

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, I move:

That the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION

**The situation arising out of growing incidents of terrorism in the country
with special reference to recent blasts in Mumbai on 13th July, 2011.**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up Short Duration Discussion on the situation arising out of growing incidents of terrorism in the country with special reference to recent blasts in Mumbai on 13th July, 2011. Dr. Manohar Joshi to initiate the discussion.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate in this important discussion on the issue of bomb blasts in Mumbai and other parts of the country. Sir, I am also thankful to Shri Arun Jaitley, Leader of the Opposition, and, Shri Ahluwalia for giving me the opportunity to initiate this important debate.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) *in the Chair*)

Sir, the subject before us is not a new subject. All of us know, for the last 18 years, bomb explosions are taking place in the entire country. It is true that no remedy has been found so far to stop the terrorist attacks. A number of attacks have been carried out particularly in the commercial capital of this country, the city of Mumbai. Sir, there are many, many important points, which I think, should be brought before the House.

Sir, thousands of innocent people have died in bomb blasts. It is also true that in the last three years, the number of terrorist activities has increased but, unfortunately, I do not see that the Government is active in taking action. Therefore, in this august Parliament, cutting across party lines, we must discuss this important issue.

Sir, during this period, there were a number of Governments run by different political parties in the States and also in the Centre but, unfortunately, no Government has been successful in stopping the terrorist attacks on the innocent people. Here, I would like to mention some of the instances which happened during the last three years. These instances have happened all over the country, almost in all important cities. There was a bomb blast in Varanasi in December, 2010. Then, there were bomb blasts at Jama Masjid, Delhi in July, 2010; at Chinnaswamy Stadium in 2010, and, also in Pune on 13th February, 2010.

There was Margao bomb blast on 16/10/2009, and, there was a terrorist attack in Mumbai on 26/11/2008, which was perhaps the biggest one. Sir, such blasts also happened again at Malda and Malegaon in Maharashtra on 29th September, 2008, and, also at Sabarkantha in Gujarat on 29th of September, 2008. There was another bomb blast in Delhi on 27th September, 2008 and, there was a series of five bomb blast in Delhi on 13th September, 2008. Sir, on 26th July 2008, a series of bomb blasts took place in Ahmedabad; a series of bomb blasts again took place in Bangalore; a series of bomb blasts took place in Jaipur and also an attack took place on CRPF Group Center at Rampur on 1st of January, 2008. But the issue came for a discussion today because on 13th July, 2011, there were blasts at three places in Mumbai. Therefore, I was very particular to raise this issue in the House. These three blasts in Mumbai took place on 13th July, 2011 in the evening at about seven o'clock. One of the blasts took place in Dadar, from where I come and which is my constituency also. I was sitting in my office. At about 7.10 p.m., I heard a sound of the bomb explosion and I rushed to the spot. Exactly after five minutes, I was on the spot. I saw that people were running from one place to another. The police had come. They had come immediately. When I saw them, I enquired with the police officers as to what had happened. The police immediately told me that this was not a small thing. An electric meter box was put on the bus stop and in that box, there was a bomb which had exploded and the entire chaos was because people were to be moved to the hospital forthwith which they were finding very difficult. There was lot of crowd also. In the mean time, the news came out about two more bomb blasts, one was at Zaveri Bazaar and another was near Opera House in South Mumbai. We must have read in the newspapers that 21 innocent people died and 141 got injured in those blasts. This was not happening in Mumbai for the first time. This has

been happening in Mumbai right from 12th of March, 1993. In that bomb blast also more than 200 people died.

Sir, one part I would like to bring to the notice of the House is that the court case went on in this particular case for 14 years and the final judgement came from the court after 14 years. Three people, whose names are also known to us, were Dawood Ibrahim, Tiger Memon and Mohd. Dossa. They could not be arrested; they ran away. They were not found and since 1993, the bombs are being exploded by the terrorists and we find that this Government is not going to the root cause of these bomb explosions. The Government is not going into it because of some reason or the other. I would not like to go into that. But in Lok Sabha, a question was asked by one of the Members, Mr. Aggarwal, "Whether Government is making any scheme to tackle the problem of increasing terrorism and separatism in the country". This question was asked. While replying to the question, the Government, as usual, said, "The Government is committed to combat terrorism, extremism and separation in its all forms and manifestations as no cause, genuine or imaginary, can justify terrorism or violence. The Government continues to be alert to these threats and recalibrates its measures to combat terrorism by way of reviewing threat perceptions and a number of important decisions and measures have been taken". Similarly, to deal with separatism, the Government of India, in tandem with the State Governments, had adopted a multi-pronged approach to contain such terrorism in the North-East and to contain cross-border infiltration in Jammu and Kashmir. This shows that the Government is satisfied with its own action. But the Government is not ready to go to its root cause.

This question was again asked in the Lok Sabha on 15th March. While replying to the question of its root causes, the Government said, 'The consistent position of the Government of India in all international fora is that India does not subscribe to the hypothesis of root causes of terrorism. And no grievance or cause can excuse or justify an act of terrorism.' I can understand the approach of the Government. But this does not convince me. I want to know why its root cause cannot be found. I think if the Government does not want to go into the root causes of attacks by terrorists, terrorism may not vanish. I personally feel that if the Government goes to find its root cause, it may find out that the activities in our neighbouring country are mostly responsible for the root cause of terrorism.

Is the Government prepared to accept it? If it is not, then for the satisfaction of the Members of the House, the Government must come forward and explain the reasons behind these attacks. Sir, I could not understand why some people come to our country and risk their own lives also. And apart from that, these people spoil the atmosphere of the entire country. It is also not understandable to me why people like Dawood Ibrahim, Tiger Memon and Mohammed Dossa, etc., are not being brought to the country. The attacks of the terrorists can be stopped provided they are scared of the Government. Unfortunate though it is, I have to admit and I have to say that the Government is not very serious about it.

I was insisting on discussing this issue first with the Opposition parties because other issues can be taken up afterwards. If I go back to Mumbai, where thousands of people were killed, without raising this issue, Mumbaikars will be the most unhappy people.

Sir, it is true that the maximum number of bomb explosions have taken place in Mumbai. Mumbai city being the commercial capital of the country, terrorists also must have thought if they could attack the city of Mumbai, their purpose would be served to a large extent.

In Mumbai, except 1995-99, there were bomb explosions every year. On 3rd December, 2002, two people were killed and 49 were injured. On 27th January, 2003, near Vile Parle Station, one person was killed and 28 were injured. On 13th March, 2003, there were bomb explosions in trains where ten people were killed and 70 were injured. I am only referring to attacks on Mumbai city. On 25th August, 2003, near Gateway of India and Zaveri Bazaar, 52 people were killed and 204 people were injured. This happens where there is a crowd. This happens at railway stations. This happens near the seashore. This happens at the places where there is a crowd. This happens in trains also.

On 11th July, 2006, bomb blasts took place in railway compartments and 185 people died and 800 people were injured. This happened in Malegaon where 37 people died and 125 people were injured. Again, in Malegaon, on 29th September, 2008, seven people died and 80 were injured. After all these things happen, the Government comes forward for consoling the people or giving money to the relatives of deceased persons. But, is it sufficient? What special measures have been adopted by the Government? This is my question. Regular reply given by the Government in this House and

elsewhere is, we are trying to do our best and we are trying to see that such incidents do not take place again. The Mumbai incident is only an example. But, I am not going to concentrate only on the city of Mumbai. What is happening in other parts of the country is the same thing. This country has become weak. Terrorists have no fear about it. Therefore, last time, when I spoke about it, I had said that if you want to stop terrorism, you must go to the root cause and find out from where terrorists are coming. If you find terrorist camps in any country, you must be able to attack. Only strong Government can do this. This Government has become weak and it is difficult to expect anything from this weak Government. I am sure that the present Government is the most weak Government and, therefore, these attacks are increasing. Can we not stop it?

Sir, I want the hon. Home Minister to be serious on this issue. One thing is certain that when the incident took place in Mumbai on 13th of July, all political party leaders visited the hospitals after the incident. Our hon. Prime Minister and the Home Minister also visited the hospitals. But, is it sufficient? Going to hospitals, looking after the patients and consoling them is not sufficient. They should try to find out what are the reasons for this and what was the device used this time? Every time, they try to use different devices. Improvised Explosive Devices were used this time.

Sir, the incident that took place in Dadar was near De Silva High School. Fortunately, this took place at 7 o'clock and, therefore, the school going boys and girls were saved. But, had it happened during any other time, those students studying in the school would also have been killed.

