owner of a property is and whether it is Waqf property or not. This bill prevents the Waqf Board from identifying properties and gives the Collector the power to make decisions. It also clearly states that monuments protected by the ASI and tribal lands under schedules 5 and 6 cannot be Waqf properties. In 2006, there were 4.9 lakh Waqf properties, which increased to 8.7 lakh, but the income from these properties increased only marginally. The Comptroller and Auditor General has also raised serious questions regarding the misuse of Waqf properties. Additionally, the Kerala Waqf Board has claimed land in Ernakulam and Chavakkad. It is incomprehensible that people from the church and Kerala are coming to Delhi to file complaints about the Waqf Board. I have quoted all the clauses, quoted all the sub-sections. All these sub-sections show how this law went in the wrong direction. Between 2013 and 2025, Muslim brothers have suffered significant losses and the land mafia has made huge profits out of it. It would be beneficial if the Congress party focused on the education and healthcare of poor Muslims. A new trend being observed is that Members, after delivering their speeches, leave the House. To whom shall we answer? What is the benefit of delivering a speech if more than half of it gets expunged? Nothing is gained through arrogance; one should let go of stubbornness and accept reality. In the end, I hope for cooperation from the opposition.

SHRI H. D. DEVEGOWDA: Nadda Ji has delivered an exhaustive speech on the Waqf Bill. Donors have contributed property worth approximately ₹1.2 lakh crore, which has been misused. Now, the present Prime Minister wants to put a seal on not to allow this donor's property, which was given for a particular purpose to a community, to be swallowed by rich people or the people who are strong enough in the community to swallow this property. The Waqf Board currently controls 8.7 lakh properties, spanning about 9.4 lakh acres in India, which has been estimated at Rs. 1.2 lakh crores. Wholeheartedly I congratulate the Prime Minister, Narendra Modiji, Mr. Amit Shah, the Home Minister, and the Parliamentary Affairs Minister who have done some homework to bring this legislation, to protect the properties which have been given by the donors. If anybody has got a grievance, by this Amendment, they are free to go to the court. The Sachar Committee report

came during the tenure of Dr. Manmohan Singh. Late Shri Sachchar had said, 'The donor's property has been misused. It should be protected.' I support the government. This bill is now going to become a law. In future, all Waqf properties will be protected by this law to be made by this Parliament.

DR. ABHISHEK MANU SINGHVI: The Bill I am going to speak about is less about reform and justice and more about suspicion and bias. This bill violates Articles 25 and 26 of our Constitution, particularly Article 26. The Supreme Court has repeatedly clarified two principles—first, if a tradition or practice of a religion or sect has become an integral part of its identity, it is granted constitutional protection; and second, if any law curtails the right of religious institutions to manage their affairs, it will be deemed unconstitutional. Historic Supreme Court cases such as Shirur Mutt, Ratilal Gandhi, Dargah Committee, and Tilkayat Govindlal Maharaj have been based on these two articles. As per Supreme Court, Article 26 brings out the competence of the legislature to make a law in regard to the administration of the property belonging to a religious denomination. However, the denomination's right must not be extinguished or destroyed or diminished under the guise of regulating the administration of the property by the denomination. These are constitutional principles established over 75 years, they have to be applied in the context of this law. Under clause 11 of the Bill, 100 percent of the members of the regional Waqf Board will be persons appointed and nominated by the state government. Where is the autonomy and jurisdiction left for an Islamic Muslim organization? It is written in the Wakf Board that there should be a minimum of three, i.e. 3 out of 11 should be Muslims. That is, you can appoint 8 non-Muslims out of 11. In Articles 25 and 26, people of their own religion are given the right to run their own institutions. By clause 14 of the bill, no member can bring a no-confidence vote against the chairman of the Wakf Board. The democratic process has been replaced by government control. In the old law, the CEO of the Wakf Board was required to be a Muslim and also to appoint one of the two persons whose names were given by the board. Clause 15 of the current bill removes all these. There are several Acts relating to various religious institutions. Can you name any other community, religion, in which jurisdiction has been given to nominate people other than that community, religion? Then on what basis is the government adopting different criteria for one community. The Supreme Court has established through its decision that 'Waqf by User' is legal, correct and constitutional. The basis of the Supreme Court's decision cannot be removed, neither retrospectively nor prospectively. Under clause three, the word 'contrivance' has been kept regarding the requirement of following Islam for five years. If a person has been following Islam for not 5 but 30 years, he has a sale deed, he is the owner of that land, still he will have to go to the Collectorate and government offices throughout his life to tell that there is no 'contrivance' and hence he will remain under the control of our administrators.

This Bill says that the Limitation Act will apply to the Wakf Act. It is actually designed in favour of those persons, including many Government entities, who have actually been illegally occupying Wakf properties for many years. On one hand, the concept of 'Wakf by user' is being omitted by the Bill. On the other, the applicability of the Limitation Act has allowed the Government, other Government-like quasi-entities, and others outside the community to lay a claim over real Wakf property on the basis of uninterrupted and continued possession beyond 12 years, so long as litigation is not started before that. A property can thus be usurped on the principle of adverse possession. This is just an attempt by the government to push its agenda forward. If this is not reconsidered I have no doubt it will be ruled unconstitutional in the next few years.

PROF. RAM GOPAL YADAV: All religions should be treated equally. The public is not satisfied with what the government has done in the past. That is why the public does

not trust you. In the speeches being given by the Treasury benches, there is a frequent mention of land, funds and money. I feel that till 2014-2024, you did not realize that the Waqf Board has such a huge property. You did not even think about how many problems would arise when this is implemented. The more doubt arises on this Bill when we see that in Uttar Pradesh people cannot offer Namaaz, they cannot offer Namaaz on the roof of their house. In such an environment, even if you bring a Bill regarding minorities with good intentions, they will not trust it. If a person is born a Muslim, then he is of the Muslim religion. So there is no benefit in putting a barrier of five years in it. Article 13 and Article 26 state that any minority community can make all arrangements related to its religion on its own. Therefore, this is unconstitutional.

SHRI PRAFUL PATEL: Our Indian Constitution is the best. We make laws as per the provisions of the Constitution and the Constitution has also provided a system to approach the judiciary. Our one objective should be to make good laws. Now when we talk of Waqf, here the details of the lands are given, how many Waqf properties there were, how many acres of land there was, how many acres of land is there today. You talk about old things, twist them, muddle them and present them to people again and again that this is against religion. Why are we deliberately trying to repeatedly humiliate a community or create a different kind of thinking about them in society? Talking about only one thing, talking about religion, this is not right. This should not create division in society.

SHRI KAPIL SIBBAL: To say that only Muslims can give Wakf - what kind of law is this? Also to say that Muslims should first become a Muslim for 5 years, then it will have to be decided whether he can give the Waqf or not. Hey, the property is mine, the ownership is mine, I want to give it to charity, who are you to say that I cannot give it? I am a Hindu and I can give it even though I am a Hindu. This is my wish, right? The property is mine, you have no right. If you talk 'one nation, one law', so you apply this to all religions, anyone can give. You say, look, there are eight lakh acres in Auqaf. Your Hindu temples also have so much wealth, what are you doing there? Not every religion can be reformed. Should it be? There should be reform in Hinduism too. Earlier it used to happen that on waqf property there was encroachment, unauthorized encroachment. The government also used to take possession of it. That is why a provision regarding limitation was introduced. If someone takes over the Waqf property, then if the limitation comes, he cannot challenge it after 12 years. You brought back that limitation, which means that their unauthorized occupation will continue. Are you protecting Waqf property or you are protecting the encroachment. Then you also said that The District Magistrate has full authority to decide whether this is Wakf property or not. So what investigation does the District Magistrate have to do? He will decide himself and his decision is final! And when he decides that this property is not Wakf property, then until he gives the final decision, it cannot be challenged. You said there are trusts. Yes, there are trusts. But you know that under the Code of Civil Procedure, when there is a trust, the property belongs to the trust. But there is a difference between auqaf and a trust. For auqaf, the land once donated belongs to God. It belongs to God. You can never sell it. Trust can sell the property. Waqf property cannot be sold. And Waqf property can be donated for religious purposes. It can be donated for shelter homes. It can be given for schools, it can be given for graveyards, it can be given for the benefit of women, and once given it cannot be taken back, unlike trusts. They rely on Supreme Court judgment, that is the Babri Masjid judgment. The Hon'ble Minister of Minority Affairs should take note of this. Paragraph 1134 of the Babri Masjid judgment states that creation of wakf by user is an accepted mode of creation of wakf. We should honour the judgment that says, 'waqf by user' is a matter of evidence. And, in fact, 'waqf by user' is established pursuant to the Board which is a statutory board, sending out special

people who are assessors as to whether, in fact, this is an actual waqf or not. These are specialists. You have abolished the specialists. Now the district management will decide.

