

and trucks, but with airlines because safety is paramount. What I have been thinking is to have a separate Railway Safety Board. And, this is not any kind of a policy matter; this is just an idea because like Mr. Rudy, I am also a flier and I have taken some technology from there, and there is no doubt about it. If we can have an independent Railway Safety Board, what are they going to do? We are going to have experts, not necessarily in-house experts. There are lot of Railway Board Chairmen who are retired. There are lot of expert people in this country. We are going to analyse various accidents in the Railway system. Why are they happening? How do we get out? Analysing and providing advice regarding accidents will be one function. There are lot of things. I don't want to go into all of them.

Lastly, Sir, there are three areas to make travel very safe - identification of risk, safety management system, mitigating the risk of the safety. These are the three broad parameters. If the hon. Members support - - I am again quite glad and happy that they are all, on board, with me - we are going to make sure that between, perhaps, Kolkata and Delhi, why should it not take only five hours? Why should it take seventeen hours? Between Delhi and Jaipur, why should it take four hours? It can be covered in one hour safely. We talked about Japan. Japan has the technology. Definitely, it has the technology. India has the brains. Please understand, all our IIT students, all our IIM students are there. India is full of knowledge and full of brains. We have to develop this in-house as well. All I need from you, hon. Members of Parliament, is a huge support. Let's take the Railways to the fourth generation so that this country can give one of the best railway systems the world has ever seen. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we will continue the 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. वीर सिंह जी, कल जहां स्टाप किया था, वहीं से शुरू कीजिए। शुरू से शुरू मत कीजिए।

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

श्री वीर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। कल सदन में देश में आतंकवादी घटना से संबंधित विषय पर चर्चा हो रही थी, उसमें मेरी बात अधूरी रह गई थी, आज आपने मुझे बोलने का पुनः सुअवसर दिया है।

श्री उपसभापति: वहीं से शुरू कीजिए।

श्री वीर सिंह: मान्यवर, जैसाकि आप सभी जानते हैं कि केंद्र सरकार की कमजोरी का फायदा उठाकर आतंकवादी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमाओं के रास्ते देश में प्रवेश करते हैं और आतंकवादी वारदातों को अंजाम देते हैं। इसके लिए अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमाओं के साथ-साथ देश से लगे समुद्री तटों को भी सुरक्षित किया जाना अत्यंत आवश्यक है। मान्यवर, बी.एस.पी. केन्द्र सरकार का ध्यान इस तथ्य की ओर लगातार आकर्षित करती रही है, परंतु केंद्र सरकार द्वारा अभी तक देश की सीमाओं से होने वाली घुसपैठ को पूरी तरह से रोकने का कोई प्रयास और सही कदम नहीं उठाया गया है, जिसके कारण देश में आतंकवादियों की घुसपैठ लगातार जारी है। मान्यवर, आप सभी अवगत हैं कि 26 नवम्बर, 2011 को मुंबई में हुई आतंकी घटना को अंजाम देने वाले आतंकवादी इसी रास्ते से आए थे। बी.एस.पी. लगातार केंद्र सरकार को, केंद्रीय खुफिया विभाग को और सक्रिय करने, इसे और अधिक सक्षम तथा प्रभावी बनाने के लिए सुझाव देती रही है, परंतु अभी तक इस दिशा में कोई खास कार्य नहीं हुआ है।

मान्यवर, मैं आपको यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि सिर्फ सख्त कानून बनाने से ही केन्द्र सरकार आतंकवाद पर प्रभावी अंकुश नहीं लगा पाएगी और न ही इससे आतंकवाद रुकने वाला है। जब तक देश की अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमाओं पर पुख्ता इन्तजाम नहीं होगा, तब तक आतंकवादी घटनाएं होती रहेंगी।

मान्यवर, यह सर्वविदित है कि आतंकवादियों के पास अत्याधुनिक हथियार एवं उपकरण हैं, जिनका सामना करने में हमारे सुरक्षा बल सक्षम नहीं हैं। बी.एस.पी. केन्द्र सरकार को इस तरफ अविलम्ब ध्यान देने की सलाह देती रही है। केन्द्र सरकार को दलगत राजनीति से ऊपर उठ कर हर राज्य को आधुनिक असलहों की व्यवस्था के लिए तुरंत उचित धनराशि अथवा विशेष पैकेज देना चाहिए। अधिकांश राज्यों की मौजूदा वित्तीय स्थिति ऐसी नहीं है कि वे पुलिस बलों को सुसज्जित करने के लिए आधुनिक हथियार एवं उपकरण अपने संसाधनों से खरीद सकें।

मान्यवर, उत्तर प्रदेश की बहुजन समाज पार्टी सरकार ने अपने लगभग चार वर्ष से अधिक के कार्यकाल में इस समस्या से निबटने के लिए गम्भीर प्रयास किए हैं। इसके लिए नवम्बर, 2007 में ही प्रदेश में आतंकवादी निरोधक दस्ते का गठन कर दिया गया था, जिसे आतंकवादी अभिसूचनाओं के संकलन, इससे जुड़े अभियोगों की विवेचना और उसके विचारण के लिए पूरी तरह उत्तरदायी बनाया गया है।

मान्यवर, राज्य सरकार द्वारा मौजूदा समय की चुनौतियों से निबटने के लिए पुलिस बल को सुदृढ़ करने के लिए अनेक कदम उठाए गए हैं। प्रदेश के सभी थानों का उच्चीकरण करते हुए इनकी कमान इंस्पेक्टर रैंक के अधिकारी को सौंपी गई है। साथ ही थानों में पुलिस बल की कमी को देखते हुए सभी शहरों तथा ग्रामीण थानों के नियतन में बढ़ोत्तरी की गई है।

(उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए)

इसके साथ ही एन.सी.आर., नक्सल प्रभावित क्षेत्र और भारत-नेपाल सीमा से सटे जनपदों के पुलिस बल में भी समुचित वृद्धि की गई है। राज्य सरकार ने ऐतिहासिक निर्णय लेते हुए पुलिस बल में 2 लाख 4 हजार से अधिक नए पदों का सृजन किया है तथा 35 हजार पुलिस कर्मियों की भर्ती की गई है। इसके अलावा वर्तमान में पुलिस/पी.ए.सी. आरक्षियों के 41 हजार 440 पदों की भर्ती की प्रक्रिया प्रारम्भ की गई है।

मान्यवर, राज्यों में कमांडो, बी.डी.डी.एस. तथा अभिसूचना सम्बन्धी विशिष्ट प्रशिक्षण सुविधाएं सुलभ न हो पाने के कारण इसके लिए केन्द्रीय एजेंसियों पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है। अतः आतंकवाद के दृष्टिगत उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा किए गए प्रयासों को देखते हुए प्रदेश के पुलिस बल को प्रशिक्षण दिलाने के लिए केन्द्रीय प्रशिक्षण एजेंसियों से अधिक से अधिक सीटें उपलब्ध कराई जानी चाहिए।

मान्यवर, प्रदेश सरकार विभिन्न फॉरेन्सिक जांच सुविधाओं के विकास पर भी ध्यान दे रही है और उसने केन्द्र सरकार से अनुरोध किया है कि जब तक प्रदेश में आधुनिकतम फॉरेन्सिक जांच सुविधाएं नहीं विकसित हो जातीं, तब तक प्रदेश की डेजिग्नेटेड संस्थाओं, जैसे ए.टी.एस., एस.टी.एफ., एस.आई.टी. आदि को सी.एफ.एस.एल. में फॉरेन्सिक जांच की सुविधा प्राथमिकता पर उपलब्ध कराई जाए।

मान्यवर, प्रदेश सरकार ने एन.एस.जी. कमांडो की तर्ज पर दो हजार कमांडो बल भी तैयार करने का निर्णय लिया है, जिसके लिए उत्तर प्रदेश में एक कमांडो ट्रेनिंग स्कूल बनाया जाएगा।

मान्यवर, उत्तर प्रदेश से लगी नेपाल की लगभग 600 किलोमीटर से भी अधिक लम्बी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय सीमा पर संचालित एस.एस.बी. के 51 बॉर्डर आउटपोस्ट के जवानों के त्वरित और सुगम आवागमन के लिए सीमा के किनारे पक्के सड़क निर्माण की आवश्यकता है। इस संबंध में भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय में अनेक बार चर्चा हुई है।

केन्द्र सरकार की अपेक्षा के अनुसार प्रदेश सरकार ने लगभग 1503 करोड़ रुपये की एक परियोजना केन्द्र सरकार को प्रेषित की है, जिसकी स्वीकृति अभी तक नहीं दी गई है। इस कारण नेपाल से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय आतंकवादी उत्तर प्रदेश के रास्ते देश में प्रवेश कर जाते हैं। स्पष्ट है कि केन्द्र सरकार आतंकवाद को रोकने के लिए बिल्कुल भी गंभीर नहीं है, इसी कारण नेपाल से लगी सीमा पर सुरक्षा व्यवस्था कड़ी करने तथा उत्तर प्रदेश में एक एनएसजी हब स्थापित करने संबंधी उत्तर प्रदेश के प्रस्ताव पर वह कोई निर्णय नहीं ले रही है।

मान्यवर, आप सभी लोग जानते हैं कि केन्द्र सरकार ने मुम्बई में हुई आतंकवादी घटना के बाद बिना राज्य सरकारों के परामर्श के राष्ट्रीय जांच एजेंसी (एनआईए) के गठन का विधेयक आनन-फानन में पारित कर दिया, जबकि इसके लिए बेहतर होता कि राज्य सरकारों का भी अभिमत प्राप्त कर लिया जाता।

मान्यवर, बहुजन समाज पार्टी की सरकार ने आतंकवादी गतिविधियों पर प्रभावी अंकुश लगाया है, इसके अलावा राज्य सरकार द्वारा आतंक निरोधक दस्ता गठित किया गया है, जिसके माध्यम से अनेक आतंकवादियों की गिरफ्तारी में अन्य प्रदेशों की सरकारों को सहयोग प्रदान किया गया है। बीएसपी सरकार आतंकवाद के खिलाफ केन्द्र सरकार को पूरा सहयोग दे रही है, लेकिन दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि यूपीए सरकार आतंकवाद के खिलाफ उत्तर प्रदेश को सहयोग देने में आनाकानी कर रही है।

प्रदेश में कानून द्वारा कानून का राज स्थापित करने को बीएसपी सरकार ने सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता दी है, जिसके कारण अच्छे परिणाम सामने आए हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): वीर सिंह जी, आपका टाइम खत्म हो गया है।

श्री वीर सिंह: मान्यवर, मेरे द्वारा तथा बहुजन समाज पार्टी द्वारा जो सुझाव दिए गए हैं, मैं माननीय गृह मंत्री जी से निवेदन करूंगा और यूपीए सरकार से भी आग्रह करूंगा कि इन सुझावों पर गंभीरता से विचार करें, जिससे देश में आतंकवादी घटनाएं रोकी जा सकें। धन्यवाद।

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN (West Bengal): Thank you, Sir. It is a discussion on terrorist activities in the country which is a great threat before the internal security of our country. This discussion has special reference to the 13th July incident that happened in Mumbai. At first, I would like to say that our party always condemns this type of heinous activity or incident. In the sorry incident which happened in Mumbai on 13th July, 26 people died, 123 were injured and a huge loss to property took place. We have express, our concern to the bereaved families. At this point, I would like to say that all the time the issue of compensation was talked about. So, I would like to know from the Minister whether it is properly done or not. It is a fact that our party CPI (M) has always been against this type of activity wherever it happens, be it throughout the country as well as outside the country.