Sir, this issue must be given top priority for a debate in this House. Unfortunately, this did not happen. There were a number of bomb explosions in Mumbai every time there was a discussion in this House. On 2nd December, 2002, in the BEST bus depot, there was a blast and two people died. Sir, in Vyapar Shopping Complex, 30 persons were injured and this was done during day time. Terrorists are not coming during night time only. They also come during day time and attack the people. Sir, such incidents happened at Mulund station also and 11 people died and 65 injured on 13th March, 2003. The Gateway of India and Jhaveri Bazaar which were previous incidents to the

recent incident, 160 people were injured and 46 persons were killed. As some senior Members have already said, the bomb explosion in the railway compartment claimed lives of 200 people and 700 were injured. This incident also happened near my office. I have gone there to see the reaction of the people. The people were absolutely upset. Fortunately, no untoward incident happened after that. But I must tell this House that in future if such incidents take place, I am sure, the affected people may also start burning the Government properties. My intention in bringing this issue before the House is to request the Government to take necessary steps.

On 26th November, 2008, attacks targeting the Taj Hotel, the Oberoi Trident Hotel, Cafe Leopold, Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus railway station and the Cama Hospital took place. These incidents are known to everybody wherein 166 people died and 388 people were injured. These things are happening in Mumbai as well as in other parts of the country. The Government has to take steps to check these things. But the Government is not prepared to take steps for the reasons known to them. On all these incidents and other incidents in the country, in reply to a question in the Lok Sabha, the hon. Minister has said "The case is under investigation." This was the reply from the Government. In Varanasi bomb blasts also, this was the reply. On 19-2-2010 the reply was "The case is under investigation." On 17th April, 2010 the reply remained the same "The case is under investigation." On 27th September, the reply was "The case is under investigation." On 29th September also, the reply was the same. "The case is under investigation." From February, 2010 the reply had little changed. In regard to bomb blasts in Pune, the reply was "The case is under trial." On 13/5 the reply was "The case is under trial." On 16-10-2010, the reply was "The case is under trial." On 25/7 the reply was, "The case is under trial." On 13th September, the reply was again "The case is under trial."

On 1st of January, 2008 the same reply was given. Either the cases are under trial or the investigations are pending. The Government is not able to give any other reply, probably, because the Government is not acting fast. The police are not working. I am not here to condemn the police department, because the police have always been saying that they do not get the latest material to stop terrorist activities. The money is also not being spent, from time to time. After terrorists tried to storm one place after another, the Government promised a number of times to provide financial

assistance, but the money which is required for stopping terrorist activity has not come. Today, I have sufficient time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): But still.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: But, Sir, what about the statement of the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and other Ministers. After these incidents took place, the Chief Minister went into most unwanted issue of rift with the NCP. I know that there is no relationship. But I am reading from the statement of what the State Chief Minister has said. I quote: "We made a grave mistake by giving Home Department to the NCP and, therefore, the bomb blasts could not be stopped by the Home Minister of the NCP."

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Goa): Please don't misquote. *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): It is the statement of the Chief Minister. *(Interruptions)*... The Chief Minister has clarified it later. *(Interruptions)*... Later the Chief Minister has clarified it. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: What does it carry? It carries the serious reservation in the minds of the people. *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Manohar Joshiji, the Home Minister wants to say something. *(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): He was making very important points and I am noting very carefully. But when we begin to discuss matters relating to a State Cabinet in Parliament, what prevents them from discussing tomorrow matters relating to the Union Cabinet in their legislature? I think, we should avoid discussion about purely internal matters of the State. *(Interruptions)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: I don't understand what the Home Minister wants to convey. *(Interruptions)*... I only told him about the statement of the Chief Minister. But there are other shocking statements also.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: We can't discuss them here.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: The Chief Minister is the head of the State and if the Chief Minister

makes a mistake, he is responsible. Did the Home Minister warn him the next minute when the statement came? It came on all media, the TV, etc. The statement was shown everywhere.

When the Chief Minister went to meet the relatives of the injured people, there were slogans like "hai, hai, shame, shame". This was organised by a political party leader. I am mentioning it because that leader did not belong to the Congress. He belonged to the other party. The people got agitated after the statement of the Chief Minister and they asked the Chief Minister to go back. This was absolutely wrong. The unfortunate part is that the political leader also did not understand the seriousness of this statement. Apart from this, the topmost leader. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VIJAY JAWAHARLAL DARDA: Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, please.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Your newspaper has only published it. ...*(Interruptions)*... So, you know the name of the leader. ...*(Interruptions)*... Your newspaper published it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) : You please don't react to it.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: If you want to know the name of the leader, you can see me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Try to conclude, please.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: The statement of the topmost leader of the country * is also not liked by that very people. What has * said? He has expressed the inability of the Government to stop bomb blasts and explosions 100 per cent. He has stated that no country has been able to stop them totally. Is it the occasion to speak like this? My question is different. I am referring to politics only wherever it is absolutely necessary. Can the top leader of the country say that we can do 99 per cent or 100 per cent can't be done? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): One minute. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, Tiwariji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiji, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me say. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री वी. हनुमंत राव (आंध्र प्रदेश): आप किसी का भी नाम नहीं ...*(व्यवधान)*...

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Tiwariji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Rao, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiiji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mabelji, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiiji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... You can't criticise an hon. Member of the other House. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please let me say. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, please.

श्री विक्रम वर्मा: सर, ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी (बिहार): इन्होंने * जी को टॉप लीडर मान लिया है, तब आप क्यों ...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): प्लीज़, आप बैठिए। आप बैठिए ...*(व्यवधान)*... You can't criticise an hon. Member of the other House. That is not right. You are a very senior Member. ...*(Interruptions)*... You were the Speaker of the other House. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please. ...*(Interruptions)*... You are a very senior Member. You were the hon. Speaker of the other House. You were the Chief Minister. So, you know the rules. You can't criticise an hon. Member of the other House who can't come here and defend himself. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, please. I have said what I want to say. Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Whatever he is doing, I have said what I have to say.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I have said, "One leader of a party". There should not be any objection to that. I am not accusing him. I am only saying that this is the statement which is known to everybody. Can it be said, when such an incident has taken place and people have died, that no party can stop it, that no Government can stop it? What is more important? More important is not his statement, but the time, which he has chosen for making a statement, is wrong. This was, absolutely, not necessary and it was not worth-saying at a time when people had died.

There was one more statement, which also I am opposing. You know, Sir, who has made that statement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Joshiiji, whatever amounts to criticism of the Member of the other House, I will delete it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: I am not naming anybody. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't go to an area. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please sit down. Don't go to an area where you are not supposed to go. I am telling it to you. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is my problem. You are a very senior Member. That is my problem. ...*(Interruptions)*... Joshiji, you are a very senior Member. That is my problem.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, I have not said anything wrong.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You constrain yourself. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: I am not saying anything wrong.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Whatever is amounting to criticism, will be deleted, will be expunged.

डॉ. वी. मैत्रेयन (तमिलनाडु): सर, ...**(व्यवधान)**... जब नाम नहीं लेंगे, तो फिर बोलने में क्या है? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): इन्होंने नाम ले लिया। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

डॉ. वी. मैत्रेयन: अभी नहीं लिया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): इन्होंने पहले नाम ले लिया। ...**(व्यवधान)**... He could have said, "A leader". ...*(Interruptions)*... इन्होंने नाम ले लिया। What can I do? ...*(Interruptions)*... Also, the time allotted to you is 20 minutes, but you have taken 31 minutes. Please conclude.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, half of my speech is over.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You see, the time allotted for 'Others' group is only 20 minutes and you have taken 31 minutes. How can I accommodate others?

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: सर, ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Let him confine to what he has to say.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has told me that I can take as much time as I want.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has told me. Sir, how can you say, "No"?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no. Whatever the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs says. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs came to me and said. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Whatever the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs told you is between you and him. I have to go by the allotted time. I have to run the House. You try to conclude. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी (उत्तराखंड): सर, ...*(व्यवधान)*... ये महाराष्ट्र से हैं। ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप इनको बोलने दीजिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Jharkhand): What is the problem? A newly appointed Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, who represents Maharashtra, assured the Maharashtraian leader that he can take as much time as he wants. What is the problem? He has given this assurance.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Ahluwaliaji, I am not bound by that. That is the problem.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, another gentleman has said, Which is very shocking, that terrorist attacks took place because of the influx of outsiders into Mumbai. He particularly said that the influx of people from Uttar Pradesh and Bihar was responsible for these attacks. Therefore, his conclusion was it is not my conclusion - that in the entire country a permit system should be started. Is it time for making these statements? Did the Government take notice of it? Did you ask him why he had made such a statement? Sir, while starting my speech, I said that this issue was beyond politics. We must all be worried about it. One of the reasons why such things happen is the behaviour of such types of leaders and their statements. That is why I have quoted these two statements. ...*(Interruptions)*... He is not a Member of the House. Are we, politicians, alone to be concerned with this issue? I don't think so. A famous cine actor,...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Joshiji, please conclude. You have taken 34 minutes.