SHRI HARIS BEERAN: I stand here to oppose the Bill. Waqf is an Islamic concept. It is a permanent dedication to God. But it is your intention to dedicate which is paramount under the Islamic concept. That is why, the oral Waqf was recognized in law till today. Now that has been deleted. That means, you are legislating a law which is contrary to the Islamic concept of Waqf. That is the fundamental flaw in this particular legislation. This is against Articles 25 and 26 of the Constitution. On 'waqf by users', several waqfs were created centuries ago. Clause 3 that is, Section 3 of the Waqf Bill says that 'Waqf by user', has to be prospective. But they are saying it with riders. The rider is that there should not be any dispute. What is a 'dispute' is not defined under the Act. If the Government says that there is a dispute with regard to a property, the Government can go to a government officer and the government officer will decide whether there is a dispute or not. If he thinks that there is a dispute that property will cease to be a waqf property. There is no natural justice in this particular legislation. Once that government officer decides on some dispute, there is no mechanism for appeal. For argument's sake, if we admit that 'yes', 'Waqf by User' is prospective and all the 'Waqf by User' properties will be protected, there is another clause, which is Clause 3(b), which says that list of details of the Waqf has to be given within six months. If the list of details of Waqf is not given within six months, the property ceases to be a Waqf property. So, there is a dichotomy. So, I do not know how they are going to reconcile this dichotomy. This is a very dangerous trend in this legislation. Waqf is a dedication to *Allah*. Non-Muslims will manage the properties which are dedicated to Allah. In Waqf Council, twelve people will be in majority and seven people in Waqf Board will be in majority. This is a direct affront to Article 26 of the Constitution which says that you have the right to manage your own affairs. Do the Muslims not have capacity or capability to manage their own affairs? How much State control will be there in these religious matters and religious affairs? In other religious endowments, only that particular religion will be allowed. So, there is this direct affront to Article 14. We know how to protect ourselves. 'Secularism' means live and let live. They are adopting the policy of 'Divide and rule'. The Government and the BJP is doing this with the minority communities for political gains. This is something that will harm the ethos, social fabric and very fundamentals of this country. I strongly oppose this Bill.

SHRI BRIJ LAL: This bill will give justice to everyone, as it is fair and transparent. It will give justice to poor Muslims, Pasmanda Muslims, women and children and will ensure their participation. Due to this new Act no one's land will be snatched away. The Waqf Act that was made in 1995 said that whoever wants, if he understands that it is Waqf property, then he can get it investigated, can take it. How many powers were given to them? The tribunal will be theirs, the people will be theirs, the decision will be theirs and they will do whatever they want. 4 lakh Waqf properties in 2006 became 8.72 lakh properties in 2024. The money that would have been received for that, which Sachar Sahab had said was 193 crores, it increased by only 3 crores from 193 crores. Waqf which exists till now is only dominated by the elite class of Muslims. Poor Muslims, Pasmanda Muslims had no role in it. This Act which is coming will provide justice to these people - Bhatiyara, Fakir, Dafali, Halalkhor, Lal Begi, Muslim Banjara, Dhobi, Nai, Muslim Jogi, Rangrez, Mochi, Bhishti, Mukeri. These are the people who were converted once and they were Dalits. This Waqf Act made the condition of these castes from bad to worse. The new Act will uplift them and their participation will be ensured. Section 40 of the Waqf Act, 1995 is a unique provision, which authorizes the Waqf Board to make an enquiry in respect of any land to find out as to whether the property is a Waqf property or not. In case the Waqf Board has the reason to

believe that property of the Trust or the Society is Waqf property, it may call upon the Trust or the Society to show cause as to why such property be not registered as Waqf property. The decision of the Waqf is final subject to any order passed by Waqf Tribunal. The custodian in land matters is District Magistrate. His entire paraphernalia is - from Lekhpal to Kanungo, Tehsildar, ADM, SDM and the Collector himself. The justice he will deliver will not be acceptable to them. Democracy does not work like this. However, now in it, the collector has been replaced by a designated officer and the rank of that designated officer will be above the collector. I read section 40 of the Waqf Act. Multiple properties were occupied under it arbitrarily. The sweeping powers given in the Act, the unlimited rights given should be abolished. This Act has been misused a lot. It caused a lot of litigations. But today we are bringing this Act, which will give us relief. Sir, there are many evacuee properties which we call enemy property. Evacuee properties are the properties of those people who vacated the property and went to Pakistan after partition. On 8 April, 1950, an agreement was signed between Liaquat and Nehru ji. A time frame was given so that people can go there and settle their lands. But the Hindus, Sikhs who came to India from Pakistan after partition did not have the courage and all the properties that were evacuated here, became Waqf property in back date. I say that these properties should also be investigated. This new Waqf Amendment Act will give justice to all, Dalits will get it, Pasmanda Muslims will get it and whether they are Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs or Christians, their properties cannot be snatched now. I support this bill.

SHRI IMRAN PRATAPGARHI: I have stood up to speak against the unconstitutional changes being made in the Waqf laws. Whether it is Article 14, 29 or 30 of the Constitution, it screams that everyone in the country has equal rights. Article 26 says that everyone has the right to build temples, mosques, churches and gurudwaras for their religious purposes and also has the right to maintain them, but this government is disregarding Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar's Constitution and is acting unfairly towards the Muslims of the country. Truth is not being spoken. The government has named this bill as Umeed and has been calling it a new hope for the Muslims of the country. But this bill is neither a hope for the Muslims nor a new ray of hope. Waqf Tribunal is described as if Waqf Tribunal is some religious Khap Panchayat, whereas the truth is that Waqf Tribunal is also a government judicial department, in which there are judges appointed by the government, in which there are administrative officers. The Home Minister of the country said in this house that no one can go to court against the decision of the Wakf Tribunal, whereas the truth is that under Section 83 (ix) of the Wakf Act, 1995, the High Court can not only review the decision of the Wakf Tribunal, but can also change it. The truth is that the Wakf Board itself is fighting cases in many courts for its lands. We should talk about the truths of the 123 properties of Delhi about which the Minority Minister, Home Minister and the Honorable Leader of the House were talking yesterday. In the year 1911, when the British Government decided to make Delhi the capital instead of Kolkata, a lot of land belonging to Muslims around Raisina Hills was acquired and Lutyens was given the responsibility of constructing buildings on this land. Like Central Vista, the mega plan of Lutyens Zone was prepared, but the Muslims of that time fought against the then British Government to save their places of worship. When this matter reached the British Government, it was decided that the religious places would remain as they are. Whether it is the mosque next to India Gate, or the Zabta Ganj- Sunhari Bagh Mosque, or the mosque on Parliament Road - the 'Mussalman Wakf Validation Act' was made in 1913 to manage all such 123 properties. After this, a new city was established, which was named Lutyens Zone. Before independence, another agreement was signed between 1943-45, under which all the Waqf properties were placed under the Sunni Majlis Auqaf so that all the Waqf properties could be looked after. What the Home Minister has been saying in the House for two days are actually the same 123 properties that

come under the Sunni Majlis Auqaf. After independence, the Waqf Act came into force in 1954, under Section 9 of which the Central Waqf Council was formed in 1964. The same 123 properties of Delhi were surveyed and gazetted in 1970. To settle this, former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi formed the Barani Committee in 1974. The Barani Committee submitted a report in 1976 stating that these 123 properties were the properties of the Delhi Waqf Board. Based on that report, in 1984 the Congress Government decided to hand over these 123 properties to the Delhi Waqf Board, against which the Vishwa Hindu Parishad went to court. This matter remained pending till 2011, and then in the year 2011 the court ordered the Government to settle it. Then in 2013, the then UPA Government handed over these 123 properties of Delhi to the Waqf Board as per the recommendations of the Barani Committee. These are the same properties on which the Home Minister has been scolding Congress since yesterday. After this, the BJP Government came to power in the year 2014, and the BJP Government has been trying to take these lands under its control ever since. This Bill is being said to protect the rights of Muslims, but the BJP Government does not have a single Muslim MP in the Lok Sabha to talk about it. So I still appeal to you to withdraw this Bill, this Bill is not good for your own citizens in any way.