My second point is this. Sir, on the floor of this House, on behalf of our party, we have repeatedly told that terrorists or terrorism has no religion, no caste and no creed. It was also proved after the assassination of the Father of the Nation, after the assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi and after the assassination of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. Those who were involved in these three crimes, belonged to extremist groups. I am not in a position to take their name; everybody knows that. They have proved one thing that extremist groups, terrorists or Maoists are secular in the other sense. So, they

have no religion, no caste and no creed. In this perspective, I should say that we must display one board so far as terrorist activities are concerned, that is, zero tolerance board. But in this perspective, we must fight these evils unitedly. But where is the unity?

Is there any unity in the Government? I read in the newspapers what the Chief Minister, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Home Minister said. I heard their press conference. They said that the Maoists are a great threat to our internal security. But the other partner, the second partner always asked where the Maoists were. I do not know whether they have changed their attitude after taking the charge of the office of the West Bengal or not. But it's happening throughout the country.

Another thing is, after any incident what do the police do? The police indiscriminately arrest the people. The worst sufferers are the Muslims who are minorities. And it has been proved after the Malegaon blasts.

Sir, because it is Mumbai related, I have before me one figure pertaining to Maharashtra. I would like to know about it from the hon. Home Minister. In Maharashtra, Muslim population is 13 per cent. But among the jail population of Maharashtra, 43 per cent belong to the Muslim community. We are told that many innocent people are arrested. If it goes on, and nobody stops this alienation, it will create an uneven situation throughout the country.

When this type of incident happens, there are many agencies to tackle it. But when it actually takes place what is heard is 'lack of coordination'. What is the Ministry doing? It says, 'no idea' or 'no report' or 'no information'. The Home Minister said before the Press that it's 'intelligence failure'. But after 26/11, many tools were announced to protect our country, to take care of the internal security of our country. One thing was NATGRID (National Intelligence Grid). With your permission, Sir, I would like to read out two-three lines. It says, "The National Intelligence Grid has been set up as an attached office of the Ministry of Home Affairs in April 2010. NATGRID will link databases for constructing actionable intelligence to combat terrorism and internal security threats. As such, NATGRID has been set up to create a facility that improves India's capability to counter internal security threats." But what is it doing? I came to know that it just got in principle approval two-three weeks ago. It shows lack of coordination, so far as the Ministry is concerned.

Sir, another point, which I would like to make, is this. I think that the Minister remembers that both the Houses discussed and passed two important Bills, namely, NIA and UAPA. They are Acts now. POTA was repealed. We have had some reservation over it. But we agreed to it because the Minister had told us that it's for the sake of national security. But he promised, while concluding his reply, that he would come back to this august House with the experience. What happened to that? Till date, we could not get time to share that experience concerning the two Bills which we passed on the promise or advice of the Minister.

Sir, it is not merely a law and order question. We have repeatedly said that if we have to check internal security of our country, we have to take care of three factors. One is economic. Second is political. Third is ideological. We should squarely fight it out. I suppose the Government is a little complacent.

Because after the Mumbai blasts on 13th July, like me, many hon. Members have heard one important announcement or observation from a leader of national prominence that 99 per cent of terrorism is already solved and only one per cent is left. It is a very bad timing. Sir, I am not going into details. Sir, the Government should clarify about the percentage matter, from top to bottom.

I am again saying that unity is the main thing to combat the internal security problem of our country because it is our country. This great country, India, belongs to crores of people. So, it is our duty. Sir, my concern is this. When such incidents happen, I feel one sport event 'Go as you like' held in Delhi. Minister says one thing; Deputy Minister says another thing; intelligence adviser says one thing; and, the Prime Minister says another thing. So, it is not a sport event like 'Go as you like'. If it is going on, national security will be under pressure. So, through you, I would like to request the Minister that we must make a concerted effort.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude. Your time is over.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Sir, my last point is this. Yesterday, it was also asked: What is the root cause? I support it. But, it is a very wide question as to what is the root cause. Who will find it

out? Unitedly, we should find out the root cause. The Ministry and the Government are one of the piloting subjects or piloting sectors. But, I feel one thing. Please consider this. You are going to build up an Aero City very near to Terminal-3. I have seen a report regarding Terminal-3. I know that the Minister knows better. The Government has already permitted about 15 five-star hotels and one mall. What is the distance between the runway and the mall? What is the distance between the runway and these five-star hotels? It is barely 115 metres. Is it possible to maintain internal security of the country when you are doing this?

Lastly, Sir, our State Minister knows very well. It is in a very limited area of three districts. It is a Maoist-affected area. So, joint action is taking place. Many people have lost their lives including farmers and common people. It is a threat to the internal security. We should act unitedly to solve the problem. Our Party, not only me but all, is in favour of the strong internal security of the country. With these words, I thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Hon. Members, we have a number of speakers. Therefore, I request every hon. Member to stick to the time allotted to his party.

Now, Shri Shivanand Tiwariji, not here. Then, Shri Tiruchi Siva.

SHRI TIRUCHI SIVA (Tamil Nadul): Sir, the commercial capital of India has been repeatedly struck by terrorists since 1993. Mumbai has become the likely target of the terrorists because terrorists want to destabilise the booming economy of India and the status it is having as a rising power by way of rattling foreign investors and driving away the tourists.

Each strike on Mumbai has raised international concerns about the security of India resulting in foreign tourists either abandoning or delaying their tour plan to India. The recent series of explosions in Mumbai have claimed 28 lives and severely injuring many other might have another objective. That is to divert international pressure to bring the Pakistan-based planners of the 26/11. Now, India is saddled with the responsibility of investigating another terrorist attack. Sir, the international profile of 26/11 attack may decline, it may come down. It is a probability. Now the issue has taken a dimension of law and order to that of a national security. I would like to say, through you, some accusations were levelled against the Government. One is that the diplomatic stand vis-a-vis Pakistan policy and

the counter-terrorism activities have been put on a separate list. Experts have credited our Government for taking a historical stand in dealing with the extremists through a different mechanism by deploying heavy military forces and, at the same time, addressing grievances through negotiations. Another accusation was made that the Government has not taken any lesson through the previous experiences and not any steps were taken to combat terrorism. I would like to say, through you, Sir, again what are the steps the Government have taken so far. The National Security Guards whose commandos battled the terrorists in Mumbai during the 26/11 attacks, now have four NSG hubs each with an operational strength of around 250 personnel. As many as 20 temporary Counter-Insurgency and Anti-Terrorism Schools were being set up. Following 26/11, coastal security was also reviewed at various levels. Under the ongoing Coastal Security Scheme, 64 out of 73 coastal police stations were operationalised. As many as 79 new battalions of the Central Para-Military Forces were sanctioned since 2004-05; and a proposal for raising 38 additional battalions of the Central Reserve Police Force, including two battalions of women personnel were also sanctioned. The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act was amended and notified. A model Police Act, drafted by an expert committee in 2006, which provided for well defined duties and responsiveness and sensitivity of the police towards public and accountability to rule of law, was sent to the States for consideration.

Many States - when we were ruling in Tamil Nadu - including Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Assam, Gujarat, Chhattisgarh and Haryana-have amended the Police Act or framed new Police Act. Along with all other things, including police forces, including two battalion of women personnel are the results of all these steps? I would like to say, it is not out of place to mention here that in 2001, the fatalities due to terrorism was 5,839. In 2009, it declined to 2,232. In 2010, it came down to 1,902. This year, 2011, currently till February 117 plus 28 whom we lost in the recent bomb blasts. I am not trying to defend that the numbers have declined and that everything is all right. As the Railway Minister has said, not even one death should take place because of the terrorist activities.

I would like to submit, through you, to the hon. Minister that there was a shocking admission by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra State that the Government was not able to purchase 500 CCTV cameras which is the recommendation of the Ram Pradhan Committee to look after the security lapses of 27/11; and the scheme is still pending with the Central Government for approval. The Chief Minister has also said that he was totally deprived for 15 minutes and that deprived him of acting immediately.

That has to be looked into.

Another proposal relating to telecommunication, which would help even at the time of crisis, whatever may happen, is still pending with the Government. The Central Government should, realising the active and crucial role played by the State Government, address these issues.

So, my submission to the hon. Home Minister and to the Government is, at any cost, we should not let the bombers drive home their message that India, despite its being a rising international power, is not able to control the terrorist attacks and that they have more potential by undercutting the flagging credibility of the Government. I submit to the Home Minister and the Government that stringent and strong punitive and preventive action must be taken against the perpetrators or those who commit such crimes, and send out the message and reassure the people of this country and the international community that India is totally and completely intolerant to any such crimes; and anything done to disrupt the sovereignty and the national security of India will not be tolerated. Severe action must be taken against such persons, whoever they may be, with strong hands. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Thank you, Shri Tiruchi Siva. Dr. Yogendra P. Trivedi.

DR. YOGENDRA P. TRIVEDI (Maharashtra): Thank you, Sir. Yesterday, we had a very good opening from Dr. Manohar Joshi who narrated the events that had taken place and the terrorist attacks one by one. I also made some chronological data. I find that from the beginning of this century we have 33 terrorist attacks and the last one was in Mumbai on 13th July. I particularly

remember it because it was at the Opera House and every day I passed through the area when I went to my office. This has become almost a common thing. The people in Mumbai or the people elsewhere in the country are resilient. Are they resilient or are they helpless? They have no other go. They have to go for their work; they have to earn their wage. They have to work and they go for that, but not because they are resilient or they don't mind. Many people in Mumbai, when they get out of their homes, are not sure whether they will be able to return home safe and sound. Why is this happening?

Sir, it is the primary duty of the State to protect the citizens from internal violence just as from foreign invasion. It is not happening in our country. Why is it that we are so soft? Why is it that we are so vulnerable? We found the other day that a ship landed near Versova in Mumbai. One wonders what our naval personnel and coast guards were doing! How can such a ship come right up to the shore? Let us imagine that there was a nuclear device inside the ship. The whole city would have been in jeopardy. How can a ship, breaking all the naval barriers, come right up to the coast of Versova? I think that it is something which we have to think about. Probably, we are too soft about the whole thing. Fortunately, our Home Minister, who is well versed in law, knows that the courts are moving very slowly. After the arrest, there are years of trial. Very often, except in extreme cases, bails are granted almost for asking. You will be surprised, Sir, to know that, when journalist Dey's murder took place in Mumbai, most of the contract killers were people who were already convicted; but they were on bail. Now when these things happen you must have a second look at our legal system. We in this House are here primarily for the purpose of legislating.