SHRI MANOHAR JOSHI: A famous cine actor, *, threw a party ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Why is he bringing such things here?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): That is what I am saying. Mr. Joshi, why do you go to this area? You confine yourself to the subject. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: In what way are we concerned whether somebody threw a party or not? ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार): परमिट सिस्टम वाली बात किसने बोली, उसका नाम ले लीजिए।
...(**व्यवधान**)...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: What he has done, is it in the interest of the country?
...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: सर, परमिट वाले का नाम इन्होंने नहीं लिया। ...(**व्यवधान**)... जिसने बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश के लोगों के बारे में कहा, उसका नाम नहीं लिया। ...(**व्यवधान**)... * का नाम लिया। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Joshi, it is a well accepted convention in the House that we will not criticize a person who cannot come here and defend himself. You know that. Why do you take names? You say, 'a leader' or 'a film star'. I can accept that. Don't take names. Now, please conclude.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Was it proper for a cine star to throw a party when people have died? Are they not responsible members of the society? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI BRINDA KARAT: Let them say how many of their leaders attended the Fashion Show. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: सर, * का नाम क्यों नहीं लिया गया, * का नाम क्यों लिया गया? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): All the names of people, which he has mentioned here, those who cannot come here and defend themselves, are to be expunged.

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

4.00 P.M.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, Osama bin Laden ...*(Interruptions)*... Can I take his name?
...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: We want the Chair to say whether this is going on record or not. And, should we refer to Osama bin Laden as Osama bin Ladenji?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude. You have taken 37 minutes.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: I am so sorry to say that a leader, who is always in the habit of making allegations, has made an allegation that the bomb blasts were because of RSS. You all know who must have said it. These allegations also cannot be tolerated. Then, when he went to Bhopal, - I am now giving a clue - people attacked him and, thereafter, he stopped saying about the bomb blasts. Finally, Sir, ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री विजय जवाहरलाल दर्डा (महाराष्ट्र): उत्तर भारतीय किसने बोला, उसका नाम बताइए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: If you are reading newspapers, you will know that. Finally, Sir, a number of political leaders came to the hospital, and they made important statements. The Prime Minister said in Mumbai, "Every remedial step will be taken to stop terrorism anywhere."

I would like to know from the hon. Minister the steps they has taken. Has he taken any step? My charge against the Government is that it has taken no steps to stop terrorism. I am also convinced that action against terrorism is not being taken for political reasons. Otherwise, it is not difficult and it is not impossible also...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Please conclude now.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: If you cannot save the lives of people, it is a very serious matter.

Sir, Shri Chidambaram was also there at the hospital. He knows what the Prime Minister has said. Shri Chidambaram, the hon. Minister of Home Affairs, had said that this was a pre-planned

conspiracy. How did the lion. Minister come to know of this the very next day? How could he make this statement the next day? And if he made this statement, he should tell the House now...

DR. V. MAITREYAN: He should tell us who is behind this conspiracy?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No cross-talk please.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: He should, at least, take the House into confidence and tell us who did it.

Sir, Advaniji is a renowned leader and a Member of the other House. He has said that, looking into the inability of the present Government, the people must now find an alternative. His statement is very true. If this Government cannot save the lives of our people, it has no right to rule this country. Therefore, I support the statement made by Advaniji.

Then, Sir, if I do not refer to the statement made by my party chief, it would be unfair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): All right. You can do that.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Shri Balasaheb Thackeray had made a statement and that statement is equally important.

SHRI TARIQ ANWAR (Maharashtra): Objectionable. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: What is objectionable?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please, Dr. Joshi. You have no time to get into this.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: Sir, ask them not to disturb me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Don't listen to them. You speak for one or two minutes and conclude.

DR. MANOHAR JOSHI: I will conclude, Sir, provided nobody disturbs me.

Now, Balasaheb made a statement, "it is now the time if you want to stop terrorism. Everybody must take a weapon in his own hands and then only terrorism can be stopped; otherwise, not". ...*(Interruptions)*... Why are you trying to ridicule it? ...*(Interruptions)*... Why are you trying

to ridicule it? Israel did it. They made army training compulsory and, therefore, were able to stop terrorism. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I must also say that only condolence motions are passed in this House, and emotions for the innocents who are killed in terrorist acts are not enough. Give weapons to the people. The Chief Minister had said that the Scotland Yard Police is required to stop this. I don't think so. Our own Police can do it. Give them proper jackets. Give them modern weapons. Many a time these complaints have been made but the Government hasn't done anything. Sometimes, money was not provided, particularly to the State of Maharashtra, looking into the difficulties of the city of Mumbai. I would request the hon. Home Minister to look into these matters, provide everything that is required and I am confident that the Police of Mumbai, as also the Police in the entire country, is capable enough to stop terrorism. But, then, you must treat them properly and help them fully in the discharge of their duties.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, we are discussing today the situation arising out of growing incidents of terrorism in the country with special reference to recent blasts in Mumbai on 13th July, 2011.

Sir, it is very difficult to define 'terrorism'. Several attempts have been made by various institutions and bodies but nobody has been able to arrive at a precise definition of 'terrorism'. It is said that it broadly refers to those violent acts which are intended to create fear and are perpetrated for religious, political or ideological good. There are more than a hundred definitions of 'terrorism' which are in circulation.

But, broadly speaking, there are two types of terrorist acts or terrorism.

One of them is State-sponsored terrorism, the one which is resorted to by Pakistan, our neighbour. The other is resorted to by a State in the country, the Government of a State in our own country, which belongs to an opposition party. Nobody talks of that terrorism. Nobody is trying to seek any remedy. That is the state. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE (Rajasthan): Sir, what is he talking?

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, I am talking about the State terrorism. I have not named any State. I have not named any political party. I am entitled to speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री विजय जवाहरलाल दर्डा: किसी का नाम नहीं लिया फिर क्यों आपत्ति कर रहे हैं? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): मैं रिकॉर्ड देखूंगा।

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: In November, 2004, the U.N. Secretary-General's report describes 'terrorism' as "any act intended to cause death or serious body harm to civilians or non-combatants' with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a Government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act. I am just trying to define an act of terrorism from definitions which are in circulation.

It is said that as on 2006-the hon. Home Minister may correct me if I am wrong - 232 out of 608 districts are affected by terrorists. I think, this figure should be on the higher side now. It is also said that about 800 terrorist cells are in operation in the country. Joshiji is not here, but right from the beginning, he had been saying that the Government is not serious on fighting terrorism. There cannot be more * than this statement. Throughout his speech, he was telling *. Can you imagine that the Government is not serious? You can find fault with the Government. You can say that it should have done this or that. But saying that the Government is not serious is not right.

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार): अगर रूलिंग पार्टी के मेन स्पीकर का यह स्वभाव है, then you are giving a licence to others.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Ravi Shankar Prasad, before your asking, I have removed it from the record.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: He was speaking untruth. He was saying something which was not true. ...*(Interruptions)*... Do I not have the liberty to say that he was speaking untruth? He is speaking about Mumbai blasts, etc. If there is any party which saw a sort of violence was his party and 30 years back! Ask him who started that. He has seen in Mumbai buses being burnt and burnt. He has not seen such violence in Mumbai before that. Therefore, he must speak with a sense of responsibility. He must see which party started any sort of violence in Mumbai.

Secondly, Sir, one of our leaders has been criticized for speaking something which is true. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, acts of terrorism do take place in any part of the country and in any part of the world. If somebody says that we cannot prevent all acts of terrorism, it is a reality. Why should

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

anybody criticize the statement which says that we cannot prevent all acts of terrorism? It is true. Why should we discourage somebody from saying something which is truth? I wonder why the media should show it as truth throughout the day. Would you like somebody to say untruth?

SHRI BHAGAT SINGH KOSHYARI: Sir, if a senior Member from the ruling party says like this, it means, we should expect more and more such activities in the country. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE: You simply say that you cannot stop it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: We are realistic. We are realistic, not artificial, not cosmetic like you. We are not cosmetic, we are realistic. We have to try our best to see to it that all acts of terrorism are prevented. But, if somebody says that we can't prevent all acts, what is wrong in it? In a country, where millions of people move in a place-you can see lakhs of people in Mumbai moving in a place - if anybody does any act, by and large, can you prevent such an act? We have to try our best to prevent such acts. But, please remember, be realistic. If you want to be unrealistic, fine; it is up to you.

Sir, Advaniji came to Mumbai, he came to Mumbai immediately after this incident, and he said, "There was no failure of communication or any intelligence machinery. There was a failure of policy." What is the failure of policy? He never explained it. Perhaps, he has got in mind certain policy. How do we know about his policy? How do we know about his party's policy? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Keep in mind my ruling. You cannot take name and criticize. ...*(Interruptions)*... That is the ruling I have already given.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Okay; if that name is unparliamentary, I will not take it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You can say, 'a leader'. By taking name, you cannot criticize. It is because that person cannot come and defend here. That is all.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: The question is, I know only your policy which allows to take

terrorists in a special plane and reach them to safety. That is your policy against terrorism. Are you going to refer to that policy? Where is the failure of our policy? Which part of our policy which has failed? You just indicate that. Which of our law which has failed? You show any action of ours which has failed. I can understand, we have to do more. But saying that there is no intelligence failure, but there is a policy failure is not correct. You are saying this because this time you found that there was no failure as such. Therefore, you are referring to policy failure.