MS. SUSHMITA DEV: It is not the first time that the Waqf Act is being amended. It has been done earlier too, I think, is not comparable to what may have happened in 2013. See, there are two types of intentions, one is the legislative intent and the other one is the political intent, what I feel-when I hear both sides, when I hear the Treasury Benches-what stands between the Opposition and what stands between the Treasury Benches is mistrust and why that mistrust is happening is because of the regime that is in power. We are not just debating the Constitution Article 25 or 26 of the Constitution but, we are today, actually, debating two ideologies. What is this Waqf (Amendment) Bill reeking of? There is a provision, which, I personally find very shocking that the managing trustee, the *mutawalli* can be removed from his position and one of the grounds is, if he is a member of an organisation which is banned under UAPA. Also a non-Muslim person cannot donate land to a waqf, are we not creating a bigger divide between the Muslims and non-Muslims in this country? A Muslim must be a practicing Muslim for five years, gives rise to a kind of discretion at the officer level in intervention which I believe, would be humiliating for any person of any religion.

SHRI K. R. SURESH REDDY: We heard the Honourable Minister when he gave the gist of the Bill as far as I understood from his gist, I think we don't really need a Bill because the content of your Bill seems fine but there is a difference in the intent. This is what people are discussing today, this is already happening that a good facade has been created that this is a progressive Bill, but we understand that behind this facade, there is not progression but an attempt at polarisation. Tell me one thing where will you present the record of 200-300 years? I will give a small example. He is talking about Waqf, I am talking about revenue. Even today, many people buy and sell land in Telangana. Some people do it verbally, some people call it a simple deed. They write on a paper that this land is yours, they take it. They take it, it goes to their children, in this way it belongs to their children. Sometimes the Government brings a reform, under the same if Government says that this is a plain paper, and then we respect this plain paper as well. We will legalise it and then the title is established. So, these are the progressive things one needs to look at. I will once again reiterate that we will oppose the Bill and we want the Government to take back the Bill and come back after further consultations. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI VAIKO: This obnoxious, anti-federal, anti-democratic, anti-secular Bill should be withdrawn. The Bill proposes major changes to the Waqf Act 1995, by introducing sweeping changes in the governance and regulation of Waqfs in India. We from

the Opposition Parties are strongly opposed to this Bill because it strikes at the very root of democracy. We vehemently oppose this anti-minority Bill because it is, *prima-facie*, unconstitutional, divisive and anti-minority. This Bill takes away the rights of the minority communities. In the earlier law, in the case of dispute resolution of a Government land considered as Waqf property, Waqf Tribunal would decide the matter. In the present Bill, it has been provided for that the State Government designate an Officer above the rank of Collector who will decide whether a property is waqf or Government land and the decision being final. In the principal law, Waqf Act, 1995, oral recognition of waqf was admissible for consideration of a property as waqf. In the present Bill, this provision is being removed, and properties without a valid waqfnama will be treated as suspect or disputed and will remain inactive until the District Collector makes a final decision. No non-Muslim members were allowed in the composition of Waqf Board. This Bill provides for the appointment of non-Muslim CEO and, at least, two non-Muslim members to the State Waqf Boards. This is a clear violation of religious rights of Muslim community. This Bill also provides greater powers to the Government over Waqf properties. Therefore, the Waqf Amendment Bill, 2025, is a direct assault on the constitutional rights and the sanctity of Waqf properties. I, therefore, oppose this Bill.

SHRI MILIND MURLI DEORA: The Muslim community wants empowerment, not appeasement. They don't want the dark history of Shah Bano, they want a bright future. It has become a fashion these days to say that this Government is against religious minorities. After the removal of Article 370, Kashmiri Muslims have benefited the most. Today, tourism has boomed in Kashmir; infrastructure has improved and people from the country and abroad are coming there, building infrastructure and investing in tourism, which is creating jobs for the youth. And this is the Prime Minister's policy of 'development for all; appeasement for none'. I request you to evaluate the bill on its merit and be assured that the government's intention is to promote such reforms, which will benefit the community in the long run. With these words, I want to wholeheartedly welcome and support this bill.

SHRI P.P. SUNEER: I reject this Bill in its entirety because it is an assault on secularism and equality, the core values of our Constitution. The Waqf Bill violates Article 14 by selectively imposing restrictions on Waqf. It infringes upon Article 25 by allowing the State to decide who qualifies to create a Waqf. It disregards Article 26, which guarantees religious denominations the right to manage their own affairs. This Bill is not only unfair, it is clearly unconstitutional. The removal of 'Waqf by User' provision is an assault on community rights. Second, the new eligibility criterion, that only those practising Islam for five years can declare Waqf, is an arbitrary rule. Faith is a matter of personal belief, not bureaucratic certification. Third, the transfer of Waqf dispute resolution from Tribunals to District Collectors places decision-making solely in the hands of the Government-controlled bureaucrats. Fourth, restructuring the Waqf Council to include non-Muslims and increase Government interference is an unjustified overreach. The Bill is about alienation. It reinforces the false narrative that Waqf properties are illegitimate and that the minorities are outsiders in their own country. The State's job is to ensure fairness to all religions. With these words, on behalf of the CPI, I demand that this Bill must be withdrawn.

SHRI MANAN KUMAR MISHRA: This bill has fulfilled all the shortcomings of the previous related acts. The decision of the board was considered supreme in the hearing of land acquisition cases but now an appeal can be made in the High Court. Through this bill, transparency will be established regarding Waqf properties and the burden of cases on the courts will also be reduced. When the government did some work in favor of Muslims,

others started getting restless. I believe that this bill will benefit the poor, helpless widows and Muslim people.

SHRI JOSE K. MANI: This nation has always sought to protect the right of every community. Any undemocratic attempt to alter this delicate balance must be opposed, while necessary reforms to uphold the right of all citizens should be welcomed. By and large, I oppose this Bill and the overall intention of the Government to interfere with the religious affairs of the minorities. But my Party, Kerala Congress (M), acknowledges a positive aspect -- the provision allowing Waqf Board decision to be challenged in the court of law. Currently, the challenge against the Waqf claims are restricted to Waqf Tribunals, which often rule in favour of the Board. The amendment allows appeals to High Court, which would introduce a crucial layer of judicial review under clause 35 of the Amendment Bill. However, the proposed amendment to the Waqf Act, in its present form, is prospective and provides no relief to the matters already pending before Tribunals and Courts. Without an express provision to extend the benefit of the amendment to pending case, its intended remedial effect is lost. I, therefore, urge this House to consider inserting a clear clause deeming all pending proceedings to have been instituted under the Amendment Act. Apart from this, Just as Hindu temples and Christian institutions maintain their religious character in administration, the Waqf Board, established under Islamic law, should remain under the management of Muslim community. All the laws in India should strive to achieve harmony among communities while safeguarding individual right. I reiterate that I support Clause 20 and 35 of the Bill which safeguard the community properties from unilateral Waqf claims. I object to Clause 9 and 11 of the Bill which are against the spirit of Right to Freedom of Religion enshrined in our Constitution.

DR. K. LAXMAN: Waqf is not about the Islam religion. Waqf is about the Muslim society. Waqf is about properties, lands, management, income and expenditure. So, then the fundamental question is, Waqf is a State subject or a religious subject. Should the Waqf Board come under Government or should it be under a religious body? Today in many Islamic countries Waqf management has been modernized, centralized and brought under the state control to ensure transparency, accountability and efficiency. But during the Congress regime in 1995, when this Waqf Act was brought under Section 40, it puts Waqf above the Government and its revenue departments. Waqf cannot be above the courts or Judiciary. The Waqf Boards or Tribunals should naturally be under the control of the State and they should be answerable to the Judiciary. Secondly, if Waqf Boards are a State subject and India is a secular country, then the State has no specific religion, then, Non-Muslims can also be on the board, once it comes under the State control. The third issue is 'Waqf by Users'. Out of the 77,538 acres of land in Telangana, 57,000 acres of Waqf land has been completely encroached by land grabbers. Not only this, a judicial inquiry was demanded on Waqf Board activities of encroachment of land, irregularities in Telangana waqf properties, corruption, missing records and illegal allotments by the Waqf Board. Modiji's Government is making efforts to bring Waqf Boards under the Constitution, thinking of a New India. Apart from this, a centralized online portal has been created for transparency and accountability. Poor Muslims, poor women, widows and Pasmanda Muslims will benefit through this bill. Therefore, I support this bill and give full cooperation.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE): Regarding Waqf Board Amendment Bill, such an atmosphere has been created in the whole country that this bill has been brought to harass minorities. If there were many changes compared to the 1995 Act, we would have accepted it, but there are flaws in it which you should consider. Through this Bill attempts have been made to snatch away the rights of