Let us look at our legislative system and find out whether something can be done about the procedure in courts. We find that the trial takes years; thereafter, there are voluminous judgements running into so many pages. There is a first appeal and then the second appeal. If there is a big sentence, then there is confirmation. All this procedure takes a long time. In the meanwhile, you know about the people who are in jail. Our jails are not particularly very bad; they are quite cozy too. It was mentioned that Kasab - who was almost found by everybody and there were several

witnesses, still that trial went on for years - was provided biryani in the jail. I think this is something which shows that we are too soft. We are trying to show the world that we are the people who are very law-abiding; we are the people who have great honour for the dignity of a man. But does the world care? We must take some illustration, some example from what is happening in the United States. The United States had a terror attack. Thereafter, they became quite strict and there has not been a single such terror attack there. So we must try to understand the situation. There must be a speedy trial; there must be quick conviction and the treatment in jail should be as people deserve to have that in jails. We are here to legislate. One should bear in mind that we have first appeal, then we have second appeal to the High Court and then the third appeal to the Supreme Court. Can we not do away with all these matters where terrorism is involved once and for all? After the conviction, if there is an appeal only to the Supreme Court, the appeal to the High Court can be avoided. So one ladder, two or three year's time which we spend in the first appeal, can easily be avoided and from the conviction, if a man is so convinced, he can go only to the Supreme Court. We must give a close thought to it. I personally believe, we should give more investigative powers to the police. It is very surprising. In the city of Mumbai, I am connected with an organization, the Indian Merchants' Chamber. We had offered to the State Government Rs. 200 crores for close circuit TVs. But look at the bureaucratic approach. When we offered close circuit TVs to be put throughout the city of Mumbai, because of some bureaucratic involvement, that offer was rejected. Today we have no clue about the people who had gone and planted these bombs in Zaveri Bazar, Opera House and Dadar. So, I believe that we have to move with the time.

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

DR. YOGENDRA P. TRIVEDI: Sir, I will take two minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You have already taken one minute more. So, take one minute more.

DR. YOGENDRA P. TRIVEDI: I am only saying one thing that Parliament is a place where we legislate. Let us do away with one ladder altogether; from conviction stage, go to the Supreme Court if you have got a case. Somehow or the other, we must put some fear in the mind of the terrorists. I

am making a suggestion. The moment there is a terror attack, one terrorist who is waiting on death row and whose mercy petition has not been disposed of for a number of years, he should immediately be hanged so that the person who is on the death row will tell the terrorists that 'please don't do the terror attacks because my life is in danger.' Something should be done. Mercy petitions are not disposed of for years together. We must think about it. We are a soft State; we are too vulnerable; anybody can come and do anything. Thirty-three attacks in ten years is something which is unimaginable. I think the Home Minister, who fortunately is a very eminent lawyer, will be able to apply his mind and put a legislative process by which people outside, the terrorists, the killers should not feel that India is a soft place where they can go, commit a crime, go in jail, wait for ten years, file a mercy petition and then once again remain happy. Thank you very much, Sir.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): श्री महेन्द्र मोहन जी। ...**(व्यवधान)**... सुनिए, आपकी पार्टी का टाइम तीन मिनट है, आप पांच मिनट बोल लीजिए।

श्री महेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 13 जुलाई, 2011 को मुम्बई के चेहरे पर एक बार फिर कालिख पुती। उस दिन जो आतंकी हमला हुआ, उसने 26 नवम्बर, 2008 को हुए हमले की याद दिलाई और उसके बाद हमने क्या arrangements किए थे, एक तरह से हमारी सारी पोल खुल गई कि ऐसे कोई भी arrangements वहां पर नहीं थे, जो इस हमले को रोक सकते थे।

महोदय, 12 मार्च, 1993 के बाद 14 बार मुम्बई पर हमले हुए हैं। हमें यह सोचना चाहिए कि आतंकवादी मुम्बई पर ही हमले क्यों करते हैं? मुम्बई हमारे बिज़नेस की राजधानी है, मुम्बई हमारी इकनॉमिक कैपिटल है और वहां पर ऐसे हमलों के माध्यम से आतंकवादी केवल यह संदेश देना चाहते हैं कि इस देश में पैसा मत लगाइए, इस देश के अंदर कोई योगदान मत दीजिए, जिससे देश आगे न बढ़ सके।

इसी संबंध में मैंने देखा कि अमरीका के Santa Monica : Milken Institute की एक रिपोर्ट है, जिसमें कहा गया है कि आतंकवाद की एक घटना के कारण 0.75 परसेंट तक जी.डी.पी. ग्रोथ रुक जाती है। यही कारण था कि जब इज़राइल में 2001 से 2003 के बीच आतंकवाद चल रहा था, तो वहां के आर्थिक विकास में 10 प्रतिशत की कमी आ गई थी। हमारे यहां बराबर आतंकवाद बढ़ता चला जा रहा है, इसका सबसे बड़ा कारण यह है कि हमारे यहां आतंकवादियों के मन में कोई भय नहीं है। जैसा अभी हमारे साथी त्रिवेदी जी ने कहा कि निश्चित रूप से हमें आतंकवादियों के मन में वह भय पैदा करना होगा कि अगर आप आतंकवाद के रास्ते पर आते हैं, तो आपको कड़ी से कड़ी सज़ा मिलेगी और उसका डिसीज़न बहुत जल्दी होगा। इसके लिए जरूरत हो तो Fast Tract Courts बनाए

जाएं, ताकि उनमें तुरन्त conviction हो और दोषी लोगों को सजाएं दी जा सकें। ये मर्सी पिटीशंस का pending पड़ा रहना ठीक नहीं है। अगर हम इस तरह से काम करेंगे, तो निश्चित रूप से हम इस देश से आतंकवाद को समाप्त नहीं कर सकेंगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, कल मेरा एक अनस्टार्ड प्रश्न था, जिसमें मैंने पूछा था कि आतंकवाद को रोकने के लिए हम क्या कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं? मुझे इसका जवाब मिला है। मेरा प्रश्न था कि - "Whether Government had proposed to set up National Counter Terrorism Centres." The reply is "Yes, Sir. However, no final decision has been taken on the constitution and structure of the proposed National Counter Terrorism Centres." Our hon. Home Minister is competent enough; when he can finish off terrorism in Punjab, he can finish off terrorism in the whole country. I would like to know from him as to why he is not in a position to deliver the thing which he can. So, I would like to know by what time a final decision will be taken, when the National Counter Terrorism Centres will be established, because this will help us in fighting out terrorism in the country.

इसी प्रकार से हमारा internal security का जो सिस्टम है, उसमें आपस में coordination नहीं है। हमारे यहां इतने internal security systems हैं - IB अपनी जगह काम करता है, NIA अपनी जगह काम करता है, मिलिट्री इंटेलिजेंस अपनी जगह काम करती है, लेकिन उनका आपस में कोऑर्डिनेशन नहीं होता है, जिसका नतीजा हमने देखा कि मुंबई में शिप्स आ जाते हैं और हमें पता ही नहीं चलता कि वे शिप्स कहां से आ गए, वे किसके शिप्स हैं, किस प्रकार से आ गए हैं? अगर हमको अपनी जी.डी.पी. की ग्रोथ को बरकरार रखना है, हम जो बात करते हैं कि 8 परसेंट या 9 परसेंट की ग्रोथ हमको चाहिए, तो हमें पहले आतंकवाद को रोकना होगा। अगर साल में दो या तीन terrorism की activities हो जाती हैं जो हमारी जी.डी.पी. ग्रोथ डेढ़ से दो परसेंट पीछे चली जाती है। इसके लिए बहुत जरूरी है कि हम इसको देखें। आप इस आतंकवाद का indirect impact भी देखिए कि आज जो सिक्योरिटी सिस्टम है, चाहे हम रेल से कहीं जाएं या प्लेन से कहीं जाएं, हमारी कितनी energy उसमें वेस्ट हो रही है। इससे हमारी कॉस्ट भी काफी बढ़ती है। हमको ये सारी चीजें देखनी चाहिए कि हम कैसे इनको कंट्रोल करें।

अभी मुझे कल ही होम मिनिस्ट्री से एक जवाब मिला है। मैंने पूछा था कि - "How the work of multiple agencies is being coordinated and whether the NIA has regional offices also." The reply is, "The NIA has regional offices at Hyderabad and Guwahati along with the Central office in New Delhi." Now, we have had 14 attacks in Mumbai. Then, why are we not having the regional office of NIA even in

Mumbai? Mumbai is a very sensitive city, and we have to ensure that this does not happen in place like Mumbai and Delhi. Of course, this should not happen anywhere in the country. But Delhi and Mumbai are very sensitive places, and we must control terrorism. That is possible only when we have coordination amongst our intelligence agencies. And whatever we commit, we must do it. Sir, on 26th November, 2008, a statement was made that we would have a Multi Agency Centre (MAC) to coordinate all these things.

What is the position on that? Has it been established? How are they coordinating? Sir, if these terrorist activities continue, we will not be in a position to have our GDP growth. I am confident, Sir, that Shri Chidambaram, being the head of the Home Ministry - when he can finish terrorism in Punjab - he can, certainly, finish terrorism in India also but, for that, strict laws are needed, a faster judiciary is needed and immediate punishment to culprits is needed. That is my request to the hon. Home Minister. Thank you very much, Sir.