Then, Sir, there were several incidents at several places. You always get irritated when somebody refers to right-wing terrorism, etc. But it is there in the country. This all happens in my own town, Madgaon, in Goa. Whose act is it? It is right-wing Hindu terrorism. Now, the prosecution is going on. There were such acts at Malegaon, Ajmer, etc. Why do you feel shy of it? I think, you have got very much control over those people. Please, try to convince them. They are in your hands; they are your friends; they are your relatives. Please, try to control those people. If you control the right-wing terrorism, then, almost 50 to 60 per cent of terrorism will be over. It is going on and increasing. महात्मा गांधी को इस दुनिया से किसने उठाया, आप जरा सोचिए। वह सबसे पहला terrorism का act था, जब महात्मा गांधी को इस दुनिया से उठाया। किन लोगों ने उठाया, वे किसके रिश्तेदार थे, वे किसके दोस्त थे, उनके किनसे संबंध थे, यह आप जरा सोचिए। फिर आपको पता चलेगा कि right - wing terrorism क्या होता है?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Shantaramji, come to the topic. ...*(Interruptions)*... I will deal with it.

SHRI V.P. SINGH BADNORE: Is he speaking on terrorism? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Is this not relevant? What is this, Sir? Sir, *

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, यह क्या हो रहा है? ...*(व्यवधान)*... यह कोई मज़ाक है क्या? कांग्रेस का किसके साथ संबंध है? ...*(व्यवधान)*... What is this? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Have I said anything unparliamentary? ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, this is my maiden speech. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You speak on the subject. ...*(Interruptions)*...

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: ये क्या बोल रहे हैं? यह हिंदुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट है। क्या आप नहीं समझते हैं? क्या वे जिम्मेदारी की बात कर रहे हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Shantaram, you have a subject before you. ...**(Interruptions)**...

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी: आप किस गांधी को गांधी मानते हो? यह क्या बात है? ...**(व्यवधान)**... असली गांधी को हम गांधी मानते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: अगर वे प्रोवोक कर रहे हैं तो ...**(व्यवधान)**... You are a senior Member. ...**(Interruptions)**... This is not acceptable. I am very sorry. अगर उनको प्रोवोकेटिव डिबेट करनी है तो हम तैयार हैं इसके लिए। बताइए क्या बोल रहे हैं? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Please, sit down. I will go through the records. Whatever is objectionable will be expunged.

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, * क्या मतलब है इसका? ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): No, no; it will be expunged. ...**(Interruptions)**...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: ये क्या बोल रहे हैं? He must apologize. ...**(Interruptions)**... मैं फिर कह रहा हूँ कि अगर प्रोवोकेटिव डिबेट होनी है तो हम तैयार हैं। हम कांग्रेस का पूरा कच्चा-चिट्ठा खोलकर रख देंगे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): It will be expunged. ...**(Interruptions)**...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, I would like to get a ruling on this. Today in the Business Order it is written, 'To raise a discussion on the situation arising out of growing incidents of terrorism in the country with special reference to recent blasts in Mumbai on 13th July, 2011'. But the Member from the other side, from the Treasury Benches, wants to refer or raise the issue of 1948 or 1949. I am a displaced person, I am a sufferer of partition, I have many grievances against those leaders, our founding fathers. You just draw a line. What do you mean by this notice? You must draw a line. Tell him to withdraw his words. Whatever he said should be withdrawn. He should withdraw his words. ...**(Interruptions)**...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: इनके नेता ने कहा था, एक बड़ा पेड़ गिरता है तो धरती हिलती है ...**(Interruptions)**... मैं नाम नहीं ले रहा हूँ। इनके नेता ने कहा था कि बड़ा पेड़ गिरता है तो धरती हिलती है। ...**(Interruptions)**...

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: He should withdraw that. Which type of terrorism do you want to discuss? ...*(Interruptions)*... This formulation was decided by the BAC. Which type of terrorism are we discussing? You must draw a line and tell him to withdraw his last sentence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please listen to me. I have already given the ruling and clarified that. The discussion should be within the scope of this subject matter. I told you to speak whatever is relevant with regard to the subject. I told this. It is applicable to every Member. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, he has stated it many times. It has gone on television. टीवी पर क्या-क्या बोलता है? ...*(व्यवधान)*... उनको माफी मांगनी पड़ेगी। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Ravi Shankar Prasadji, please listen. Whatever particular sentence he has said is expunged and it cannot be telecast. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No, no, Sir. He should withdraw that ...*(Interruptions)*... No, no. He should withdraw that. Whatever he has said should be withdrawn by him. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Withdraw, what? ...*(Interruptions)*... You tell me what I should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, he should withdraw that ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: What I should withdraw? You tell me...*(Interruptions)*... Tell me what I should withdraw? ...*(Interruptions)*... Give me in writing what I should withdraw ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: This is not the way, Sir. You told the other hon. Member that you would delete everything which is unparliamentary. He was talking about the recent occurrences. Now, he is talking since the inception of India. What is this? At that time, he was from Portugal; he was not from India. You are from Portugal at that time. He came to know about India later. He was a Portuguese at that time.

श्री शान्तराम नायक: क्या महात्मा गांधी के बारे में यही आदर है? ...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, please tell him to withdraw that ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): It is already expunged ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री पुरुषोत्तम खोडाभाई रुपाला (गुजरात): जब भी ऐसा हमला होता है, इनको गांधी जी क्यों याद आते हैं?
...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN) : It is expunged...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : Why do you remove?...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, everybody will say something unparliamentary and you will delete it!...*(Interruptions)*... it is already telecast ...*(Interruptions)*... That is not the point He must understand what to say and what not say ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL (Gujarat) : Sir, he cannot presurize the Chair to direct the Member to withdraw something ...*(Interruptions)*... It is the Chair which has to decided about ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : Let the Chair decide. You don't decide ...*(Interruptions)*... Please don't stand up in between ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री शान्तराम नायक : सर, महात्मा गांधी का खून हुआ, क्या हम यह नहीं बता सकते?...*(व्यवधान)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA : Sir, tell him to withdraw. Otherwise, it is difficult to control the Members ...*(Interruptions)*... It is difficult to control the Members ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, let me close the chapter. Now, I am giving concrete suggestions. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am concluding my speech. ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BHARAT KUMAR RAUT (Maharashtra): Sir, he should withdraw his statement first. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री शान्तराम नायक: कौनसा स्टेटमेंट? ...*(व्यवधान)*... Which statement you are talking about? I am now making some concrete suggestions. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: He has to withdraw that statement, first. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री शान्ताराम नायक: कौनसा स्टेटमेंट? ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): One minute ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, I suggest that in our school text books lessons on patriotism have to be incorporated ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI VIKRAM VERMA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, what is this. ...(Interruptions)... सर, यह क्या है? ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please sit down. See, the position is this. He was making a blanket allegation on all the leaders of the party which he is not expected to do. This is number one. But, I expunged that statement. Once it is expunged, it is as if he has not said. Therefore, withdrawal is not possible. So, my suggestion and advice is, he can express sorry. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No, no. It cannot be done like this. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, unless I know which is the statement that has constituted unparliamentary, how can I withdraw? ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, you have expunged it from the record. But, it is a live telecast. The entire world has watched what he said. He must apologize. He must apologize. It is only then he can proceed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Ahluwaliaji, whatever is. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No; he must say sorry. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री शान्ताराम नायक: अगर आप गांधी जी के ऊपर ...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): He will express regret. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया: पहले माफी मांगें, उसके बाद कुछ कहें।

श्री शान्ताराम नायक: सुन लीजिए ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No; no, say 'sorry'. ...(Interruptions)...

श्री शान्ताराम नायक: अगर मेरे कहने से ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: No its and buts. ...(Interruptions)... No its and buts. ...(Interruptions)... Say 'sorry'. ...(Interruptions)... What is this? ...(Interruptions)... Control your members.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): अहलुवालिया जी, ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शान्ताराम नायक: मेरे किसी बयान से आपकी फीलिंग्स हर्ट हुई हैं तो मैं माफी चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Okay, now, proceed. Please stick to the subject.

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK: Sir, I would like to suggest that in our school textbooks lessons on patriotism have to be embedded so that every student becomes a patriotic citizen.

Secondly, our law should be so amended that if any citizen comes to know about any act of terrorism or comes to know about any terrorist, it should be his bounden duty to inform the law authorities so that timely action can be taken.

Thirdly, I would like to say that our intelligence agencies - I would not like to compare with the KGB - should be broad-based agencies. There are lakhs to people who are willing to inform the authorities about suspected terrorist activities. Let us take the help of those informers and strengthen our intelligence agencies.

My next suggestion is that, if possible, certain chemicals, like, ammonium nitrate, which can be used in making bombs, should be banned. Such chemicals should not be easily available.

Then, Sir, our police force must be modernized and all modern technologies must be available with them. Most of our police stations do not have modern technological equipments. Every police station, howsoever small it may be, should have internet, fax, and scanning facilities. They should be up-to-date, as far as communication system is concerned. We must re-introduce the beat system in our police force. In some States, the beat system has been revived. A beat constable is the key person who knows the most about his area. He surveys each and every house of his area on a regular basis. Therefore, the beat system should be revived.