Minorities. The Act was accepted unanimously in 1995. Today they are making a new law. They are making it for the poor and the minorities. There is nothing new in this. Survey Commissioner and Additional Commissioner have been appointed to conduct the preliminary survey of Waqf properties. Now in place of Survey Commissioner, a government officer above the rank of Collector will be appointed. Now all will be nominated members! Intention is not right. Earlier there was a provision that government property identified as Waqf will remain Waqf. Now a provision has been made that government property identified as Waqf will not be considered Waqf. In case of uncertainty, the District Collector will determine the ownership and update the revenue records. All land revenue remains in hands of Collector. If he will deliver justice, it is natural that he will deliver the decision in his own favour and not in favour of the Wakf Board. The one who has to deliver justice is the party. Earlier, there was a provision that the Members of Parliament, former judges and eminent persons to be appointed in the Central Wakf Council must be Muslims. Now, the Members of Parliament, former judges and eminent persons to be appointed in the Central Wakf Council need not to be Muslims and two members must be non-Muslims. Why are non-Muslims being included in this? Do you include any Muslim in the Tirupati Trust or the Ram Mandir Trust? Do you do this for other religions? There were already at least two women in this. This is nothing new. This is not good for Muslims. This is against the Constitution. Try to maintain peace and harmony in this country.

SHRI SANJAY KUMAR JHA: People from Muslim society and religious institutions expressed their concern. Their main concern was what effect this would have on their religious beliefs. Will they be in danger? Misconceptions and rumours are being spread that *mosque, Idgah and graveyard* will be in danger. This is what was being spread among them like CAA. It has become clear that the misconceptions being spread are not true. Whatever the old situation is, it will remain intact. People from *Rain Samaj, Ansari Samaj, Mansoori Samaj* were not given any representation in Waqf. They will also be included. Representatives from Pasmada Samaj will also be there. Women will also have a place in it. With this bill, the right people and especially the Pasmada people will get the benefit of Waqf. There is a lot of happiness in the Pasmada society. This bill will work for the poor Muslims in the true sense. There is a provision to file an appeal in the High Court within 90 days on the decision taken by the Waqf Tribunal. Even today there are 14 law tribunals in the country. It is not that the decision of any tribunal cannot be appealed in the High Court or Supreme Court. Why are the opposition people worried about saving the undemocratic provision?

DR. MEDHA VISHRAM KULKARNI: So many good decisions are being taken continuously in India. The present government in the country considers the country as holy land and fatherland. Various decisions were taken in this government including Article 370. Today we are discussing the Waqf Amendment Bill. 38 meetings of the JPC constituted regarding Waqf were held. We have brought this reform to ensure the ways of registration and information whenever a Waqf property is created. Till date there was no methodical system for this. The Sachchar Committee is being cited again and again. The Sachchar Committee had said in 2006 that most of the Muslims in this country are below the poverty line. Did such people do Waqf? Can those who do not have their own property do Waqf? If someone is a beneficiary of 'Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana', how does he become eligible? What are the conditions to become a beneficiary? The reason for this is that eligibility is given only to those who do not have their own property and whose income is low. The number of Waqf properties in our country till 1954 has increased today. That means the number of properties doubled, tripled and quadrupled. During the Sachar Committee, their number was four and a half lakh. By 1954, there were only 37,000 Waqf properties in our

country. Utility based Waqf - no name, no information is in the record. This property is in Jalna district of Maharashtra, it is shown differently in the records of Wamsi portal and Maharashtra government. This property is registered in the name of Khairat and Dhavane, there is a temple here and the same property is also shown on the Wamsi portal. After all, how did this property get registered with different names on the portal? In Uttar Pradesh, 61 percent of the properties have an area written as "zero". Even if parents gift any property to their children, they get a gift deed done for the same. Then how can Waqf properties be transferred verbally? This country is not run by Hadith and Quran, but by the Constitution.

SHRI KARTIKEYA SHARMA: I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on this historic bill. This bill takes forward the honourable Prime Minister's mission of Sabka Sath, Sabka Vikas. Waqf means donating any land or property forever so that it can be used not for any one individual but for religious, social or charity works. Some colleagues in the Opposition are trying to create misunderstanding in the country by giving a religious colour to an administrative issue. They repeatedly described Waqf as a religious issue. When the Waqf Board is not a religious but an administrative body, then the question of Article 25 or Article 26 does not arise here. The various courts of the country have clearly stated that the management of waqf and temple property is not a religious but a secular function. The current law has several provisions that are unconstitutional, such as, the 'Waqf by User' or the absence of a provision for appeal against tribunal's decisions. Both these clauses inserted after 1995 are against Article 300A, the Right to Property. I want to quote Sardar Vallabhai Patel ji who had said during the Constituent Assembly debate, 'The Government must ensure that religious properties serve public good, not private interests.' The Waqf (Amendment) Bill, 2025 exactly do that. There should be no politics on this issue and whether it is the ruling party or the opposition, all should unanimously support this bill.

SHRIMATI JEBI MATHER HISHAM: I would like to begin by sharing the concerns of the people of Munambam in my home state of Kerala, where around 600 families are caught in a legal tangle over their land and homes and are fighting for justice and their rights. We stand with the people of Munambam without any conditions. This Bill is not just a threat to India's secular fabric, but an attack on the very heart of our Constitution, especially Article 26, which guarantees Right to Freedom of Religion. This is a Bill intended to take away the rights of a minority community. Sir, I want to ask this Government, how can BJP stand for having only Hindus to be a part of the Devaswom Boards while legislating a Waqf Bill which permits non-Muslims to be a part of Waqf board? Sir, I conclude by saying that this Bill is cloaked in the guise of transparency. But, in reality, it serves the darker political agenda of the ruling dispensation. So, I oppose this unconstitutional Bill. Jai Hind!

DR. M. THAMBIDURAI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, on behalf of the AIADMK Party, I rise to participate in the Waqf Board Bill discussion. The Government has brought forward this Bill to change the composition of the Waqf Boards and Waqf Board Council.

DR. SUDHANSHU TRIVEDI: When we are talking about Waqf, the time has come for the departure of the old Waqf and the time has come for the new dawn of a new Waqf. First, the technical provisions of this bill, second is the concept of Waqf, third is the politics of Waqf and fourth is the communal versus secular politics in the name of Waqf politics. For the first time, our government has started a new Waqf of a new dawn by honestly giving equal representation to everyone even within the Muslim community, for this I want to congratulate the government. Tell me, how many of the Mullahs, Maulvis, Muftis, Mukarrams, Paari, and Hafiz belong to the Pasmada community? How many among them are Julaha, Ansari, Ghosee, or Mirasi? Leave the rest aside—what is there in

the Personal Law Board? What is there in the Waqf Board? But I would like to say one more thing—our government has named this *UMEED*. Who is this hope for? This hope is for the honest Muslim and for every common citizen of the country. There are some people who were nurturing the dream of 'Ummah. The entire Islamic caliphate and rule is referred to as 'Ummah.' Those who had hope are seeing a new light of hope, while the hopes of the 'Ummah' followers are being shattered. I just want to say only the last two lines of what the Catholic Church of Kerala wrote on March 31, 2025. “We request the Central Government to get the Amendment Bill passed as early as possible so that the tears of thousands of suffering people in a place like Munambam can be wiped out only by a legal amendment that can provide a permanent solution to their suffering. So, we urge all the MPs from Opposition parties to support the Bill so that the historic legislation can become unanimous.” Also, many people talk about the Places of Worship Act, so as per the Places of Worship Act, the status of the temple in Tamil Nadu cannot be changed. After August 15, 1947, the status of any place of worship cannot be changed, so the Waqf Board should forfeit the claim because it is in contrast to the Places of Worship Act. In the case of *Bashir Vs. State of West Bengal*, they have very clearly stated that: “Waqf is not a religious denomination in accordance with Article 26 of the Constitution. So, the matter relating to restricting the economic, financial, political, or other secular activities that may be associated with religious practice under Article 25(2)(a) of the Constitution can be regulated by the State.” I believe that after this, there should be no scope for any ifs or buts. Much has also been said about the concept of Waqf and its origins, but I would like to emphasize that the first mention of Waqf appears when Caliph Umar captured the Sassanid Empire. At that time, the region that is now southern Iraq was declared as ‘Waqf,’ and it was controlled by the state. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan also did not consider Waqf to be a part of original Islam and classified it under Muzara‘ah (tenancy), quoting Fatawa Alamgiri in support of his argument. Due to this, the 1894 Privy Council judgment ruled against Waqf-al-Aulad. But in 1906, a resolution was passed at the Kolkata Congress session stating that there was an error in the Privy Council's judgment and that it should be changed, because Jinnah had joined Congress in 1904. Therefore, I want to say that in 1913, that decision was reversed. “Since the Bill was introduced to administer the Muslim law for Musalmans, the question of public policy does not arise.” Sir, Muhammad Ali Jinnah used this phrase in April 1913 while moving the Report of the Select Committee for the Imperial Legislative Council. A question that is often raised—why can only Muslims donate to Waqf? What our government has done has been done to respect Muslim sentiments. I want to ask—when the British rule came, they took all authority from the Mughals, so how did ownership remain with them? The abolition of the zamindari system took place in 1948. But how were these zamindars created later? All the Muslim rulers who came after Alauddin Khilji read the *khutba* of the Caliph of Baghdad. That is the foreign rule. It is on record. How can the Government of India recognize it? When independence was achieved, did anyone demand that a Waqf Board was needed? No, they did not. Then why was it given in 1954? Did any Muslim demand that a madrasa was needed? Then why was it given? The Muslim community was ready to join the national mainstream. During Indira Ji's time, the Muslim Personal Law Board was introduced; during Rajiv Ji's time, the Shah Bano case arose. During Narasimha Rao Ji's time, the 1995 Act was enacted; during Manmohan Singh's time, the 2013 Act was introduced, but no solution was found.