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी (उत्तर प्रदेश): आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आंतरिक सुरक्षा और आतंकवाद पर इस सदन में पहले भी चर्चा हो चुकी है और कई बार हुई है। मैं उन चर्चाओं का ज़िक्र नहीं करूंगा लेकिन एक चर्चा जो वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर और पेंटागन पर हमले के बाद इस सदन में हुई थी, उसका ज़िक्र जरूर करना चाहूंगा। उस समय जब वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर और पेंटागन पर आतंकवादी हमला हुआ था, तो पूरी दुनिया में अल-कायदा की जड़ें ढूंढी जा रही थीं। अल-कायदा की जड़ें अमरीका में मिलीं, ब्रिटेन में मिलीं, जर्मनी में मिलीं और दुनिया के अलग-अलग हिस्सों में मिलीं। इसी सदन में उस समय के तत्कालीन गृह मंत्री, आदरणीय श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी जी ने बताया था कि मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि भारत में अल-कायदा की जड़ें कहीं पर भी नहीं हैं। महोदय, मैंने यह ज़िक्र इसलिए किया कि इन सात सालों में ऐसा कौन सा परिवर्तन आया है, ऐसी कौन सी परिस्थितियां बदली हैं, जिससे कि हर गांव में, हर मोहल्ली में, हर शहर में अल-कायदा की जड़ें दिखाई पड़ रही हैं? यह मैं नहीं इसके सिक्योरिटी एडवाइजर कह रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)... मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं, नेशनल सिक्योरिटी एडवाइजर कह रहे हैं, होम मिनिस्टर कह रहे हैं और उसके साथ-साथ सरकार की तरफ से कहा जा रहा है। यही नहीं, अल-कायदा ही नहीं, बल्कि अलग-अलग रंग-रूप में, अलग-अलग संगठन आज देश के अलग-अलग हिस्सों में आतंकवादी गतिविधियों में लगे हुए हैं और यहां तक की कई संगठनों ने "इंडियन" नाम भी रख लिया है, जैसे "इंडियन मुजाहिदीन" या इस तरह के नाम, जिससे कि कहीं न कहीं भ्रम फैलाया जा सके।

महोदय, आज जो महत्वपूर्ण बात है, वह यह है कि मैं जानता हूं कि माननीय गृह मंत्री जी के तरकश में तर्क के बहुत से तीर होंगे क्योंकि माननीय गृह मंत्री जी तर्कशास्त्री भी हैं। वे तमाम तर्क देंगे कि पूरी दुनिया में आतंकवाद

बढ़ा, इसलिए यहां बढ़ा। इसके ये कारण हैं, वे कारण हैं, "ए" कारण, "बी" कारण, "सी" कारण, "डी" कारण आदि, लेकिन माननीय गृह मंत्री जी क्या उन बेगुनाहों के खून को जस्टिफाई कर पाएंगे जो कि आतंकवादियों इन पिछले सालों में बहाया है? क्या उन बच्चों के बिलखते हुए आंसुओं को जस्टिफाई कर पाएंगे, जो आतंकवाद के डर से इस देश में सहम-सहम कर रह रहे हैं? उन मां-बहनों के उजड़े हुए सिंदूर को या इस आतंकवाद की वजह से जो पूरे देश उजाड़ दिए गए हैं, वे जस्टिफाई कर पाएंगे? क्या आज देश में जो दहशत का माहौल है, उसको कोई तर्क या किसी तरह का जस्टिफिकेशन ठीक कर सकता है? मुझे ऐसा नहीं लगता।

महोदय, आज सदन में सभी ने कहा कि टेररिज्म का कोई रंग नहीं होता, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि एक बदरंग टेररिज्म को इस सरकार ने रंगीला टेररिज्म बना दिया है। अभी कहा जाएगा कि यह "रेड टेररिज्म" है, कभी कहा जाएगा कि यह "सैफ्रन टेररिज्म" है, कभी कहा जाएगा कि "रैडिकल टेररिज्म" है, लेकिन वास्तविक टेररिज्म की जड़ों में जाने के बजाय कहीं न कहीं यह सरकार पूरी तरह से आतंकवाद के वास्तविक मुद्दे से भटकती रही और कहीं न कहीं यह दिखाने की कोशिश करती रही कि जो आतंकवाद की फैक्टरी पाकिस्तान है, जहां हर दिन आतंकवादियों का निर्माण हो रहा है, जहां से दुनिया के तमाम हिस्सों में और खाख तौर पर भारत में आतंकवादी भेजे जा रहे हैं, उसका कोई हाथ नहीं है, यह सारा आतंकवाद हमारा घरेलू आतंकवाद है। मुझे इस बात का अफसोस है कि आज सरकार की तरफ से जब इस तरह के तर्क आएंगे तो आतंकवादियों के हौसलों का क्या होगा?

निश्चित तौर से इसका नतीजा है कि आतंकवादियों के हौसले बढ़ रहे हैं। जब गृह मंत्री कहते हैं, यह सरकार कहती है कि हम आतंकवादियों से सख्ती से निपटेंगे, उसके तीसरे दिन कहीं धमाका हो जाता है। जब यह सरकार कहती है कि हम अब आतंकवाद नहीं होने देंगे, तो देश के किसी हिस्से में आतंकवादी अपनी शैतानी हरकत को अंजाम दे रहे होते हैं। ये तमाम ऐसी चीजें हैं, जिनके बारे में आज देश के लोग जानना चाहते हैं, देश के लोग समझना चाहते हैं। महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से इस सरकार को यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आज देश के जो हालात हैं, वह बहुत ही सहमे हुए हालात हैं। यह देश के लोगों की ज़िंदादिली है, इस देश के लोगों की हिम्मत है, इस देश के लोगों की राष्ट्रभक्ति का जज्बा है कि तमाम आतंकवादी हरकतों के बावजूद, उनके उकसाने के बावजूद भी किसी तरह से देश में आतंकवादी सफल नहीं हो पाए। मुझे माफ करिएगा, मैं इसमें सरकार को कोई क्रेडिट नहीं देना चाहता क्योंकि सरकार ने कभी इस तरह की इच्छा शक्ति जताई ही नहीं कि वह आतंकवाद से लड़ना चाहती है, वह आतंकवाद का खात्मा करना चाहती है। जब मैं यह बात कह रहा हूं तो इस दर्द के साथ कह रहा हूं कि आज देश में जब एक आतंकवादी धमाका होता है तो देश तो सहमता ही है, देश का मुसलमान उससे ज्यादा सहम जाता

है। आतंकवादी धमाके की गूंज चार दिन के बाद खत्म हो जाती है, टेलीविज़न पर, अखबारों में, रेडियो में उसके समाचार आने बंद हो जाते हैं, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान, जिसकी ढाढ़ी और टोपी और जिसके नाम पर इस सरकार की नीतियों की वजह से ओसामा बिन लादेन की मुहर लगा दी गई है, वह सहमा रहता है, दबा रहता है, उसे डर लगता है कि कब पुलिस आकर उसे गिरफ्तार न कर ले, कब उसे आतंकवादी बनाकर जेल न भेज दिया जाए। मैं यह बात इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि एक अखबार में मैंने पढ़ा कि देश में 16000 से ज्यादा लोग आतंकवाद के, अलगाववाद के और नक्सलवाद के नाम पर जेल में हैं। महोदय, मैं इसको सही नहीं मानता, गृह मंत्री जी अपने जवाब में इस बारे में बताएं। उसमें दिया है कि उन 16000 में से 13,800 लोग वे हैं, जो मुस्लिम हैं और आतंकवाद के नाम पर जेलों में बंद हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): अब कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: यह क्या परिवर्तन हुआ है? कौन सी ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ बनी हैं, जिनकी वजह से आज अपने ही देश में आपने इस देश के मुसलमानों को किराएदार बनाकर रख दिया है? आप उससे हर महीने वोट के रूप में किराया वसूल करते हैं, अन्यथा आप सेक्युलरिज़्म की बंदूक उसकी कनपटी पर लगाकर डराते रहेंगे और कहेंगे कि अगर तुम वोट का किराया नहीं दोगे तो तुम्हें इस देश से भगा दिया जाएगा ...(समय की घंटी)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): अब समाप्त करिए।

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: आज देश में यह परिस्थितियाँ बनी हैं। महोदय, मैं एक अंतिम बात कहना चाहूँगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आपका टाइम खत्म हो गया है। आपने दो मिनट एक्स्ट्रा ले लिया है।

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: सर, मैं इस सरकार की नीति के बारे में एक अंतिम बात कहना चाहूँगा। गृह मंत्री जी एक ऐसे कार्यक्रम में जाते हैं, जो कार्यक्रम वन्दे मातरम् के विरोध से शुरू होता है, ऐसे कार्यक्रम में अध्यक्षता करते हैं, जिस कार्यक्रम में अलगाववादी भाषा बोली जाती है। यही नहीं, इस सरकार में जो पार्टी लीड कर रही है, उसके एक प्रमुख नेता हैं, मैं उनका नाम इसलिए नहीं ले रहा हूँ क्योंकि आपने कल कहा था कि नाम मत लो, जब से ओसामा बिन लादेन मरा है, तब से ओसामा जी, ओसामा जी करते रहते हैं। जब से वह मरा, उनके अंदर ओसामा का भूत सवार हो गया है, उनके अंदर भूत घुस गया है, उनको सोते-जागते ओसामा जी, ओसामा जी लगता है। यह काम करते वे कहीं न कहीं, किसी न किसी रूप में एक तरफ तो अलगाववादी और आतंकवादियों को बढ़ा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ इस देश के मुसलमानों की राष्ट्रभक्ति पर सवालिया निशान लगा रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): अब समाप्त कीजिए ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: उन्हें लगता है कि अगर हम ओसामा की तारीफ करेंगे, हम कहेंगे कि ओसामा जी बहुत महान हैं, तो इस देश का मुसलमान खुश होगा। इस देश का मुसलमान भी आतंकवाद से उतनी ही नफरत

करता है, जितना कोई और करता। मेरा यह कहना है कि आज जो परिस्थितियां हैं ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आपने चार मिनट अधिक ले लिए हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: सर, मैं माननीय गृह मंत्री जी के लिए एक अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि

तू मुंसिफ बना है तो इंसाफ भी कर,

तू हिन्दू-मुसलमान क्या देखता है?

तू दरिया में तूफान क्या देखता है?

आपने आतंकवाद को हिन्दू और मुसलमान के दायरे में बांट दिया है। ...(व्यवधान).... हमने कभी भी नहीं कहा कि आतंकवाद हिन्दू या मुसलमान ...(व्यवधान).... आतंकवाद को हिन्दू और मुसलमान बनाने का काम ...(व्यवधान)....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप यह प्वाइंट पहले ही कह चुके हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: गंदी मानसिकता का नतीजा है और उसी गंद मानसिकता के चलते ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप चार मिनट ज्यादा ले चुके हैं। आप प्वाइंट्स को रिपीट करते हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: सर, आपने सारे लोगों को बोलने दिया। ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आपको 4 मिनट ज्यादा समय दिया है और किसी को नहीं दिया है।

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: नहीं, सर, आपने इतना टोका है ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): सुनिए, चेयर पर एलिगेशन मत दो, आपको 5 मिनट ज्यादा समय दिया है, जबकि और किसी को ज्यादा नहीं दिया है। लेकिन आप क्या बोल रहे हैं। बस, खत्म कीजिए। ...(व्यवधान)....
Naqviji, please take your seat.

श्री मुख्तार अब्बास नक़वी: मैं कन्क्लूड करता हूँ।

मैं केवल सरकार से एक अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ और एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। आज देश इस गंभीर माहौल में, इस गंभीर परिस्थितियों पर बहुत चिंतित है और चिंतित इसलिए नहीं है कि आतंकवादी रोज हमले कर रहे हैं और रोज धमाके कर रहे हैं। वे चिंतित इसलिए हैं कि सरकार की आतंकवाद, अलगाववाद और नक्सलवाद

पर जो नीतियां हैं वह टेरेरिस्ट फ्रेंडली हैं और इस टेरेरिस्ट फ्रेंडली का ही नतीजा है कि हर दिन आतंकवादी देश के किसी न किसी कोने पर बेखौफ होकर वे घूम रहा है और बेखौफ होकर वे अपने शैतानी मंसूबों को अंजाम दे रहा है और सरकार कुछ नहीं कर पा रही है। ... (समय की घंटी)...