Then, our Evidence Act should be amended because new technological pieces of evidence are available these days. Many such technological evidences are not recognized by our Evidence Act. These are also not recognized by our courts of law. Therefore, if modern challenges are to be met, the Evidence Act will have to be accordingly amended.

Lastly, apart from taking action on individual basis, we must have a policy to deal with State terrorism, which is prevailing in some parts of the country.

Thank you very much.

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज की चर्चा बहुत ही संवेदनशील विषय पर है। मुम्बई में 1993 से आज तक 14 आतंकवादी हमले हो चुके हैं। अभी जो 13 जुलाई को हुआ, जिसकी हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं, इसमें 17 लोग मारे गए हैं और सैंकड़ों लोग घायल हुए। आज हम आतंक के साये में जी रहे हैं, कब आतंक का नासूर कहां फूट जाएगा, हमें पता नहीं है। आतंकी आते हैं, हमला करते हैं, हम सब चर्चा करते हैं, सांत्वना देते हैं और हम इस साये में रहते हैं कि अगला आतंकी हमला कब होगा? अभी जोशी जी ने हाल की कुछ घटनाओं का जिक्र किया, काशी में गंगा आरती के समय लोग मारे गए, मैं 2010 की चर्चा कर रहा हूँ, जर्मन बेकरी पर हमला हुआ, दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट के सामने बम फटा, बेंगलुरु में हुआ, लेकिन अभी तक किसी घटना के षडयंत्रकारी को हम नहीं पकड़ सके और न अनुसंधान की दिशा में आगे जा सके।

मुझे याद है कि 13 तारीख को माननीय प्रधान मंत्री डा. मनमोहन सिंह मुम्बई में थे और स्वयं माननीय गृह मंत्री चिदम्बरम साहब भी थे। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी की उस दिन की टिप्पणी को देखा है कि हम इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे कि आगे कोई आतंकवादी घटना न हो। उसी दिन मुम्बई में माननीय गृह मंत्री जी की टिप्पणी आयी कि भारत के सारे शहर खतरे में हैं। वे सारे स्टेटमेंट मेरे पास हैं, उनको दिखाने की जरूरत नहीं है। मतलब आगे हमले हो सकते हैं और हमले रुकेंगे, इसकी गारंटी नहीं है। ये हमले बार-बार क्यों होते हैं? आज उधर से चर्चा हो रही थी 1947-48 की, हमें उसमें जाने की जरूरत नहीं है। माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मुम्बई में बार-बार हमले होने के तीन सीधे कारण हैं। आतंकवादी बताना चाहते हैं कि हम हैं, हमारी हैसियत पहचानो। Recognise our visibility. We can do anything we feel like. दूसरा कारण है, वे यह बताना चाहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र की पुलिस या बाकी सुरक्षा बल कितने कमजोर हैं, हम जब चाहे उसे भेदकर आतंकवादी हमले कर सकते हैं। तीसरा कारण है कि जब भारत के प्रधान मंत्री G-20 में जाते हैं और वित्त मंत्री जी वहां लोगों से मिलने जाते हैं कि हमारी हैसियत पहचानो, तो वे कहते हैं कि तुम्हारी हैसियत यह है कि हम जब चाहे बम फोड़ सकते हैं और investors, don't invest in India. It is a security risk country. इसके लिए 1947-48 में जाने की जरूरत नहीं है और यह सब पाकिस्तान के इशारे से हो रहा है जिसकी एक पॉलिसी है थाउजेंड कट्स।

आज जब मैं यहां खड़ा हूँ आतंकवादी का कोई स्वरूप हो, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए नहीं खड़ा हूँ, जिसके खिलाफ सबूत हो, मैं उसके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। यह क्या बात है? हिन्दू आतंकवाद की बात कही जाती है। हमने कभी मुस्लिम आतंकवाद नहीं कहा, हमने ज़ेहाद आतंकवाद की बात कही। इस मुल्क को

बनाने में हिन्दू-मुस्लिम-सिख-ईसाई सभी का हाथ है और आतंकवाद के साथे में सभी मरते हैं। आतंकवादी हिन्दुओं को भी मारते हैं, मुसलमानों को भी मारते हैं। क्या इससे सिख परेशान नहीं हैं? क्योंकि आतंकवादी यह समझते हैं कि हम हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेंगे और हमारे खिलाफ कोई दंडात्मक कार्यवाही नहीं होगी। They know they have no penalty to pay for unleashing terrorist attack in India. उनको मालूम है, उनके आकाओं को मालूम है कि अगर कभी फंस भी जाओगे तो हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति ऐसी है कि तुमको बचाने के लिए अपने-आप रास्ता निकलता जाएगा। इसका कुछ संकेत हम यहां की डिबेट में देख रहे हैं, यह हमें समझना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मुम्बई की घटना हुई, मैं उसका एक फोटो देख रहा था। एक वैन में पांच-छह लोगों को फेंक दिया गया था, खौफ से, खून से सने हुए चेहरे, इंडिया टुडे में भी एक चेहरा छपा है। ट्रेड टॉवर न्यूयार्क में 9/11 को आतंकवादी घटना हुयी थी, उसमें 3 हजार लोग मारे गये थे। यह सवाल मेरे जेहन में हमेशा उठता है कि अमेरिका और यूरोप की टेलिविजन कम्पनियां, रेडियो कम्पनियां हम से अधिक फ्री हैं। लेकिन क्या हमने कभी 3 हजार लोगों की लाशों की कतारें देखीं, खून से सने उनके चेहरे देखो, घबराये हुए चेहरे देखे? मैं अमेरिका में एक कार्यक्रम में था, वहां पर टी.वी. के लोग थे, थिंक टैंक यूनिटी के लोग थे, मैंने उनसे सवाल पूछा और यह बात 2003 की है, तो उन्होंने कहा, "हां" हम आजाद हैं, लेकिन हम अपने रेडियो, टेलिविजन का अवसर, प्लेटफार्म आतंकवादियों को मुल्क में खौफ पैदा करने के लिए नहीं देना चाहते। जब यह समझदारी बनती है, तो अमेरिका में 9/11 के बाद कोई आतंकवादी हमला नहीं होता है। यदि होता है, तो टाइम स्क्वायर पर पाकिस्तान का आतंकवादी पकड़ा जाता है। क्या हम यह समझदारी बना सकते हैं, क्यों नहीं बना सकते।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, whenever there is a debate on terrorism, why do we appear so divided? आज मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक नासूर है, विदेश के इशारे से काम होता है। माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने बताया था कि we have vulnerable neighbourhood around us, from Afghanistan to Pakistan. तो क्या हमें आतंकवाद के खिलाफ सख्त कार्यवाही करने की आवश्यकता नहीं है? मैं आज BJP की ओर से कहना चाहता हूं कि आप अपने वक्ता को देखिए और गृह मंत्री जी, इधर की जिम्मेवारी देखिए तथा आतंकवाद को रोकने के लिए सख्त कार्यवाही कीजिए, हम आपके साथ खड़े रहेंगे, हम यह वायदा करते हैं। ये हमारे नेताओं ने भी कहा है, यह जिम्मेवारी तो होनी चाहिए। इधर क्या होता है? एक घटना बटाला हाउस की हुई और उसमें आतंकवादी मारे गए। उस घटना में दिल्ली पुलिस का एक बहादुर इन्स्पेक्टर मोहन शर्मा भी मारा गया था, उसको अशोक चक्र दिया। आपके एक महामंत्री हैं, वे मिलने के लिए आजमगढ़ चले गये, क्या संकेत दिया कि पूरी घटना गलत थी। ऐसा क्यों होता है? अफजल गुरु की बात आती है, लेकिन मैं उसकी बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता हूं, आप भी वरिष्ठ सांसद हैं और आपको भी मालूम है कि जब 2002 में संसद पर हमला हुआ, तब आप भी

MP थे और मैं भी मंत्री था। सबको मालूम है कि हम सारे MP संसद के अंदर एक ब्लेड का टुकड़ा लेकर भी अंदर नहीं घुस सकते। अगर उस दिन एक आतंकवादी भी पार्लियामेंट में घुस गया होता, तो हम सभी पार्टियों के नेता सेन्ट्रल हॉल में मारे गए होते। ऐसे में उस आतंकवादी को लोअर कोर्ट से फांसी की सजा हुई, हाईकोर्ट से फांसी की सजा हुई और सुप्रीम कोर्ट से भी फांसी की सजा हुई। उकी review petition rejected; rectification petition rejected फिर भी हम उसको फांसी नहीं दे पाते हैं?