After Modi ji's government came to power, our colleagues have told us that 70 percent of the people from the minority community have definitely benefited from one or the other scheme. Whatever we want to do for the Muslims and the country, we will definitely get success in that. Support this positive Bill of ours. But I just want to say in the end that the change your thinking. If you are trying to cross this river in a boat that has not succeeded

for the past 75 years and has faced many jolts in the last 10-12 years, then change the boat and the path. Now if a new destination is to be reached and a new dawn is to be seen, then I want to say let's move forward together.

SHRI JAVED ALI KHAN: Hon'ble Minister said that about one crore people had given their opinion on this Bill to him or the JPC. I would like to request the Minister that when he gives answers, please also give the figures. Even if he considers it to be one crore, but he should specify how many of them were in favor of the Bill and how many people objected to the provisions of this Bill. Our Hon'ble Chairman Sir often says that there should not be a free fall of information. People say whatever comes to their mind, such a situation should not happen. This rule should also be applicable to the Minister and the Minister should provide some document in this regard and should certify how the Parliament House was going to come under the possession of the Waqf Board. Sir, this new Waqf Bill will lead to the development of the Muslim community, that is, the Waqf Board of today is the biggest obstacle in the development of Muslims. We are going to abolish it. It was said that the property which is disputed or on which dispute is going on, will not be included in Waqf and registration will have to be done on the new portal within six months. Sir, six months is very little time. There are so many Waqf properties, which were mentioned, I think they will not be able to be registered in six months. Then, later, disputed properties will certainly not be registered. Our Uttar Pradesh government says that 78% of the Waqf properties in Uttar Pradesh are on government land. That is, if the Uttar Pradesh government makes 78% of the Waqf properties in Uttar Pradesh disputed, then how many Waqf properties will remain in Uttar Pradesh. A lot of emphasis is laid on the fact that the Waqf property is very large and the income from it is very less. Almost 60% of the Waqf lands are graveyards. Now what income was supposed to come from the graveyards, which you would spend on the welfare of minorities? My party opposes this Waqf Amendment Bill and we do not have any positive opinion about it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT (SHRI RAMDAS ATHAWALE): Hon'ble Narendra Modi *ji* has always spoken for Muslims, minorities, Dalits and the poor. This Bill will give justice to all Muslims, maximum Muslims, 90% of the Muslims. This Bill is not unconstitutional. This Bill is a very transformative Bill. This Bill will unite people from Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian and Buddhist communities. After this Bill is passed, all Muslims will come to our side. No one will stay with you. Muslim community, Dalit community, Sikh community, Christian community, OBC community, Brahmin community - all communities will join us. My party supports this Bill. This Bill has been passed in the Lok Sabha and will be passed in the Rajya Sabha too. We will keep moving forward for the welfare of Muslims. I support this Bill.

SHRI GULAM ALI: Today, I stand in support of the Waqf (Amendment) Bill, 2025. Waqf is not just a legal reform in Islam, but a spiritual commitment to Allah for the welfare of his servants. The Waqf is like a sick animal, a sick animal that does not have money in its pocket to fight a case, the Waqf that does not have salaries to pay its employees. We said that there are 44 amendments, discuss them clause-by-clause, but no one talked about it. I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister of the country, who has worked to reform the 1995 Bill, which is the 1995 Act. This was the same law, 'where the fence itself was eating the field.' There should be a CBI inquiry on the looting of Waqf assets in the last 70 years. You intimidate Muslims. Let them join the mainstream. Muslims have been called criminals and even illiterate. But the truth is that since independence, the development of Muslims has been ignored. Muslims are now coming into the mainstream. Even those who claim to be the leaders of Muslims do not talk about them. Opposition

parties do not give importance to Muslims in their organization. The Honourable Prime Minister has always talked about the real development of Muslims and has shown the way for it. On one hand, your party members are ready for UCC and on the other hand they talk about personal law. You also take advantage of BNS. You express different views in your states and then call the Central Government anti-federal. You say that the Minority Minister should have knowledge of Islam. No one listens to you now. You have defamed Muslims and Waqf. Now times are changing. In the North-Eastern region, a lot of land has been donated by the tribes for graveyards. When we brought reforms in Vaishno Devi, the sadhu community there protested a lot. Today a university has been built there, today there are facilities, today a cancer hospital has been built there. Whereas you did nothing for the Muslims. You did not give them representation anywhere. You should support this bill so that Waqf becomes the strength of the community again.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FARMERS WELFARE (SHRI RAM NATH THAKUR): On behalf of my party and Bihar, I congratulate the Minister of Minority Affairs. You people should go to the Idgah on the day of Eid and think about the condition of Muslims, poor Muslims, do research and then speak. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia did not want to leave any work incomplete. Our party is supporting this bill with this goal. You are debating on the proposal made by the Government of India to give the poor Muslims the rights they were not getting but are not checking the situation. When reservation came, there were similar arguments and when reservation came, everyone became quiet.

DR. FAUZIA KHAN: This Bill claims to bring about reform and development in the management of Waqf properties. Reform is needed. But from my experience, I would like to tell you that the biggest issues before the Waqf Board are corruption and illegal occupation. To deal with these, the Waqf Boards needed, and still need, the Government's help, but this is a matter of intention. If reform was to be brought about, there would have been talk of removing encroachments, the harshest provisions would have been brought against corruption, which is not there in this Bill. Illegal purchase or sale of land has not been made a serious crime. The share that the Waqf Board gets from the Mutawallis has also been reduced. If you wanted to empower the Waqf Boards, there would have been talk of offices, institutional support. But you are taking away their autonomy. You say that the Waqf Board is not a religious institution. The management of the land that people have donated to the Waqf Board for religious purposes is not religious, this thinking is also amazing. According to the Sachar Committee report, the biggest occupier of the Wakf Board is the state government itself and you have given the right to decide to the encroacher. You should have given more resources to the board. This Bill is a kind of encroachment on the constitutional rights of minorities.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF MINORITY AFFAIRS; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FISHERIES, ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND DAIRYING (SHRI GEORGE KURIAN): In Munambam, a church is located in that land of 404 acres. That is Our Lady of Velankanni Church. CPM and Congress wanted to evict these people from there in Kerala. That is why, the Bishop Council of India, Kerala Catholic Bishop Council, the Kerala Council of Churches, etc. passed resolutions. I will read one of the resolutions. It says that over the past three years, this issue has escalated into a complex legal dispute. The fact remains that only legal amendments can provide a permanent solution and this must be recognised by the people's representatives and MPs from Kerala. As Waqf Amendment Bill was to be introduced in Parliament, CBCI urged political parties and the legislators to adopt an unbiased and constructive approach on this issue. The rightful ownership of land must be fully bestowed

to the people of Munambam. Any provision of law, which contradicts the principle of the Indian Constitution, must be amended. At the same time, the rights of the religious minorities, as guaranteed by the Constitution, must be safeguarded. Yesterday in Lok Sabha, one of the most popular leaders of Kerala, Shri Suresh Gopi, stated that resolution of the Kerala Assembly would be thrown into the Arabian Sea. What was Kerala Assembly's resolution? They passed the resolution that the Waqf Amendment Bill should be withdrawn. In Kerala, Muslims are very gentle and pious. But these people want to mislead them. You know what they were telling about Manipur. They were telling that it is a Hindu-Christian issue and they visited all the Christian and Hindu houses; Hindus and Christians are fighting with each other and why are you sitting idle. Why? In which way Mr. Suresh Gopi was selected? It is because of Christian votes. Christians are educated. Actually, the people of Kerala and these representatives, want to support this Bill. So many MPs know that their future will be in darkness. WAMSI data shows that out of 8.72 lakh registered Waqf properties, 1,088 have registered Waqf deeds and only 9,279 are having the ownership establishing documents. In Munambam, they are having nothing. No deed is there. The High Court asked them, 'Where were you?' It happened 100 years ago. They want to snatch the property of these Munambam people. They are Christians, Hindus and fishermen. That is why it happened. I support the Munambam people. I support this bill.