सरकार से मेरा इतना अनुरोध है कि आतंकवाद को आतंकवाद की नज़र से देखिए, आतंकवाद में आप रंग मत देखिए और जिस दिन आप आतंकवाद को मजबूत, फौलादी, राष्ट्रवादी इच्छा शक्ति के साथ डील करेंगे उस दिन आतंकवाद इस देश से खत्म होगा और जब तक आप आतंकवाद के प्रति दोस्ताना रवैया रखेंगे तो कुछ नहीं होने वाला है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): बैठिए, धन्यवाद। श्री राजनीति प्रसाद, सिर्फ 5 मिनट। सुनिए, अदर्स केटगरी में टाइम जीरो है। इसलिए सब को 5 मिनट देते हैं।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार): सर, मैं तीन मिनट बोलूंगा, अपने एक्स्ट्रा दो मिनट इनको दे देता हूं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P. J. KURIEN): Listen, for 'Others Category' there is no time allotted. The time is over for 'Others Category'. So, take five minutes. ... (Interruptions)... Everybody should cooperate.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: सर, इस हाउस में पहले भी इस पर बहुत बहस हुई है और कभी-कभी मुझको ऐसा लगता है कि - "मर्ज बढ़ता ही गया, ज्यों-ज्यों दवा की।" आप जब कभी बोलते हैं कि हम आतंकवाद को कोसेंगे, लेकिन इस पर जब आपका स्टेटमेंट आता है और जब कभी आपका फैसला होता है तो दूसरे दिन या उसी दिन हो सकता है कि कोई बम फट जाता है। कल मनोहर जोशी जी और रवि शंकर जी ने बहुत बढ़िया भाषण किया, जिसकी मैंने तारीफ की है। लेकिन वे एक बात कहना भूल गए कि इस आतंकवाद की शुरुआत कहां से हुई। अमेरिका में 9/11 हुआ, उसके बाद वहां कुछ नहीं हुआ। लेकिन आप जरा सोचिए, विचार करिए, आप लोग बहुत ताली बजाते हैं, आप 1993 के बाद और 1993 से पहले का नक्शा बना लीजिए। हम किसी पर एलिगेशन नहीं लगा रहे हैं। 193 के पहले और 1993 के बाद आतंकवाद में कौन सा बढ़ावा हुआ, 1993 के पहले कौन सा आतंकवाद था और 1993 के बाद कितना आतंकवाद हुआ, यह आप सोच लीजिए। 18 साल में ... (व्यवधान)... रुकिए आप, नहीं बोलने देंगे तो हम चले जाएंगे, कोई बात नहीं है। केवल मुम्बई में 18 साल में 16 बार आतंकवाद हुआ। 1993 से पहले और 1993 के बाद कितनी बार मुम्बई में हुआ, आप भी इस पर विचार करिए, मैं किसी घटना का नाम नहीं ले रहा हूं लेकिन - "नहीं संभलोगे तो मिट जाओगे हिन्दोस्तां वालो, कि तुम्हारी दास्तां भी नहीं होगी दास्ताओं में।"

अगर हम सुबह घर से निकलें और शाम को आने के लिए परिवार के लोग इंतजार करें कि जो मर गया ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री बलबीर पुंज (उड़ीसा): हिन्दुस्तान कभी मिटेगा नहीं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

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

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: सर, सुनिए, जरा बैठ जाइए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Rajnitiiji, address the Chair. Do not look there. ...**(Interruptions)**...

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: मैं आपके लोगों की तारीफ कर रहा हूँ, आप रुकिए, बैठ जाइए।

SHRI BALBIR PUNJ: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this should be expunged. We cannot allow in this House that 'xÆü@QäüÄÿÖÖÖÖ नहीं मिटेगा'। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I will look into the records. I will go through the records.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: आप expunge कर दीजिए। आपको जो करना है कर दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप बोलिए। आप बोलिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप चेयर को एड्रेस करिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: सर, मैं आपके माध्यम से एक बात गृह मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इतनी सारी इन्वेस्टिगेशन एजेंसी बनायी है, अब आप यह बताइए, अभी हमारे नक़वी साहब बोल रहे थे..।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Rajniti Prasad, you please address the Chair. You don't address them. You please address the Chair.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: सर, अभी आतंकवाद के बारे में नक़वी साहब बता रहे थे, वह हैं, तो उनको ऐसा बोलना ही पड़ेगा। अब आप तो नक़वी साहब हैं नहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि 13 हजार मुसलमान लोग जेल में हैं, लेकिन यह बात क्यों आई, आप जरा इस पर गौर करिए। आपने लोगों के मन को तिना तोड़ा है। इसलिए आदमी कभी-कभी बदला भी लेता है। कैसे मन को 1993 में आपने तोड़ा है, कैसे लोगों को आपने खतरनाक स्थिति में पहुंचाया है, पूरी ताली बजाई है और उसका परिणाम है कि पूरे मुल्क में आग लगाने का काम आप लोगों ने किया है। इसी का परिणाम है कि जब आदमी सुबह घर से निकलता है, तो वह शाम को घर में आएगा या नहीं, इसका पता नहीं लगता है। आप लोग खूब ताली बजा रहे हैं और पूरा नाटक आप देख रहे हैं। हम आपको जानते हैं कि किस तरह से काम कर रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आपने खुद भी आग लगाने का काम किया है। ...**(व्यवधान)**... देखिए, ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री भगत सिंह कोश्यारी (झारखंड): आप या तो हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को दोष दीजिए या पाकिस्तान के लोगों को दोष दीजिए। मैं आपसे निवम्रतापूर्वक निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि आप कम से कम ...(व्यवधान)... आप अलग से बात करिए, लेकिन आतंकवाद it is a very important issue. आप इस इश्यु को टाल नहीं सकते हैं। अगर आप बार-बार किसी घटना का जिक्र करेंगे, तो यह गलत है। ...(व्यवधान)... अगर आप टेररिज्म की तुलना करेंगे, तो फिर मैं भागलपुर, जलगांव और अन्य कितनी घटनाएं हैं, उन पर जाऊंगा, तो बहुत समय लगेगा। इसलिए जो कारण हैं, जिसके बारे में आज अमेरिका कह रहा है और भी लोग कह रहे हैं कि इसके लिए पाकिस्तान जिम्मेवार है, आप इसकी ओर ध्यान दीजिए। अगर इस तरह का संदेश संसद से जाएगा, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि it will send wrong signals to the world.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Mr. Rajniti Prasad, please conclude. ...(Interruptions)... राजनीति प्रसाद जी, आप बोलिए। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI BALBIR PUNJ: What is he saying? ...(Interruptions)... They are blaming the Muslims of India for doing all these terrorist activities to avenge the demolition of Babri Masjid. In fact, he is blaming the entire Muslim community for all the terrorist activities in the last 20 years. This is unacceptable, Sir. There has been a clear case of Pakistan. ...(Interruptions)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप बैठ जाइए। आप बैठ जाइए। ...(व्यवधान)... आपने बोल दिया। आप बैठ जाइए। ...(व्यवधान)... राजनीति प्रसाद जी। ...(व्यवधान)... आप बैठ जाइए। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI BALBIR PUNJ: He is absolving Pakistan and blaming the Muslims of India. This is totally unacceptable.

श्री विक्रम वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, राजनीति प्रसाद ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): राजनीति जी, आप बोलिए। ...(व्यवधान)... Mr. Rajniti Prasad, please speak on the relevant subject and conclude.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: सर, टाइम खत्म हो गया। ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो. पी.जे. कुरियन): आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए। देखिए, आपने दो मिनट एक्स्ट्रा टाइम लिया। ...(व्यवधान)... आपने दो मिनट एक्स्ट्रा लिया, आपने सात मिनट का समय लिया है। आप देखो। आप वहां पर देखिए। ...(व्यवधान)... Take one minute more.

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद: ठीक है। मैं नहीं बोलता हूँ। मैं अब नहीं बोलता हूँ।

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, the triple bomb blasts in Mumbai on July 13 deserves serious condemnation. The terrorists are always targeting the commercial hub of our country, particularly congested places and streets. We are saying, after the terrorist attacks, our investigative agencies are moving with some pre-conceived notions. After his visit the hon. Home Minister has said, in unequivocal terms, that our investigative agencies would go without pre-conceived notions. So, this is a very welcome thing. He has also said why they are targeting Mumbai is nothing but to attack the growing prosperity of the nation. So, that is the short-term perspective of terrorists. But, we don't know; we are yet to know the long-term perspective of terrorists as to why they are attacking commercial capital of the country.

Sir, coming to investigation, i would like to say what we had seen in the past was that these investigative agencies were having a mindset and arrested thousands of Muslim youth either in Malegao incident or Macca Mazid blast or Ajmer Sharif blast or Samjhauta express. Then, afterwards, we came to know who is behind it. And, the name of Abhinav Bharat came out.

DR. CHANDAN MITRA (Madhya Pradesh): How can you say that?

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA: It has appeared in the press and investigation is going on. You are a man from the press. You know it better as to who is responsible and who is not. So, what i mean to say is that we should not go with pre-conceived notions. What mindset you were having previously and what sort of investigation we did in the past should not be repeated in the future is what I wanted to say.

Sir, recently, there was a news item in a very important Marathi Daily - Pudhari - where it said that the Government of Maharashtra is seriously thinking to form a Commission consisting retired senior officials. I am really surprised to see the names of some tainted officers in this, except one or two who are the persons of integrity. In 1992, the then Police Commissioner who was suspended because he could not safeguard the interests of the minorities and he could not control the riots has been suggested for the Commission. Another high-ranking police official who was hand-in-glove with Telgi Scam is also there. So, I am really surprised if this sort of tainted persons heading the

investigative agencies, what would happen to the final outcome. So, I urge that the Government should be very cautious while considering such persons in such Commissions.

Finally, I would like to say, as assured, there are CCTV cameras and other things and we hope that there would not be repetition of such incidents, even though it is very difficult in a country like India. But, we have to take all drastic steps to see that it should not recur again.

Today morning I was really surprised to see in the press that in spite of warning given by our fishermen about 26/11 miscreants, our police and investigative agencies did not move properly. For that, we had to face such a big horrible attack. So, from time to time, we should see that such things are stopped. And, secondly, all the investigative agencies should have proper coordination. Lack of coordination is one of the important things for failure. So, these are the things which we have to see and ensure that such sort of things should not occur, particularly in Mumbai and other areas. Thank you very much.

DR. ASHOK S. GANGULY (Nominated): Hon. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am not participating in the point-counterpoint debate that is going on. Like many of you, who were in the Parliament during terrorist attack, I happened to be at the Tajmahal hotel in Mumbai on 26/11 when the terrorist attack took place. There were twenty couples, including my wife. And, we were struck in a room without a lock. Fortunately, the lights were turned off. We struck from 8.00 P.M. to 4.30 A.M. in the morning until we were rescued with the help of the Bombay Fire Brigade, Mumbai Police and many of the troops sent by the Central forces. So, one has gone through the horrific experience and not watching on television or reading about terrorist attack in the newspapers, are entirely different experiences.