मैं आप से गृह मंत्री जी, यह जानना चाहूंगा - I am not as eminent a lawyer as he is, but I have a little knowledge of law - which is the rule or proper order passed by the Parliament or by any other statutory authority that there will be a sequencing in the capital punishment award, disposal of mercy petition? यह लाइन से ही चलेगा? क्या सुप्रीम कोर्ट से फास्टट्रेक कोर्ट नहीं होता? अभी सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने 2G केस को फास्टट्रेक नहीं किया? जेसिकालाल का केस था, कोर्ट ने उसको फास्टट्रेक किया, कांस्टिट्यूशन ने फास्टट्रेक किया, होना भी चाहिए। मुझे यह समझ में नहीं आता कि एक साधारण सजायापत्ता की mercy petition और देश के आतंकी हमले के सरगना की mercy petition सात-सात केस पीछे चले, लाइन में है, आ जाओ, चलते रहो। यह कौन सा कानून है? अगर कोई कानून है, तो उस कानून को बदलने की जरूरत है, आज मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि। जब हम यह सोचकर चलेंगे, तो आतंकवादियों को एक संदेश जाएगा कि देश एक साथ खड़ा है, बोलना चाहता है। फिर बात आई इंटेलिजेंस की। वित्त मंत्री की का वक्तव्य था, "There was no intelligence input." अखबारों में यह छपा है और मेरे पास उसकी कॉपी है। हम जानते हैं कि भारत के Intelligence में एक से एक योग्य ऑफिसर्स रहे हैं, and I am very proud of their contribution. There has been a great professional convention in the IB. इतनी बड़ी घटना हो गई, जानकारी नहीं है। यदि जानकारी है तो बताने की हिम्मत नहीं है कि कार्यवाही नहीं होगी।

महोदया, 26/11 से पहले स्पेसिफिक Intelligence input था कि समुद्र के रास्ते जहाज आयेगा और हमला होगा। उसको क्यों नहीं रोका गया? ठीक है, क्या हम यह मानें कि आज कल Intelligence के लोगों को विपक्ष की सरकारों के ऊपर सर्विलेंस के लिए अधिक काम होता है। एक घटना और घटी, आजाद भारत की जोरदार घटना कि भारत के नंबर-2, वित्त मंत्री के घर पर सर्विलेंस हो रहा है। उनके ऑफिस में सर्विलेंस हो रहा है, उनके PS के यहां हो रहा है और उनको अपनी IB पर विश्वास नहीं है। वे अपने विभाग से कहते हैं कि प्राइवेट स्टाफ लाओ और जांच करो। फिर मामला आगे बढ़ता है, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी को पत्र लिखते हैं। फिर उसका जवाब आता है कि किसी ने चुइंगम खाकर फैंक दी होगी। हमने बचपन में चुइंगम खाई थी, लेकिन इतने वैज्ञानिक तरीके से चुइंगम खाकर

फैंकी जाती है? वित्त मंत्री के टेबल के नीचे लाइन की कतार लगी रहती है, उनके पी.एस. की टेबल के नीचे लाइन की कतार लगी रहती है, किसे मूर्ख बनाया जा रहा है? हमने आई.बी. के मोराल को तोड़ने की कोशिश की है। I am sorry to say that और यह अनुभव से आया है। सभापति जी, दिल्ली पुलिस के पदाधिकारियों ने मुझे कहा कि अगर मोहन शर्मा नहीं मारा गया होता तो बाटला को लेकर इतना अधिक जुनून पैदा होता कि हम लोग प्रोसिक्यूट हो जाते। अस्सी के दशक में, जब पंजाब में आतंकवाद चल रहा था, चिदम्बरम साहब, पहले भी गृह मंत्री रहे हैं, मुझे मालूम है कि उस समय क्या कहा था। उन्होंने कहा था कि 'I am proud of my brave officers of Punjab Police', जो अपने जीवन को होम करके देश को बचाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। आज वह हिम्मत नहीं है। मुझे मालूम है कि चार सौ लोग trial face कर रहे हैं। ठीक है, अगर कोई ऑफिसर गलत काम करता है, तो उसके खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। They must be tried. अगर ह्यूमन राइट वॉयलेशन का कोई गलत केस है, तो कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। अभी कश्मीर में रेप का एक मामला आया है, इस पर जरूर कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए, लेकिन अगर हम बार-बार ये मैसेज देंगे कि सख्त कार्रवाई करोगे तो फंसोगे, इसलिए शांत रहो, तो यह दुर्भाग्य की स्थिति है।

आज हमने आतंकवाद के खिलाफ लड़ाई में यह मैसेज देने की कोशिश की है कि एक हाथ पीछे बांधकर लड़ो। यह समस्या है, इसको ठीक करने की जरूरत है। यह बात मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर किसी स्टेट में, एनकाउंटर में कुछ गलत हुआ है, तो ठीक है, उसकी कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए, लेकिन देश में 2000 एनकाउंटर होते हैं, एक स्टेट में उन्नीस एनकाउंटर होते हैं। वहां आतंकवाद के खिलाफ अच्छी कार्यवाही हुई? मैं गुजरात की बात बोल रहा हूं। ट्रायल चलता रहे, फंसता रहे, फंसता रहे। मैं यहां किसी गलत को बचाने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहा हूं, लेकिन गृह मंत्री जी बड़ा सवाल यह है कि हम क्या मोराल देने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं? आप देश के गृह मंत्री हैं, मैं आज आपका अभिनंदन करना चाहूंगा जब पहले सवाल में मैंने एस.पी.ओ. के बारे में आपसे सवाल पूछा था, and your answer reflected a great degree of concern, maturity consistent with your office as the Home Minister. What troubles me is, why is that this kind of approach of consensus is missing when you are talking about terrorism?

(उपसभापति महोदय पीठासीन हुए)

ये बड़े सवाल हैं। हमें यह सवाल समझना पड़ेगा। आज हमें इस बात की बहुत चिंता हो रही है। 26/11 के बाद माननीय चिदंबरम जी इसी हाउस में आए थे। उन्होंने बहुत आशा जगाई थी। क्या कहा था उन्होंने? उन्होंने कहा था कि एक जबर्दस्त काउंटर टेरेरिज्म मशीनरी बनेगी। मैं अभी उसकी बात जरूर बताना चाहता हूं। कहा गया था कि National Counter Terrorism Centre will be set up by 2010. It is not even limping. National Intelligence Grid has been notified, yet even to move. National Technical Research Organization को कैबिनेट ने

अपूव कर दिया as a monitoring agency for intelligence purposes. क्या मतलब है? काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। आज मुंबई के 26/11 हमले के बाद माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, तीन साल होने को आ रहे हैं और आपने यह जो वादा किया था कि देश की सबसे अधिक आवश्यकता है, उस पर कोई प्रामाणिक और प्रभावी कार्यवाही नहीं हुई है। क्यों नहीं हुई है? यह सवाल क्यों नहीं उठना चाहिए कि क्यों नहीं हुई है? यह turf war क्यों होती है? मैंने देखा कि जब एन.आई.ए. के लोग मुंबई गए, तो SIT ने मिलने से इंकार कर दिया कि हम काम करना चाहते हैं। Why this turf war cannot be controlled? That is very important. Is the security of India important or the ego battle of various security agencies are important? ये बहुत बड़े सवाल हैं। आज हम आपसे इन सवालों को जवाब सुनना चाहेंगे। हम एक बात और कहना चाहेंगे और मैं यह बात आपकी टिप्पणी से शुरू करना चाहता हूं। आपने कहा था कि हमारे पड़ोस का जो क्षेत्र है, वह बहुत तनाव और आतंकवाद से प्रभावित हैं। It is vulnerable, if I can quote his exact words. पाकिस्तान का मामला है। पाकिस्तान के बारे में आपकी क्या नीति है? माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, मैं आपकी साफ़गोई की प्रशंसा करना चाहूंगा कि जब आप कहते हैं कि "ISI has a design to destabilize India," मुझे खुशी होती है कि आप खुलकर बोलते हैं, लेकिन होता क्या है? जब बातचीत होती है, तो पूरी विदेश नीति में और गृह मंत्रालय की नीति में तरीके से कोई मामला नहीं बनता है। मैंने कांग्रेस के एक महामंत्री की चर्चा की। हमारे बहुत अच्छे दोस्त श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी जी आज बोलने वाले हैं। वे उनके बारे में और चर्चा करेंगे। ऐसा क्या है कि जब भी आप आतंकवाद के बारे में कुछ बोलते हैं, कुछ कहते हैं, कुछ लिखते हैं, तो सबसे पहले वे टिप्पणी करने को तैयार हो जाते हैं और बड़े अच्छे-अच्छे शब्दों में आपका वंदन करते हैं। हमने उनके कई interviews पढ़े हैं। आप क्या message दे रहे हैं? Mr. Home Minister, with great respect of you, India and your Government has to recognize that policy with Pakistan and counter-terrorism strategy cannot be segregated or separated. They have to go hand in hand. अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने मुशर्रफ़ साहब के साथ एक समझौता किया था, जब आगरा fail कर गया, वे पहली बार अपनी गलती माने, 4 जनवरी, 2004, जब पाकिस्तान ने कहा था कि हम अपनी धरती से किसी आतंकवादी घटना को हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ नहीं होने देंगे। आप तो भूल गए थे, क्योंकि आपको एनडीए का कोई काम अच्छा नहीं लगता, आज आपको उसकी याद आती है। 26/11 के बाद आपने उनको कितने dossiers दिए? किस dossier पर काम हुआ? Correct me if I am wrong. अब तक 5 जज बदल चुके हैं, 4 prosecutors बदल चुके हैं। 100 गवाह हैं, अब तक सिर्फ़ एक गवाह गुजरा है। This is the level of trial in one of the worst instances of terrorist violence in India from across the borders of India. विदेश मंत्रियों के बीच में * . इससे देश का क्या भला होने वाला है? यह सवाल तो कभी उठाना पड़ेगा। यह बहुत गम्भीर सवाल है।

* Expunged as ordered by the Chair .