SHRI RAMJI LAL SUMAN: This Bill is an interference by the Government in religious matters, especially those of Muslims. It violates Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the Constitution. This Bill is an attack on the basic structure of the Constitution and is against the federal structure of our country. The Government should withdraw this Amendment Bill. As far as Wakf properties are concerned, these Wakf properties belong to Muslims and Muslims should have control over them. But unnecessarily, such people are being given a place in it who have no right over them. A Joint Parliamentary Committee was formed on the question of Wakf. All its members boycotted that Committee many times and none of the amendments presented by the Opposition have been mentioned in it. A lot of propaganda is being done that Muslims will benefit greatly from this Wakf Amendment Bill. How can we trust them? The way they are selling government undertakings, I fear that they will sell Wakf properties in the same manner. The government should clarify its position on what it will do with the Waqf properties that are under its control. Overall, they are against Muslims and no one can expect them to work in the interest of Muslims.

MS. KAVITA PATIDAR: This Act is related to a subject which has challenged the principles of equality and justice in this country for decades, but under the leadership of the Hon'ble Prime Minister, a courageous step is being taken to bring transparency, purity and accountability in the management of the Waqf Board through this Act. The Waqf Board has the largest property in this country. This property is spread over about 9 lakh acres. The Sachar Committee report also stated in 2006 that if it was managed properly, it would have definitely generated an annual income of Rs 12,000 crore. Not only this, today you see that earlier the property they had was less and they had declared an income of Rs 164 crore from it. Later their property doubled, but the income they declared from it was Rs 9.92 crore, that is, the property doubled, but the income from it decreased. This mismanagement, this injustice, this corruption, the work of stopping it is being done through this bill. There are 15,008 Waqf properties in Madhya Pradesh too, but their income is negligible. So where does all this money go? Due to appeasement and vote bank politics, Congress never wanted any reforms and saw this injustice happening. What kind of law is this, which snatches people's land, occupies whole villages; what kind of law was this that could not be appealed, for which one could not go to court; what kind of law was this that they considered above the Constitution? Now corruption will not be tolerated. Now there will be talk of justice,

there will be talk of good management. This new Bill will lay the foundation of transparency, accountability and social development. The Government has done a lot of reforms through this Bill. There was a provision in Section 14 that if the Board registered any property with itself, then the Board was not obliged to give reasons, rather the victim whose property was wrongly registered had to prove how the property was his. After correcting this Section 40, now not even an inch of land of any person will be registered in it wrongly.

SHRI MASTHAN RAO YADAV BEEDHA: The Muslim community in our country faces significant socio-economic challenges. Telugu Desam Party proposed three crucial amendments to safeguard the Muslim interest. First, we ensured the prospective application of the 'Waqf By User' clause, which protects all existing waqf properties registered under this provision. Second, we played a pivotal role in strengthening State authority over disputes related to wrongful claims by Waqf Boards. Third, we successfully advocated for extending the timeline for uploading waqf property documents on the Central portal, allowing flexibility where valid reasons for delays exist. We set up Maulana Azad National Urdu University in Hyderabad in 1998. We introduced Ramzan Tofa Scheme, benefiting 10 lakh Muslim families annually. Even today, our Party remains committed to inclusive growth. We firmly believe that for effective implementation of Waqf reforms, States must have the autonomy to determine the composition of their Waqf Boards. I urge the Government to consider these recommendations while framing the rules under this Act.

SHRI UPENDRA KUSHWAHA: The hon'ble Minister, while speaking at the very beginning, clarified the situation that the Waqf Board will not have more than three non-Muslim members including the ex-officio member. He said about the council that it will not have more than 4 non-Muslims including the ex-officio member. Now despite that, if someone says that there will be a majority of non-Muslims in it, then what can be understood from this? Till when will you keep misleading the country? An opposition leader has said a very good thing about changing the system under the Bodh Gaya Temple Act. There is talk of bringing some non-Muslim members in this Bill, then the opposition has serious objection to it. The Act that came at that time has a provision that there will be eight members except the chairman. Four of them will be Hindus and four members will be Buddhists. Today this message is going around the world that a movement is going on in Bodh Gaya. Bodh Gaya Temple is a Buddhist temple, it is not spread across the country like any Waqf. The opposition has discussed very little about the reasons why the Government is bringing this Bill. The Sachchar Committee said about the Waqf and the Board that the way of functioning and management of the Waqf is completely opaque and there is a need for transparency in it.

SHRIMATI KIRAN CHOUDHRY: This Bill, is going to bring our most marginalised Muslim brethren on the path to progress, prosperity and emancipation. This Bill is not only progressive and much-needed reform, but it seeks to bring greater transparency, efficiency and inclusivity in the management of Waqf properties across the country. Bharat is poised to grow. We are the world's largest democracy and we have a robust system of law and the Constitution, which reigns supreme. There is no religion in this Bill. All those marginalized Muslims who have not had the Waqf benefits, where will they go? Take the example of women. This Bill is being brought in only to rectify what ought to have been done a long time ago. There was rampant corruption in the Waqf properties and it was monopolised by powerful elites amongst the Muslims. Law is an evolving process, law is never static, law has to change according to time. According to the National Commission for Women, in 2020, only three per cent of Waqf-funded educational institutions were for girls. The draconian Section 40 is being done away with because it gives ultimate power to

decide the nature of the Waqf property. Also, there was no provision against the Tribunal. But, now, it has been proposed in the Bill that the appeal will lie to the High Court.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS; AND THE MINISTER OF MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI KIREN RIJJU), replying to the combined debate, said: It is the rule of democracy that those who are in majority are in the Government. JPC or any Committee, those who are in majority, prevail. When there is any dispute in any district, the Collector looks into it. Still you said not to include the Collector. On your request, an officer above the Collector was included in it. This is also the request of your JPC members. The six-month time given to enforce unregistered Wakf should be extended, this was your demand and we have accepted this too. There should be three members in the Tribunal, we have also accepted this request of JPC. We said that there will be 22 members in the Central Wakf Council, among them there cannot be more than four non-Muslims including the ex-officio Chairman. I also told about the State Waqf Board that there cannot be more than three non-Muslims in a board of 11 members. Everyone asked who will decide who is a Muslim? Among all of us sitting here, some may be atheists, otherwise everyone has written the name of their religion. Like someone writes Buddhist, someone writes Christian, someone writes Hindu, someone writes Muslim, someone writes Parsi, everyone writes like this. It will be the same for Islam. Today you people have repeatedly said one thing that why do you worry about Muslims and BJP and NDA have no right to talk about Muslims. The people of the country formed the government under the leadership of Modi ji. The government of India cannot do its work on the basis of any religion. s Indian citizens, we have to see everyone equally. Modi ji has talked about ' Sabka Saath , Sabka Vikas', that is the spirit of the Constitution. You say that there is a lot of poverty among Muslims and we should think about the poor. In this country, since independence till now, you have run the government for about 60 years, especially the Congress Party. If Muslims are poor, there is more poverty among Muslims, then who made them poor? You made them poor. To correct it, we have to work under the leadership of Narendra Modi ji. If the poor Muslims had been uplifted at that time, we would not had to work so hard. By talking like this, you are exposing yourself. We are just asking for your support.

We have repeatedly said that there is no interference in the Waqf property. No one can do this in any religious institution. Whether it is your Kashi Vishwanath temple, or any church, or Jama Masjid, is there any person of another religion a member in its committee? It is not possible because it is a religious institution. It has been repeatedly pointed out that there is a Charity Commissioner to oversee the trust, which is a government board. Similarly, the Waqf Board is a statutory body. If there are only Muslims in it and if there is a dispute between a Hindu and the Waqf Board over the land of the Waqf Board, then how will you solve it? This is a statutory body of the government which should be secular. Everybody should sit in it. But we have put a restriction that there can be only this many non-Muslims. Can only four members change the decision there? They can only contribute there, they can increase the importance of the work there by their expertise. You should never forget that once a wakf is made, you cannot reverse it. So when someone declares a property as waqf, it should be done thoughtfully.