We also watched the next day what happened in Chabad House. However, I compliment the Home Minister and his colleagues in the Home Ministry for a number of new initiatives which have been taken since 2008. However, there are some orange and red signals which, through you, Sir, I wish to share with the hon. Home Minister. One single weakness which still persists and which prevents us from taking pre-emptive measures is that a single point of coordination regarding issues

of internal security, is yet to be fructify and work. This is mainly because we never get rid of old Intelligence organisations while building up new ones. Turf-wars are well-known. We, sort of, tolerate them in the name of democracy. We need a single internal security command. My request to the hon. Home Minister is, more than anything else, we can learn valuable lessons from the Homeland Security Organisation in U. S. There were turf wars in United States also, which had to be ended in order to coordinate pre-emptive capabilities.

I would like to just share another example. There is a new coastal security set up, in Mumbai. Many of their new patrol boats lie idle on the coast. They cannot move around the coast because they don't have funds for fuel to operate more than for a few hours. The 13th July, 2011 explosions exposed the weakness of the systems once again. My whole point is, we keep on saying, this is not right or that is not right. Unless we have strong pre-emption capabilities, it is unlikely that we will have the ability to monitor, to control and to prevent what is going on in the terrorist cells and organisations. Modern technology, modern surveillance methods and coordination with international agencies are - unavoidable and imperative for acquiring the pre-emptive ability which this country must have.

I wish to add one important point. We are a multi-cultural and a multi-religious nation. My request to all my colleagues in this august House including the media is, don't point fingers to any single community, to any single group, to any single religion because by doing so is the biggest harm to ourselves and our nation.

I would also like to mention that cyber attacks are an additional issue that is going to grow. It is no less lethal compared to human terrorism. You don't see people being killed, but, you suddenly find out the country's secrecy, and its self confidence being undermined. China, I am sorry to say, is the leading cyber warrior in this field and has been attacking India, USA and other countries. I am not concerned with other countries which China attacks. I am concerned with China's long term designs on India's security.

Sir, I wish to make another point regarding this rise of right is forces around the world. The latest example is what happened in Norway. This House expressed its deep condolences to that nation. Rise of such forces is not restricted to Norway. Many countries are facing the rise of the

rightist forces which are no less dangerous than the visible terrorists that we normally focus upon. India is facing the rise of rightist forces who are a enormous and growing danger. My request, through you, Sir, to the hon. Home Minister is, please include them in the net for surveillance as much as we do the other well-known groups which are read about all the time in the public domain.

Finally, Sir, we can make our history, but we cannot change our geography. We happen to be in the most dangerous place in the world. We have one of the largest populations. We have a complex geography. We are surrounded by nations which are not friendly. These are the realities. We can shout, we can write headlines, but, we have to deal with the reality of our geography. The challenge of terrorism must be faced squarely. I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity of complimenting the Home Minister for what has been done to counter terrorism. But this whole House has to support you whole heartedly. Mr. Home Minister, because your task is just enormous, and every Indian has the responsibility to lend a shoulder to this national challenge.

We cannot do it by ourselves. We must take the best help from anywhere in the world. We must get the finest mind, whether in the Government or outside the Government. We must get the latest technology. There is no shortage of money in this country. What we have to have is the biggest resolve that we will not allow terrorism to overcome us, to overtake us or to overpower us. I thank you Mr. Vice-Chairman for this opportunity.

SHRI M.V. MYSURA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, at the outset, I appreciate the fact that the Home Minister rushed to Mumbai immediately after the blasts. I also appreciate the fact that the police force reached the sites within 15 minutes. But, unfortunately, till today, the agencies are lurking in the dark for clues. I am emphasizing this point because bringing the culprits to book is an important step in preventing such types of terror attacks. Sir, prevention is better than cure. Our special agencies are lacking in systematic, coordinated and precision approach. If you analyse IB, you will find that it is having a force of 25,000 personnel. Out of them, 8,000 personnel are drivers, peons and administrative staff. Only 2000 IB personnel are looking after IB operations, which is mostly political in nature. Only 200 officials have been assigned the task of counter-terrorism.

Sir, the NIA Bill was hurriedly passed by Parliament. It was piloted by our Home Minister. This Force was created in 2008. Till today, there are 28 cases with this Organisation. Of these, only three are original cases. In all other cases, it is playing second fiddle to State agencies and assisting them by giving advices.

Then, even Pune and Mumbai blast cases were also not handed over to this Organization, because they did not form specialized teams to keep a dedicated watch on different terror groups.

Then, Sir, it is our Home Minister who piloted this Bill. At the time of his meeting with the FBI Director, a little two months later, - I quote, Sir, it is Wikileaks, it is not mine - "Mr. Chidambaram conceded that he was coming perilously close to crossing constitutional limits in empowering the NIA. He explained that the concept of 'federal' crime does not exist in India, with the law and order the responsibility of the State Governments. Charge d'Affairs Steven White cabled about this meeting." Then, why was such type of a legislation brought in? If it is a weak legislation, and if it is nearing unconstitutional, this gives a message to the terrorists that laws cannot prevent them from taking up such types of terrorist activities. That message will go.

Regarding NATGRID, already my friend has mentioned about it; so, there is no need to explain that, again, in detail.

Then, I come to special squads by State Governments. ATS, especially, in Maharashtra, they have to keep a watch on suspected terrorist elements. When there is a reliable information, they must inform the other State agencies and also RAW, IB and NIA. They can coordinate with such types of organizations and collate the information. If some real information is there, they can neutralize the modules and shells. They have to do such types of things. But, unfortunately, whenever there is a blast, these people implicate wrong persons, wash their hands off, and, ultimately, shirk their responsibilities.

I can quote many examples but as there is no time, I cannot quote all those things.

In reply to yesterday's Question No. 56, the Home Minister had said that some measures have been taken to counter terrorism. But the measures which he mentioned in his reply will only prevent

the outside players from neighbouring countries but these measures will not be effective in preventing home-grown terrorism and these measures will not be able to prevent it.

Then, Sir, for Bombay blasts, no organization has come forward to take its responsibility. I do not know whether our agencies or the Ministry tried to analyse it or not. Is it the weakness of the organization which is stopping it not to own its responsibility or is it that they are testing the alertness of our police forces to conduct a big operation? I want to bring it to the notice of the Home Minister.

Last but not the least. I happened to see the Website of Maharashtra Police. I would like to quote here the three responsibilities of the Mumbai Police. One is, the Mumbai Police has been the vanguard of bringing awareness about AIDS by reaching out to people through its widespread organizational network. It regularly organizes blood donation camps for helping the needy. Presently, noise and air pollution are high in its agenda of services. If they are doing such type of services, how can they maintain law and order in the State? Sir, when there is such a lack of coordination among the special agencies, the Central Government or the State Governments cannot prevent such terrorist attacks. The God only can save this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Next is Prof. Saif-ud-Din Soz. Sozji, take fifteen minutes, please.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ (JAMMU AND KASHMIR): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, terrorism is indeed a threat to our national security and we have to fight it out with vigour. The three rush-hour blasts in Mumbai on July 13 came as a grim reminder to the country that terrorism is yet to be fought out; it is a threat to the national security and we have to be vigilant.

But while I condemn these acts of terrorism, particularly, what happened in Mumbai earlier and this time, I pay a tribute to Mumbaites who remained united most resolutely and showed their togetherness and resolve to fight terrorism. There were voices of provocation but together the Mumbaites showed their vigour as an integral part of the nation and they stood the test of time. I pay a tribute to them.

When I am condemning these acts of terrorism, I feel very sad. From the major Opposition, I heard three speeches. I heard the speech of Manohar Joshiji. I don't want to score any political points. But I say it for the record and also for your kind consideration. I heard Manohar Joshiji, Ravi Shankar Prasadji and Naqvi Saheb just now. I wasn't much impressed. I must say it, because, even while the blasts took place, the senior leaders of BJP were blaming the hon. Home Minister, the hon. Prime Minister and the UPA Government. That was a moment to stand united. Here, in the House, I heard these senior colleagues speaking on this issue. They were all the time blaming the Government, blaming the Home Minister. This is the time to stand with the Home Minister. It is a very difficult task that Mr. Chidambaram is handling. There was no substance in these speeches. Rhetoric is there, but that is not going to serve any purpose for the nation.

I wish these luminaries came forward to make suggestions to the hon. Home Minister and I wish they said that they all stand united in the fight against this menace.

I have a long list of these blasts with dates - Varanasi, Pune, Mumbai, Assam, Imphal, Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Jaipur, CRPF Camp at Raipur, Rajasthan, Hyderabad, again Hyderabad, the attack on the train and, lastly, what happened on the 13th of July in Mumbai. But there is no time. Some of the security agencies see a pattern in the blasts on 26th and 13th. I will not go into that; I do not believe that the 13th is a bad date in the calendar. It may be a superstition. But they see a pattern and they can go deeper into it and find out why this was happening. While I say all this, I feel a great relief in my mind that the international community, all the time, has stood with us. From many of the Capitals statements came and their Parliaments condemned the acts of terrorism in India. As a representative of their thoughts, I would say that Obama, at that time, was very forthright when he said, and I quote him, "During my trip to Mumbai last November, I saw first-hand the strength and resilience of the Indian people and I have no doubt that India will overcome these deplorable terrorist attacks". So, there is quite a lot of understanding of the misery we are suffering in this country. They know about our resoluteness and how earnestly we wish to fight the menace of terrorism.

Now, some people are saying that Mumbai has been under attack because it is the nation's most vibrant centre of commerce. But perhaps the hon. Home Minister is right when he says that it is not Mumbai alone which is under attack but other cities in various parts of the country need to remain vigilant too. Mumbai may need to be a little more alert because it is a vibrant commercial centre, but we must remain vigilant everywhere in India.

Now, without going into details about what happened, I have a couple of suggestions. First of all, I must pay a little more tribute to the hon. Home Minister. He may not be knowing that there is an assessment that he deals with these situations very deftly and justly; he does not want any innocent person to be hauled up, because that adds fuel to the fire. I don't wish to score any political points here but I would like to remind this hon. House that in the Lok Sabha - I have the dates with me - Advaniji stood up after a terrorist attack and said that our agencies had responded very powerfully, very positively, and we have done away with the terrorists. And only within a month it was proved that those who had been dealt with so efficiently were innocent people. I do not wish to waste this august House's time by reminding you of what happened in Chhatisinghpura in Kashmir. Even today, CBI is fighting a battle on the basis of inquiry by our prestigious institutions, including the Army, that the five people who were done to death soon after Chhatisinghpura carnage were innocent people. There is recorded evidence and found to be true by the CBI. And, therefore, when Mr. Chidambaram gives directions to deal with a case justly and quickly and says that no innocent should be hauled up, that is a point of credit for him. He should not feel any kind of remorse for them. Who want him to be tough in the sense that he must deal strongly with the acts of terrorism and haul up people right and left. He had rushed to Mumbai; the hon. Prime Minister had gone to Mumbai; the UPA Chairperson went to Mumbai. That was their duty to the nation. The Home Minister rushed forensic experts and he sent the NIA team quickly. It was a quick response to the situation. But that may not ultimately solve the problem because it is a deeper menace. It has to be fought, and he will have the time. He will hold consultations and respond to this situation strongly.