अभी आपने देखा होगा कि डेविड कोलमैन हेडली की गवाही आई थी। आपने कहा था कि वह आपको भी मिलेगा। आपके कुछ लोग वहां उससे बातचीत करने के लिए गए थे। ISI का रोल expose हो रहा था, आपको मालूम है। तवफ्फुर राणा को जिस तरह डेनमार्क के केस में तो convict किया गया है और बाकी केस से उसे बरी कर दिया गया है, वह भी किसी डील के अंतर्गत है, आप भी जानते हैं। लेकिन हम आज आपसे यह जरूर जानना चाहते हैं कि हमारी strategy क्या है? मुम्बई में रब्बी हाउस पर जो हमला हुआ था, उसके खिलाफ लोगों ने एक suit file किया हुआ है, in which they have named ISI as a defendant. Are you willing to organize the Indian community and the victims of terrorist violence from across the border to join in defending that case? What is the role of the Government of India? माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, ये बड़े सवाल हैं, क्योंकि ये सवाल उठाना बहुत जरूरी है कि हम क्या message देना चाहते हैं?

आज मैं POTA का जिक्र इसलिए करना चाहूंगा कि इसमें यह एक indication है। POTA को सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने approve किया था, दोनों हाउस ने पास किया था। Campaign हुआ कि POTA का abuse हो सकता है, इसलिए उसको हटा देना चाहिए। आपने हटा दिया। अब आप पॉवर में हैं। अगर आपके manifesto में commitment है, तो आपको हटाना है। आपके उस अधिकार का हम सम्मान करते हैं। लेकिन आपने इसे हटा कर क्या message दिया आतंकवादियों और उनके आकाओं को, जो पाकिस्तान में बैठे हुए हैं, चाहे LeT हो, चाहे HUUJ हो, चाहे जो भी हो। और यह तर्क! माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, मैं फिर कहूंगा, आप देश के बहुत बड़े वकील भी हैं, मैं उम्मीद करूँ कि आपकी वकालत बहुत जल्दी शुरू हो जाए, यह हमारी शुभकामनाएं हैं। Can the possibility and apprehension of abuse become the reason for annulling a law? Indian Penal Code is on the Statute Book for more than 160-70 years. इसका abuse तो होता है। दिल्ली में आपके SHO एक पड़ोसी को झूठा फंसा देते हैं, जिसने उनकी कुछ सेवा नहीं की। बड़े-बड़े केस में फंसा देते हैं। क्या इसलिए हम Indian Penal Code को annul करा दें। 1992 से Income Tax Law है, जो 1961 में नया लॉ बना। Income Tax के ITO, Income Tax के इंस्पेक्टर लोगों को झूठा फंसाते हैं, आपको भी मालूम है, हमें भी मालूम है। क्या इसके लिए हम Income Tax Law को annul कर दें। एक इंस्पेक्टर के false implication पर हम Income Tax Law को नहीं annul करते, एक SHO के false implication पर हम Indian Penal Code को नहीं annul करते, लेकिन आतंकवादियों के प्रचार में हम आतंकवाद के खिलाफ एक instrument POTA को annul करते हैं। इससे हम क्या संदेश देना चाहते हैं? यह सवाल तो कभी-न-कभी उठाना पड़ेगा? क्यों नहीं उठाना चाहिए? यह इसलिए जरूरी है कि जो प्रश्न आज है कि क्यों हमले होते हैं, तो हमले इसलिए होते हैं।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगा। चर्चा हुई है। ठीक है, माओवाद एक चिंता की बात है। जो गरीबी है, जो भुखमरी है, जो परेशानी है, जो आदिवासियों के rights हैं, उनकी चिंता होनी चाहिए। लेकिन क्या यह सच्चाई नहीं है कि माओवादियों का एक लक्ष्य है to capture political power over India to the barrel of gun, वायलेंस मीन्स से कैप्चर करो।

आज सुबह प्रश्नकाल में मैंने आपसे एक प्रश्न पूछा था कि वे आपकी पार्टी के लोगों को मारते हैं, हमारी पार्टी के लोगों को मारते हैं, पत्रकारों को मारते हैं, पुलिस को मारते हैं, सबको मारते हैं ...(समय की घंटी)... सर, मुझे पांच मिनट का समय और दीजिए। प्लीज सर, आपने दूसरों को इतना समय दिया, मुझे थोड़ा समय और दीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति: आपकी पार्टी के लिए इतना ही समय है।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, मैं एक फ्लो में हूँ, मुझे थोड़ा और बोलने का मौका दिया जाए।

श्री उपसभापति: पहले आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। आपकी पार्टी के पास तीस मिनट हैं, अभी दो मैम्बर्स ने और बोलना है, आप उनके लिए समय कहां से लाएंगे? मैं मानता हूँ कि आप अच्छी बातें कर रहे हैं, लेकिन समय कहां से लाएंगे?

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: ठीक है, सर, मुझे बस पांच मिनट दे दीजिए।

अगर माओवादी छत्तीसगढ़ में, उड़ीसा में, बंगाल में मारते हैं, वामपंथियों को मारते हैं, तो वे देश को तोड़ना चाहते हैं। इसकी चिंता होनी चाहिए, गरीबों को उनके अधिकार मिलने चाहिए, मैं बिल्कुल इससे सहमत हूँ। सरकार को आदिवासियों के लिए अच्छा काम करना चाहिए, मैं बिल्कुल इसके साथ हूँ, लेकिन जिनका गोल ही दूसरा है, उनके खिलाफ क्या कार्यवाही होगी? आज सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जजमेंट आया है, यह बहुत गंभीर है। मेरे पास उस जजमेंट की कॉपी है, मैंने उसके ऊपर एक लेख भी लिखा है, I am amazed.

उपसभापति जी, मैं दो लाइनें पढ़ रहा हूँ कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज ने क्या लिखा है, यह रिकॉर्ड पर जाना चाहिए, "The problem rests in the amoral political economy that the state endorses and the resultant revolutionary politics that it necessarily spawns." "Tax breaks for the rich and guns for the youngsters....." "The policy of privatisation has also meant that the state has incapacitated itself, actually and ideologically, from devoting adequate financial resources in building the capacity..."

इसका मतलब क्या है? माओवाद की हिंसा को समर्थन करने का एक रास्ता है ...(व्यवधान)... हां, मि. राजा, आप और हम बोल सकते हैं, लेकिन I am on a larger issue. अगर सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज अपनी जजमेंट में बोलते हैं कि इसी पैमाने पर चलूंगा तो वे पूर्व के जजमेंट को इग्नोर करते हैं, जिसमें कहा हुआ है कि पॉलिसी फॉर्मूलेट करना सरकार का काम है। मैं कानून की बात कर रहा हूँ, आप इसकी चिंता कीजिए।

सर, आपने मुझे टोक दिया, इसलिए मैं अपनी बात खत्म ही कर रहा हूँ। मैं आज दूसरे मूड में था, इस मूड में मैं बड़ी मुश्किल से आता हूँ। आप अगर मुझे बोलने देते तो बड़ी कृपा होती।

श्री उपसभापति: मेरी मजबूरी है।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, ये बार-बार संघ का नाम क्यों आता है? संघ का नाम आना ही क्यों चाहिए? वह एक राष्ट्रवादी संगठन है और हमें उस पर गर्व है। हमने खुल कर कहा है, स्वयं संघ के लोगों ने कहा है, यहां तक कि मोहन भागवत जी ने कहा है कि आतंकवाद कहीं से भी हो, उस पर कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। गलती किसी ने भी की हो, कार्यवाही जरूर होनी चाहिए। मुझे एक पीड़ा जरूर हुई और आज मैं बहुत जिम्मेवारी से कहना चाहता हूं, क्या हमने आपके बारे में कोई टिप्पणी की थी या हमारी पार्टी ने कोई टिप्पणी की थी? हम आगे भी टिप्पणी नहीं करेंगे। करप्शन के कुछ मामले हैं, जिन पर अलग से चर्चा होगी तो टिप्पणी करेंगे। हमारे पास आपके बारे में, आपकी सरकार के बारे में कहने के लिए काफी कुछ है, लेकिन जिस समय आपने यह कहा कि मेरे खिलाफ भाजपा के लोग इसलिए आवाज उठा रहे हैं क्योंकि मैं right-wing terrorist matter को pursue कर रहा हूं, यह वक्तव्य कितना जिम्मेवारी भरा था?