Thousands of people and delegations came to me consisting poor Muslims, Pasmanda people, Aghakhani people, Sunnis, Shias. Everyone said that the Waqf Amendment Bill that you are bringing should be passed as soon as possible because a few people have occupied the world's largest property, the Waqf property in India. When the Honorable Prime Minister took this decision, he took it after a lot of thought. You will see how much it is welcomed from tomorrow. You say so much that we intimidated, Muslims were intimidated, but we are not intimidating Muslims, you are the one who is intimidating.

You are trying to scare Muslims and take them out of the mainstream. Therefore, I want to say that when the CAA was discussed, all those Members, whether they are Members of this House or outside, who said that after the CAA is passed, the rights of Muslims will be taken away, citizenship will be taken away, then it is about to be two years, has the citizenship of even a single Muslim been taken away? So you have confused them. But no one apologized. We are not asking you to apologize today, but do not try to confuse us further. This Bill will be passed today and in future it will not harm any Muslim, rather it will benefit crores of poor Muslims. I want to thank all the members who participated in this discussion from the bottom of my heart. We have worked together till late night with a new morning, a new day and new hope. The people of the country will also see that our Members of Parliament sit till late night and work for the country. This will send a good message from here. I request all the Members to show a big heart and pass this bill unanimously for this good work.

The motion for consideration of the Bills was adopted.

All the amendments moved were negatived.

Clauses etc. were adopted.

The Bills were passed.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION

Proclamation Issued by President on 13th February, 2025 under Article 356(1) of Constitution in Relation to State of Manipur

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS; AND THE MINISTER OF COOPERATION (SHRI AMIT SHAH): I move the Resolution that this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 13th February, 2025 under Article 356(1) of the Constitution in relation to the State of Manipur.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE), *initiating the discussion, said:* Manipur has been burning for nearly two years and the Government has totally failed in stopping the violence. More than 260 people have been killed. Over 60,000 people have been displaced and thousands of homes, businesses and religious sites destroyed. He criticized the Government of inaction amid the Manipur crisis, where thousands of homes, places of worship and public structures were destroyed, and over 3,000 FIRs were filed for crimes such as rape, murder, and arson. The state witnessed the longest internet shutdown that lasted for 212 days, and police armouries were looted for sophisticated weapons. He criticized the Home Minister's minimal intervention despite the escalating violence. The unrest led to economic collapse, rising inflation, business shutdowns, falling GST collections, and severely affecting citizens. During this violence in the state, Supreme Court judge and many other NGOs also visited Manipur but not Modi ji. He criticized Prime Minister for not visiting Manipur for nearly two years despite ongoing violence and unrest in the state. He stated that the people of Manipur have lost faith in the BJP, as reflected in the party's loss of both Lok Sabha seats in the state. He accused the BJP of failing to establish peace, address grievances, or engage with stakeholders, instead allowing the conflict to escalate. Despite conducting election rallies nationwide, Modi did not visit Manipur, where people were suffering, schools were closed, and violence persisted. He demanded an inquiry and a White Paper to clarify the state's and Central Government's roles in the crisis. He condemned the BJP's governance for abandoning citizens in their time of need, failing to provide security, and suppressing critical issues. He criticized the

Government for handling of the Manipur crisis, stating that their incompetence led to the imposition of President's Rule despite having a majority in the Assembly. He accused the BJP of political maneuvering, claiming that the move was not for the safety of Manipur but to protect the party's interests ahead of elections. He asserted that the Prime Minister avoided visiting Manipur out of fear and failed to control the situation. He highlighted that the BJP's "double engine government" had resulted in bloodshed, division, and economic collapse rather than stability. He urged Modi ji to visit Manipur, help its people, and address Parliament on the issue, criticizing his absence from the House during the session. He criticized the Government for its failure to address the Manipur crisis and. He questioned the democratic nature of their governance, urging Modi ji to visit Manipur, meet the affected people, and send a message of peace. He argued that the Government lacks a long-term strategy for the state, instead resorting to inconsistent measures. Emphasizing national solidarity with Manipur, He called for collective efforts to restore peace. He said that Prime Minister should visit there, solve the problems of those people and improve the law and order situation. He said that Prime Minister should visit there, solve the problems of those people and improve the law and order situation.

DR. AJEET MADHAVRAO GOPCHADE: I want to give my statement in support of the proclamation of imposition of President's rule in Manipur. Modi ji has given three Navodaya Vidyalayas in Manipur. He has established National Sports University in Manipur. Prime Minister has given 5 times more funds to Manipur than Congress. I fully support the issue of imposition of President's rule here.

SHRI DEREK O'BRIEN: He criticized Modi ji for traveling extensively over the past 22 months while failing to travel to Manipur amid its prolonged crisis. He highlighted the severe impact of the unrest on people, including children and shopkeepers, and accused the Government of arrogance and refusal to acknowledge the problem. He warned that every month of unrest would take years to fix. Additionally, He condemned the last-minute presentation of the Manipur resolution on the final day of the session, questioning the Government's sincerity. Speaking about Manipur and expressing our love for it from this Council of States, we are told it's Rajya Sabha Day — yes, technically, it was yesterday. This is Trinamool Congress's message to Manipur, Kerala, Goa, and Bengal: We are with you. Despite having no MLAs or party in Manipur, we still stand with its people — Hindus, Muslims, Christians alike. Why are we discussing Manipur at 3 a.m., in darkness, without media coverage? Let us talk about Manipur during the day, openly. Don't question our endurance — our leader once fasted for 26 days for farmers. Don't lecture us about women's issues either — remember the two women in that viral image from Manipur? You talk about women but have only 14-15% women in Parliament; we have 39% women elected. Despite repeated demands for structured debates, the Opposition gets nothing — not even one notice. You call yourself 56-inch, but reality shows it's 26%.

SHRI A.A. RAHIM: We are here to discuss the extension of President's Rule in Manipur. But since May 2023, Manipur has been in turmoil. The Government refuses to disclose how many lives were lost, how many places of worship were attacked, or how many women were violated. Where is our Prime Minister? He hasn't even visited Manipur. My party believes Manipur is a continuation of Gujarat—an experimental lab for the Sangh Parivar. Just like in Gujarat, targeted violence is being repeated, now against another community. I visited Manipur with the INDIA bloc and saw Christian churches, schools, and hostels deliberately attacked—many blown up with gas cylinders. These were not random acts; they were planned. This pattern of violence against Christians is rising across India. I even asked about it in the Rajya Sabha, but the Government said it has no data.

Before concluding, I must mention Nari Shakti. The women paraded naked in Manipur will forever symbolize the reality behind this Government's claim of women empowerment.

DR. KANIMOZHI NVN SOMU: Manipur has suffered for months — homes burned, communities destroyed, lives lost — but the Prime Minister remained silent. The Opposition repeatedly requested a debate at the start of the session, but it was denied. As a result, thousands were displaced and forced to live as refugees in their own land. Imposing President's Rule is not a solution — it is a political cover-up and a misuse of Article 356. Even after 46 days, nothing has improved: no return of displaced people, no justice, no peace plan. Manipur remains under an unconstitutional grip of the BJP. This isn't new. The BJP follows a clear pattern: create or allow a crisis, let the state collapse, impose President's Rule, and then control from Delhi. We've seen this in J&K (2018), Madhya Pradesh (2020), Maharashtra (2022), and Jharkhand (2024). Now, it's Manipur. Article 356 was meant as a last resort. Dr. Ambedkar called it a "dead letter" — to be used only after warnings and elections, never for political gain. Even the PM and Home Minister have criticized Emergency Rule in the past. Are they now contradicting themselves? The Supreme Court, in the *S.R. Bommai* judgment, said President's Rule should only follow failed democratic options and is subject to judicial review. Yet in Manipur, there was no effort to form an alternative government, no all-party meeting, and no timeline for restoring democracy. Despite their claims of following Supreme Court orders, the government ignores them here. Violence continues, justice is absent, and fear dominates. Appeals to surrender arms failed, and even the Home Minister's highway restoration plan was rejected. The Centre is trying to impose peace, not build it through dialogue. If the BJP truly cared, it would have started peace talks immediately and ensured relief and rehabilitation for all victims.