He knows the anxiety in the hearts and minds of the countrymen. As I said, I wanted to make some suggestions, so, a couple of suggestions are here with me. One is that we have to remain

strong and united. What I saw from the major opposition parties' speeches is that we have got divided. They tried to divide us on this issue as if the Government is dead set to create this situation in this country and as if this Home Minister has gone wrong squarely. Therefore, when I say that we must remain strong and united, it is a message to the whole country. If we remain strong and united in this House, it will be a message to the country.

And we must reiterate this message whenever we get an opportunity. We have to prove that this nation has vitality to fight terrorism out of this beautiful country. We are a vibrant democracy; we have centuries' old secular edifice available and we are a finest situation of pluralism in the world. We have to protect these institutions or concepts, whatever the sacrifice we have to make. Therefore, our unity in this House or that House will matter quite a lot to keep the nation strong and vibrant. But we cannot be complacent and my grouse is not that the hon. Home Minister is complacent even when I give these suggestions. Maybe, these are already existing in his mind, but we cannot show even a trace of complacency and we must respond to the situation now when there is peace around and we shall see that no act of terrorism can take place in our country. The law-enforcing machinery in this country should not be ambiguous while dealing with situations. No officer can be allowed to be parochial in any design to deal with a situation; we cannot allow any weakness in any person's mind. It is a great duty to this nation. Therefore, I put a question to the hon. Home Minister: Who are these Indian Mujahideens? You must know this. I want to reiterate in this House that we are better off so far as Islamic institutions are concerned. India is a great country, a secular country, and our Islamic institutions are more vibrant than any other institutions in the world. Therefore, I remind you for your consideration that not only Deoband but also all the Muslim schools of thoughts have condemned terrorism unequivocally and that no Muslim can have any relation with any terrorist act. The hon. Home Minister has devised a method to deal with the situation. But I would strongly plead with him to enlighten us on who are the Indian Mujahideens. We must have a White Paper; we must have access to records. He must kindly take us into confidence that nobody deserves any mercy whether it may be SIMI or Indian Mujahideen or Hindu extreme fundamentalists. Our Forces and our Police have

done a great duty to this nation. They have been ruthless and honest in finding terrorists. Now you have a wide variety of people. I don't want to give names - Hindu or Muslim. But you have a variety of terrorism and terrorist acts in which our youth and people are indulging. Since Indian Mujahideen has been mentioned, I want the hon. Home Minister to enlighten us as to who are Indian Mujahideens, where do they receive training and how they operate. We must have some knowledge on that. I want to say one more thing. Our agencies should not suffer for want of manpower. Where is terrorism? Sir, the terrorism takes birth in minds. So, the hon. Home Minister and his agencies must know who is doing ground work and what they are then writing in newspapers.

How their minds work? And, what kind of speeches they make? It is the final act that somebody will fire a bullet or will throw a bomb. But, something is happening all the time in his or her mind. Therefore, law-enforcing machinery should have sufficient manpower to watch people, their activities, what they are writing, what they are thinking and we have to be vigilant all the time. As I said, parochialism of any kind should not be acceptable to the hon'ble Home Minister. ...(*Time-bell rings*)... And, we must know where are these people and who indulge in these activities. I am told there are vacancies in the intelligence outfits. They should have sufficient manpower.

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

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I will take just a couple of minutes. Then, I have a suggestion for hon. Home Minister. We must improve our communication system. The Press has largely covered the news that Shri Prithviraj Chavan, the hon. Chief Minister of Maharashtra, wanted to reach his DGP within first half minute of the occurrence of the blast on 13th July. But, he could not do it. He took fifteen minutes. Now, it is an open secret that we want so many CCTVs, and within the current year's Budget, economy can be effected and all apparatus, which is required by law-enforcing machinery, must be available with them, particularly these CCTVs.

Then, Sir, you are telling me to conclude. I must say that there are two more situations, that is, naxalism, remanants of naxalism, and Maoism. These are situations based on ideology. Wherever situations have elements of ideology, we have to deal with those situations very deftly, and we have

to see whether our system of social justice is intact, vibrant and does answer the requirements of Indian nation. So, that is a different situation. ...(*Time-bell rings*)... But, Maoism can add fuel to the fire of violence in this country, and, therefore, those situations have to be tackled deftly.

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

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Now, the final word is about external factor, and you can call it squarely 'Pakistan factor'. I had an occasion to go to Pakistan in my life for the first time. Rajnitiiji is not here. He was with me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please conclude within one minute.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: We were twelve people and had the privilege of entering the Marriott Hotel of Islamabad. Shri Tariq Anwar is here. He will bear me out. We had very long discussions with the representatives of Pakistan's civil society. There were four segments - woman organisations, journalists, politicians and the representatives of the Parliament of India. We had vibrant debates and we found that Pakistan's civil society was very much concerned about terrorism. In fact, barring one lady, nobody mentioned Kashmir. I am telling you, and this goes on record and this is known to our 12-member delegation, that all that they mentioned was terrorism because when we entered the hotel, threat was looming large. Mehran was attacked, and the next day, nearly 300 people died in Khyber. I found Pakistan in great difficulty. And, I raised the question. I repeat it today and we can raise it with Pakistan very safely because I found civil society there very much interested in fighting terrorism. They want to fight terrorism alongside India and they did not make a secret of these things. They raised a voice for CBMs and when I came here, I shared with the power elite here. My point is that I raised a question with them. I told them that they had a problem. I told them to raise a debate internally. There is a need for Pakistan to have a debate internally. I told the civil society to have a debate with their people who could ferment trouble like Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkare-Taiba. I told them that they were most welcome to have debate with us and I told Pakistanis that I would get back to Delhi and all 12 of us would try to have an India-Pakistan Parliamentary forum, a vibrant forum.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): You have shortage of time. You are taking more time.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Sir, I will take only two minutes. This is something very important.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Yes, I know that. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: Therefore, I raised the debate in Pakistan that they should have an internal debate because some people have the power to foment trouble ...*(Interruptions)*... We must give Pakistan's civil society our sympathy. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Soz ji, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... You have made your point. ...*(Interruptions)*...

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: I raised the question. ...*(Interruptions)*... We want a stable Pakistan. We want that country's democracy to be vibrant and we want the civil society. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Please. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sozji, that is all.

PROF. SAIF-UD-DIN SOZ: We want it so that Pakistan becomes stable and we also have lesser trouble. Thank you very much.

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी (बिहार): धन्यवाद, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय। महोदय, हम को कभी-कभी ऐसा लगता है कि हमारे देश की राजनीति इतनी झगड़ालू हो गयी है कि आतंकवाद जैसे मुद्दे पर भी हम कोई सर्व-सम्मत राय नहीं बना पाते हैं। महोदय, अभी नार्वे में बहुत बड़ी घटना हुई जिस में बड़ी संख्या में लोग मारे गए, लेकिन वहां के मीडिया ने यह नहीं दिखाया कि उस देश के अंदर यह विवाद हो कि सरकार दोषी है, अपोजीशन दोषी है। वहां पूरे देश ने उस घटना को जिस तरह से लिया वह काबिले-तारीफ है, लेकिन हमारे देश में ऐसा नहीं हो पाता है। जब भी कोई बड़ी घटना होती है तो आरोप-प्रत्यारोप का दौर चलता है। यह हमारे लिए ठीक नहीं है। मुझे लगता है कि हमारे देश में जो आतंकवाद की घटनाएं हो रही हैं, उस के पीछे हमारा perception इतना बंटा हुआ है जिस के कारण इस तरह का मतभेद होता है।

महोदय, कल इस बहस की शुरुआत आदरणीय डा. मनोहर जोशी ने की। यह भी एक mind set है कि जिसे वे represent करते हैं। हम लोगों का mind set अलग है। उन्होंने कहा कि पाकिस्तान के अंदर जो आतंकवाद का ट्रेनिंग सेंटर है, हम उस पर हमला क्यों नहीं करते हैं जिस तरह से अमेरिका ने पाकिस्तान में हमला किया। लेकिन ऐसा कहते हुए हम भूल जाते हैं कि हम अमेरिका नहीं हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान दोनों atomic हथियारों

से लेस हैं। आज दोनों को दुनिया में कोई लड़ने नहीं देगा। एक जमाना था जब हमारे पास atomic हथियार नहीं थे। हालांकि पाकिस्तान से हमारी लड़ाई सन् 65 में हुई, 71 में हुई और दोनों लड़ाइयों में हमने पाकिस्तान को परास्त किया है, लेकिन आज हमारे साथ वैसी स्थिति नहीं है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आतंकवाद में एक परिवर्तन आया है। इधर आतंकवाद के मामले में इंडियन मुजाहिदीन के आतंकवादी नौजवान पकड़े गए हैं और उन का जो बयान छपा है, वह चिंता का विषय है। पहले हम देखते थे कि आतंकवादी दूसरे देश पाकिस्तान से हमारे देश में आते थे, लेकिन इधर एक डवलपमेंट यह हुआ है कि हमारे देश के लोग ही आतंकवादी घटनाओं में लिप्त दिखायी दे रहे हैं और अब हमारे देश के लोग ही आतंकवादी घटनाओं का एक रंग नहीं रह गया है। मालेगांव मामले में जो खबर आयी, समझौता एक्सप्रेस मामले में जो खबर आयी, उससे और चिंताजनक स्थिति बन गयी है। इन दो मामलों में दो समुदाय - एक हिंदू और दूसरा मुसलमान, दोनों से आतंकवादी लोग पकड़े जा रहे हैं। यह एक गंभीर चिंता का विषय है जिसके बारे में हम लोगों को विचार करना चाहिए। हम यह महसूस करते हैं कि हिंदू समाज जिस के हम सदस्य हैं, उस की आबादी इस देश में बहुत बड़ी है। इस समुदाय के 80 परसेंट से ज्यादा लोग बसते हैं और हम यह मानते हैं कि हिंदू आबादी का यह दायित्व है कि इस देश में जो minority या अक्लियत समाज के जो लोग हैं, वे हम से सुरक्षित महसूस करें। यह देखना हमारा कर्तव्य है कि एक नागरिक के नाते जो उन का अधिकार है, हम उस की रक्षा करें। हम लोग democracy में यकीन करते हैं और democracy equal rights में यकीन करती है, यही उस का मूल सिद्धांत है। उस में हम उनके अधिकार की रक्षा कर पाते हैं या नहीं, यह देखना हमारा कर्तव्य है। अगर उन के मन में यह भय होगा कि हिंदू समाज अपनी अक्लियत का, अपनी majority की ताकत का इस्तेमाल कर के हम को दबात रहा है, हमारे अधिकारों का हनन कर रहा है तो उनके अंदर एक अलगाववाद पैदा होगा और यह हमारे देश में हुआ है। इसलिए मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि मुसलमानों के बारे में हिंदू समाज के अंदर जो गलतफहमियां हैं, जो रूढ़ियां हैं, उनको भी दूर करने की जरूरत है और मुसलमानों के अंदर जो एक अलगाववाद है, उसको भी दूर करने की जरूरत है। उन को भी mainstream में जोड़ने की जरूरत है।