हम आप पॉलिटिक्स की बात करते हैं और करते रहेंगे। हमारे लिए लोकतंत्र का वजूद है, लेकिन आतंकवादियों को पाकिस्तान में क्या संदेश गया? आगे से जब हिन्दुस्तान के लोग हम पर आरोप लगाएं, तो जवाब दो, हम नहीं, right-wing terror.

आज मुझे एक बात ध्यान आ गई। जिस दिन 26/11 का इंसिडेंट हुआ था, हम लोग रात भर टीवी देख रहे थे। दूसरे दिन मैंने डेढ़ घंटा पाकिस्तान के टीवी को देखा, उसमें अजमल कसाब के बारे में बताया जा रहा था कि he is a Hindu terrorist, क्योंकि उसके हाथ में saffron बंधा हुआ था। आज आपने देखा होगा कि पाकिस्तान क्या कहता है।

माननीय गृह मंत्री जी, आतंकवाद एक नासूर है और हमें उससे लड़ना पड़ेगा, लेकिन यह बहुत जरूरी है कि हम अपने राजनीतिक घात-प्रतिघात के भाव में देश की सुरक्षा के भाव को कमजोर नहीं करें। आज यह बात मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं।

मैं अपनी बात यहां समाप्त करूंगा। हमारा देश जब तक आतंकवादियों को यह संदेश नहीं देगा कि अगर तुम कोई कार्यवाही करोगे, तो तुम्हारे खिलाफ दंडात्मक कार्यवाही होगी। एक प्रभावी नेतृत्व, जिसमें आप होंगे, आपके प्रधान मंत्री जी होंगे, आपकी मंत्री परिषद होगी और अगर देश की अपेक्षा होगी तो हम भी आपके साथ खड़े रहेंगे। लेकिन जब तक आप यह प्रभावी संदेश नहीं देंगे कि अगर कोई आतंकवादी आंख उठा कर देखने की कोशिश करेगा तो हम उसकी इन नापाक हरकतों को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे, उसे चूर-चूर करेंगे। यह संदेश देने की जरूरत है। यह बहुत दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि यह संदेश देने में हम असफल होते जाते हैं, जिसका कुछ संकेत आज की बहस में मिला। आप उसको रोकिए। जब आप उसको रोकेंगे, तो ये हमले बंद होंगे और अगर नहीं रोकेंगे, तो हमले बढ़ते रहेंगे। उपसभापति जी, आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, next speaker is Shri Veer Singh. Before that, I would like to take the sense of the House whether we can sit beyond 5 o' clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Sir, anyway, we are going to discuss it tomorrow. We can discuss it up to 5 o'clock. Then, we can continue the debate tomorrow.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: What will be the time for reply?

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: It will be tomorrow evening.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I understand the debate will continue tomorrow. From 2 o'clock to 5 o'clock, we can discuss, and at 5 o'clock, we will reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, Shri Veer Singh can start his speech.

श्री वीर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभापति जी, आपने मुझे आतंकवाद से संबंधित समस्या पर चर्चा करने का मौका दिया, इसके लिए मैं धन्यवाद अदा करता हूँ।

मान्यवर, जैसा कि आप सभी लोग इससे सहमत होंगे कि आतंकवाद एक अंतर्राष्ट्रीय समस्या का रूप ले चुका है। आतंकवादी गतिविधियों के कारण बड़े पैमाने पर धन-जन की हानि हो रही है। यहां तक कि देश की साख पर भी दाग लग चुका है। केन्द्र सरकार सिर्फ घटना होने के बाद जांच कराने की लीपापोती करती है और केवल यह देखती है कि घटना की जिम्मेदारी कौन आतंकवादी संगठन लेता है।

मान्यवर, 26 नवम्बर, 2008 को मुम्बई पर हुए आतंकवादी हमले से भी केन्द्र सरकार ने कोई सीख नहीं ली और मुम्बई की सुरक्षा के ठोस उपाय नहीं किये गये, जिसके चलते आतंकवादियों द्वारा पूरे इत्मीनान से 13 जुलाई, 2011 को फिर मुम्बई में एक के बाद एक लगातार तीन धमाके किये गये, जिनमें 28 बेगुनाह लोग मारे गये। मान्यवर, यह खेद का विषय है कि मुम्बई, जो कि भारत की औद्योगिक राजधानी है, वहां वर्ष 1993, 2002, 2006 और 2008 में आतंकियों द्वारा लगातार आतंकी हमलों और सीरियल ब्लास्ट की घटनाओं को अंजाम दिया जाता रहा है, परन्तु केन्द्र सरकार ने अभी तक इन घटनाओं से कोई सीख नहीं ली है।

मान्यवर, पूर्व में हुई इन बम धमाकों की घटनाओं से और 13 जुलाई, 2011 को हुई घटना से अब यह पूरी तरह से साबित हो गया है कि केन्द्र की यूपीए सरकार आतंकवाद की समस्या से निबटने में पूरी तरह नाकाम रही है। उसके पास इस समस्या से निबटने के लिए दृढ़ इच्छा शक्ति का पूर्ण रूप से अभाव है, जिस वजह से वह आतंकी घटनाओं को रोकने में पूरी तरह से विफल रही है।

मान्यवर, 13 जुलाई, 2011 को हुए मुम्बई धमाकों का अब लगभग तीन हफ्ते का समय बीत चुका है, परन्तु अभी तक हमलावारों का सुराग पता लगाने में केन्द्र सरकार की सभी एजेंसियां नाकाम साबित हुई हैं। आतंकवाद के प्रति केन्द्र सरकार किस हद तक लापरवाह है, इसका अंदाजा इसी से लगाया जा सकता है कि 26/11 के बाद मुम्बई में कमांडो कैम्प पूरी तरह से स्थापित नहीं हो पाया है और महाराष्ट्र की कांग्रेस ने तो वहां का पानी भी बंद

5.00 P.M.

कर दिया है। मान्यवर, मेरा मानना है कि आतंकवाद पर कोई भारी अंकुश लगाने के लिए इसके कारणों की तह में जाना अत्यंत आवश्यक है। जब तक आतंकवाद के कारणों का पता लगाने के साथ ही इसकी जड़ों पर दृढ़ता से कुठाराघात नहीं किया जायेगा और उससे सख्ती से नहीं निबटा जायेगा, तब तक हमें इस समस्या से निजात नहीं मिलेगी।

मान्यवर, जैसा कि आप जानते हैं कि केन्द्र सरकार की कमजोरी का फायदा उठा कर आतंकवादी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमाओं के रास्ते देश में प्रवेश करते हैं और आतंकवादी वारदातों को अंजाम देते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: वीर सिंह जी, आप कल यहीं से continue कीजिएगा।

SPECIAL MENTIONS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Special Mentions to be laid on the Table.

Demand to formulate a policy to increase the number of BPL beneficiaries in proportion to the increase of population in the country

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार कश्यप (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, भारतवर्ष में लगातार जनसंख्या वृद्धि के कारण वर्तमान में जनसंख्या लगभग 121 करोड़ हो चुकी है। जनसंख्या वृद्धि के साथ-साथ देश में गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले लोगों का अनुपात भी लगातार बढ़ा है। वर्तमान में बढ़ते हुए भ्रष्टाचार एवं महंगाई के कारण गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले करोड़ों लोगों के सामने आज जीवन संकट इसलिए पैदा हो गया है, क्योंकि उनके पास खाने, पहनने आदि के लिए आर्थिक स्रोत नहीं है, जिसके कारण भुखमरी बढ़ी है और हजारों लोग भुखमरी के कारण मौत के आगोश में चले जाते हैं। लगातार भुखमरी के कारण मरने वालों की संख्या इसलिए भी बढ़ रही है, क्योंकि उनको बी.पी.एल. श्रेणी के राशन कार्ड जारी नहीं हो पा रहे हैं। कई वर्षों से सरकार ने गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले लोगों के लिए बी.पी.एल. कार्ड बनाने की योजना पर कोई विचार नहीं किया, जिसके कारण करोड़ों लोग बी.पी.एल. होने के बावजूद भी बी.पी.एल. कार्डधारक नहीं बन सके हैं। यदि सरकार बढ़ती हुई जनसंख्या के अनुपात में गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जीवन यापन करने वाले लोगों को बी.पी.एल. कार्ड जारी करने का निर्णय ले ले, तो करोड़ों लोगों के जीवन को बी.पी.एल. कार्ड पर मिलने वाली सुविधाओं के जरिए बचाया जा सकता है।

अतः आपके माध्यम से सरकार से अनुरोध है कि वह देश में बढ़ती हुई जनसंख्या के अनुपात में बी.पी.एल. श्रेणी के लोगों के बी.पी.एल. कार्ड बनाये जाने की विशेष नीति घोषित करने का कष्ट करे, ताकि गरीबी की रेखा से नीचे जीवनयापन करने वाले करोड़ों लोगों के जीवन को बचाया जा सके।