SHRI SANJAY SINGH: When I raised the issue of Manipur in Parliament, I was suspended for 11 months — the longest for any MP — just for demanding attention to the crisis. My only act was entering the Well with slogans, asking this House to hear Manipur's pain. Suspend me, remove me — that doesn't matter. But we won't stop raising real issues. If a part of the country is burning, we will speak — again and again. The Home Minister visited Manipur, and in a meeting, most Opposition leaders clearly said: remove the Chief Minister. Peace is impossible under someone seen as responsible for the violence. Manipur has suffered deeply — homes, churches, temples destroyed, lives lost. The nation hung its head in shame when a Kargil war hero's wife was paraded naked. That soldier later said, "I fought for India but couldn't protect my wife." Is this not a national disgrace? In two years, the Prime Minister spoke only 36 seconds on Manipur in Parliament. He had time for foreign trips — the U.S., Dubai, Qatar, even Mongolia — but not for Manipur. What message does that send? There is clear bias in how different states are treated. The people of Manipur deserve empathy, justice, and real leadership. Your approach towards different states is biased — especially where Opposition parties are in power. That may be understood politically. But in states where your own "double engine" government is in place, you have double responsibility — for security, employment, development, and farmers' welfare. Despite this, violence continues in such states. Take Uttar Pradesh — every major festival is preceded by unrest, whether it's Holi, Diwali, Ram Navami, or Eid. What is gained from this? And then there's Manipur — a state suffering from riots, violence, and hatred for the last two years. You finally imposed President's Rule, but only after losing both Lok Sabha seats there in 2024. It was then you realized change was needed and removed the Chief Minister, who was directly responsible for the situation. We had earlier also suggested this in the all-party meeting. Now that President's Rule has been imposed, win back the trust of Manipur's people. Instead of rushing into elections, focus on restoring peace, rebuilding communal harmony, and reviving democracy.

SHRI SANJAY YADAV: It's unfortunate that we are discussing Manipur—a deeply sensitive issue—at 3:30 AM, something that should have been prioritized much earlier. For two years, Manipur has suffered violence, fear, and pain. The double-engine government remained silent despite horrifying incidents—women paraded naked, homes burned, ministers attacked, curfews imposed, and AFSPA enforced. Yet, the Centre made no real effort for peace. Due to Government inaction, the situation worsened. When leaders shut their ears to people's cries, what impact can protest have? Manipur is grieving because governance failed. Two communities clashed while the government watched. Justice, democracy, and humanity were defeated. The idea of "government of the people, by the people, for the people" collapsed. Manipur is not just land—it's an emotional and strategic part of India. Ignoring it for two years reflects the Government's indifference. It stands as a stark reminder of administrative failure. This Government, obsessed with donations and business, focuses only on money-making — never on Manipur. If you had to impose President's Rule after two years, then accept it was a failure of your governance and administration. Today, the state of the country is such that people are like chickens in a cage — silent until their turn comes, then they scream, while the rest keep picking grains. Finally, I must say: they talk about serving the nation, but act in self-interest.

SHRI ABDUL WAHAB: During my visit to Manipur with our delegation, we met both Kuki and Meitei communities and heard their grievances. We were told that around 50 churches were attacked, indicating pre-planned violence. A healing touch is urgently needed. Despite repeated requests, no discussion on Manipur was held in Rajya Sabha, and the Prime Minister has still not visited the State. An independent inquiry must be set up to investigate the causes of the conflict, especially since a tape allegedly captures the Chief Minister admitting to instigating the violence. Manipur has seen the highest number of UAPA cases in the country — nearly 1,000 in five years. Economic disparity between communities, particularly asset concentration in the valley over the hills, has deepened the divide. Around 60,000 people have been displaced, but the Union Budget offers no clear rehabilitation plan. The government must provide special funds for their resettlement.

SHRI SANDOSH KUMAR P: I have a direct question for the Home Minister: on 22nd March, he announced in this House that Naxalism and Maoism would end by March 31, 2026. Can he similarly commit to a date by when the Manipur crisis will be resolved? It has been 22 months, and there is still no solution. Their silence reflects insensitivity. The President's Address had 5,839 words, yet Manipur wasn't mentioned even once. That says everything. Our Prime Minister, who ranks second after Queen Elizabeth II in global travel, hasn't found time to visit Manipur — just a short flight away from Delhi. What does that say about the Government's priorities? I believe the government imposed President's Rule in Manipur due to international pressure after Trump took office in the U.S. Their insensitivity is astonishing. The Finance Minister tried to blame the Opposition for this crisis, but accountability is the key. The BJP-led double-engine government has failed in Manipur. Every crisis cannot be justified by blaming Congress. The Union and State Governments must acknowledge their failure. Only then, we can move forward. I take pride in our party's presence in Manipur- leaders like Irawat Singh fought for the people, and we will continue to stand with them. A political solution is essential, involving all sections of society.

SHRIMATI PRIYANKA CHATURVEDI: When the Leader of Opposition requested to postpone this discussion, the Home Minister insisted that we would work late and discuss Manipur. Yet, now I see neither the Government nor its allies willing to address it. For two years, we have urged the Prime Minister to visit Manipur, including in all-party meetings, but our plea remains unheard. Instead of saving Manipur, efforts were made to

save the Chief Minister, despite ongoing violence for 22 months. Over 250 lives have been lost, 60,000 people displaced, yet Parliament has not held a comprehensive discussion. This marks the 11th instance of President's Rule in Manipur which is the highest for any state post-independence. That too when they knew the government would fall in a no-confidence motion. As a woman MP, the distressing images of Manipur haunt me. I recall my colleague, sports icon Mary Kom, pleading in a video -"Prime Minister, my house is burning." Now that President's Rule is in place, my request to the the Home Minister is simple-conduct elections swiftly. Manipur needs an elected government, and the message of peace must come from the Prime Minister himself.

The Hon'ble Minister, replying to the discussion on the Statutory Resolution, said: I stand before this House to seek approval for the President's Rule imposed in Manipur under Article 356(1) on February 13, 2025. Some claim it was politically motivated, but let me clarify -this was not done to topple down an opposition-led Government. The Chief Minister resigned, and no party staked a claim to form the Government which leads to the imposition of President's Rule. Contrary to misinformation, Manipur has witnessed *zero violence* since November. Seven years ago, under Congress, Manipur saw 225 days of curfews and blockades annually. We never wanted to compare, but those criticizing today must acknowledge their own failures. Congress never sent the Prime Minister during past ethnic conflicts, even when 1,500 people were killed in encounters.

Opposition leaders are now politicizing ethnic violence without understanding the difference between community clashes and armed insurgency. This is not naxalism, and it requires a different approach to tackle it. We acknowledge the tragic loss of 260 lives, but Bengal also saw 250 deaths in electoral violence. Why is it being ignored? Under BJP rule, violence in the Northeast has decreased by 70%, and we have signed 20 peace accords. Over 10,000 militants have surrendered. The current crisis in Manipur was triggered by a High Court judgment granting tribal status to a community without due process. This led to unrest between tribal and non-tribal groups. It was neither a religious conflict nor a law-and-order failure. The misinformation must stop. I urge everyone to rise above politics and work towards restoring peace in Manipur. Let us not deepen wounds for political gain.

The Statutory Resolution was adopted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon'ble Members, in the Waqf (Amendment) Bill, 2025, there was voting by division. Seat/Division number 151 is allotted to Ms. Dola Sen and Seat/Division number 133 is allotted to Shri Subrata Bakshi. It is mandatory that exercise of right of vote is valid and can be effected to make it valid only from the seat allotted to the Hon'ble Member. Any other mode does not allow the Member to engage even in correction. The facility of correction is available only when the Member exercises the right from his or her seat. A correction slip was submitted by Ms. Dola Sen and there is no dispute on that count. Sanctity of voting is fundamental and any transgression is unacceptable. That this transgression has taken place, there is no option with the Chair except to invalidate that vote. Hon'ble Members, we took recourse to electronic voting. On an earlier occasion, I had indicated that adaptability and accessibility to technology has been widely reflected by people at large. I would again urge the Members that except for very extraordinary situations, we must make optimizing rule for exercise of electronic voting. I would urge the Hon'ble Members, whenever there is an occasion like this they must have some kind of

updating on this. We will put the procedure again on the Members' Portal so that we exemplify to others also that our electronic voting is near perfect.

Hon'ble Members, it is a rare occasion the House stands adjourned at 4.02 am today to meet again on this very day at 11 am today, *i.e.*, the 4th April 2025.

P. C. MODY,
Secretary-General.

rssynop@sansad.nic.in