तभी हम आतंकवाद का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं, अकेले पुलिस के जरिए या कई तरह के संगठन बनाकर हम आतंकवाद का मुकाबला नहीं कर सकते हैं। मैं वैसे लोगों में से नहीं हूं, मैं पोटा जैसे कानून का समर्थक नहीं हूं। मैं इमरजेन्सी में जेल में रहा हूं, इधर के भी हमारे कई साथी जेल में रहे हैं। इस तरह के कानूनों का मैं समर्थन नहीं करता हूं। मैंने दो-तीन साल पहले पोटा को रोलेट एक्ट के साथ तुलना करके पढ़ा है। रोलेट एक्ट जो है, वह पोटा से ज्यादा उदार था। हमने देखा कि वहां जो ट्रायल प्रोसेस था, उसमें कोई ऐसी बात नहीं थी, जैसी पोटा में आई थी।

पोटा में ट्रायल से पहले जुडिशियल रिव्यू की गुंजाइश नहीं है, रोलेट एक्ट में तो जुडिशियल रिव्यू की भी गुंजाइश थी। सेशन जज पोटा के मामले में ट्रायल करता है और वहां अंग्रेजों के जमाने में रोलेट एक्ट, जिसको हम काला कानून मानते थे, वहां चीफ जस्टिस तीन जजों को नियुक्त करता था और वे तीन जज जो हैं रोलेट एक्ट के मामले में कार्यवाही करते थे। अगर उनको फांसी की सजा सुनानी होती थी, तो तीनों जज एक स्वर में, एक साथ मिलकर के, फांसी की सजा सुनाते थे। पोटा में हम देखते हैं कि सेशन जज जो हैं, वह फांसी की सजा सुना सकता है, इस तरह का उसे अधिकार है। पोटा का कानून तो था ही इस देश में, उस समय भी आतंकवाद की घटनाएं हुई हैं।

(श्री उपसभापति पीठासीन हुए)

उपसभापति जी, जो समस्या है, उसको पकड़ने की जरूरत है। आप जो है, दिल्ली से बैठकर पूरे देश में चाहे वह मुंबई में हो, दिल्ली में हो या और किसी शहर में हो, वहां की आतंकवादी घटनाओं को नहीं पकड़ सकते हैं। वहां की जो स्थानीय पुलिस है, जो स्थानीय इंटेलीजेन्स ऑफिसर है, जब तक उनको आप दुरुस्त नहीं करेंगे, आप कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं। आपके पास इंटेलीजेन्स गैदरिंग का कोई सिस्टम नहीं है। काम स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का है, स्टेट की पुलिस का है और स्टेट में पुलिस ट्रेंड नहीं है, इंटेलीजेन्स गैदरिंग के बारे में। हमको पता नहीं चल पाता है कि समाज के अंदर जो अलग-अलग तबके हैं, उन तबकों के अंदर थीम क्या है, उनके अंदर किस तरह की चर्चा जो है काम कर रही है? इसलिए सबसे बड़ी जरूरत यह है कि हम स्टेट के अंदर इंटेलीजेन्स गैदरिंग के लिए एक अलग से कैंडर विकसित करें और इसके लिए उस कैंडर को ट्रेंड करने की जवाबदेही केन्द्र सरकार को लेनी होगी।

महोदय, जो भारतीय स्वभाव है, लोग कहते हैं वह टावर वाला जो मामला हुआ था, उसके बाद अमरीका में इस तरह की घटना नहीं हुई, जो 26/11 को यहां हुई। हम अमरीका नहीं है। जितना अमरीका खर्च कर सकता है, हमारी वह ताकत और वह हैसियत नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति: शिवानन्द जी, अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: हम यूरोप भी नहीं हैं, हम तो यह कहना चाहेंगे कि हमें अपने साधन से, अपने तरीके से और जो हमारी संस्थाएं हैं, उनके जरिए से हमें आतंकवाद से लड़ना होगा। हम यह मानते हैं कि जो अलकायदा की बात होती है, अलकायदा को जन्म किसने दिया? अलकायदा को जन्म अमरीका ने दिया। इस ओसामा बिन लादेन को किसने जन्म दिया? अमरीका ने जन्म दिया। एक बात हम कहना चाहेंगे, उपसभापति महोदय, और उसी को कहकर अपनी बात खत्म करेंगे कि हमारे देश में जो सेकुलर राजनीति करने वाले लोग हैं, तथाकथित लोग हैं, वे पता नहीं मुसलमानों को क्या समझते हैं? यह कहा जाता है ओसामा जी, यानी भारतीय मुसलमानों का प्रतीक जो

हे, उसे आप ओसामा बिन लादेन को बनाना चाहते हैं। हमारे बिहार में दो-दो नेताओं ने, एक नेता यहां बैठे हुए हैं, चुनाव के समय लादेन के टोपे पहना कर लोगों को घुमाते थे। क्या आप मानते हैं कि भारतीय मुसलमानों का जो आदर्श है, प्रतीक जो है, वह ओसामा बिन लादेन है? आप मौलाना अबुल कलाम आजाद को मुसलमानों का आदर्श नहीं बनाते हैं, आप खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खान को मुसलमानों का आदर्श नहीं बनाते हैं, आप मोहम्मद करीम छागला को नहीं बनाते हैं, आप असगर अली इंजीनियर को नहीं बनाते हैं। कांग्रेस के लोग कम से कम रफीक जकारिया को तो याद कीजिए, उनकी किताबों को पढ़िए। उसमें जो दर्द है, हिन्दू और मुसलमानों के बीच जो अलगाव पैदा हो रहा है, उसका जो दर्द है, उसको तो आप समझिए। अपने आपको मुसलमानों का सरपरस्त करार देने के लिए आप ओसामा बिन लादेन के साथ हिंदुस्तान के मुसलमानों को ढोना चाहते हैं।

श्री उपसभापति: अच्छा, अब आप समाप्त करिए, शिवानन्द जी।

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: ओसामा बिन लादेन तो हिंदुस्तान के खिलाफ था। उसने खुलेआम डिक्लेयर किया था कि हिंदुस्तान से और अमरीका से हमको जंग लड़ना है।

श्री उपसभापति: बस, नहीं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: ओसामा बिन लादेन को मुसलमानों का पक्षधर बनाकर क्या आप उनको देशद्रोही साबित करना चाहते हैं? ऐसे लोग कम से कम जो सेकुलर लोग हैं, वे क्या मुसलमानों के हित की बात कर रहे हैं या उनको नुकसान पहुंचा रहे हैं?

श्री उपसभापति: आप खत्म कीजिए। श्री...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: ऐसे लोगों से देश को बचाना चाहिए। हम ऐसे लोगों से भी अपील करेंगे कि इस बात को ध्यान में रखें। इसी के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: उपसभापति जी, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं कि आपने मुझे इस विषय पर बोलने के लिए समय दिया। मैं श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी जी को भी धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं। हम लोग तो एक ही स्कूल के विद्यार्थी रहे हैं। वैसे वे आज बी.जे.पी. के साथ हैं, लेकिन थोड़ी-बहुत उनकी अंतरात्मा की आवाज आ ही जाती है। उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा कि ये लोग मुसलमानों को गाली देते हैं। मुसलमान लोग पूरे देश में अल्पसंख्यक हैं। जो बहुसंख्यक होता है, वह हमेशा superiority complex से ग्रसित होता है, जो अल्पसंख्यक होता है, वह हमेशा inferiority complex से ग्रसित होता है। कुछ लोग यहां गर्व से बोलते हैं कि हम हिन्दू हैं, लेकिन जब हम विदेशों में जाते हैं, ईसा मसीह के राज में जाते हैं, तो गर्व से हिन्दू नहीं बोल पाते हैं। इसलिए माइनॉरिटी की जो साइकोलॉजी है, उसको समझने की आवश्यकता है। मैं सिर्फ प्वाइंट कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति: इतना वक्त नहीं है।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: हमको बताया गया था कि हमें 7 मिनट का समय मिलेगा।

श्री उपसभापति: आप 5 मिनट ले लीजिए।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: ठीक है। पहली बात यह है कि मच्छर को हम डी.डी.टी. से मार सकते हैं, लेकिन जब तक गंदे नाले की सफाई नहीं होगी, मच्छरों का पैदा होना बंद नहीं होगा। यह उग्रवाद कहां-कहां पर है? उग्रवाद नॉर्थ-ईस्ट में है। नॉर्थ-ईस्ट में कौन लोग रहते हैं? नॉर्थ-ईस्ट में अधिकतर ईसाई लोग रहते हैं। उग्रवाद कश्मीर में है। कश्मीर में कौन-कौन लोग रहते हैं? कश्मीर में मुस्लिम लोग रहते हैं। पंजाब में उग्रवाद हुआ। पंजाब में कौन लोग रहते हैं। पंजाब में सिख लोग रहते हैं। वह पाकिस्तान का बॉर्डर है। तो नॉर्थ-ईस्ट बॉर्डर का इलाका है, पंजाब बॉर्डर का इलाका है, कश्मीर बॉर्डर का इलाका है और देश के भीतर हम नक्सलवाद को झेल चुके हैं। इसलिए हम कितना भी अच्छा घर बना लें, यदि उसकी चारदीवारी कमजोर रहेगी, तो घर में चोर के घुसने का डर रहेगा। आखिर इस उग्रवाद के पीछे कौन लोग हैं? उग्रवाद में एक तो माइनोरिटीज़ का नाम आता है, दूसरा वीकर सैक्शंस का नाम आता है। नक्सलवादियों का मामला जहां आएगा, माओवादियों का मामला जहां आएगा, वहां पर वीकर सैक्शंस का नाम आता है। जहां बाहरी आतंकवाद का नाम आएगा, वहां मुसलमानों का नाम आता है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब तक हम इन दोनों वर्गों की समस्याओं की ओर ध्यान नहीं देंगे, तब तक इसका हल नहीं निकलेगा। मनोहर जोशी जी ने ठीक कहा कि इसका root cause क्या है, इसके root cause पर हमको जाना चाहिए। अभी होम मिनिस्टर साहब यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं। हम लोग कश्मीर गए थे, हमारे साथ बी.जे.पी. की सुषमा स्वराज जी थीं, सी.पी.एम. के लोग भी थे। पिछले साल जून से लेकर सितंबर तक 110 बच्चों को गोली से उड़ा दिया गया, लेकिन कहीं उसके ऊपर कोई जांच नहीं हो रही है, कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हो रही है। एक बच्चा जो संगीन के साए में जन्म लेता है, संगीन के साए में आगे बढ़ने का काम करता है, वह यह सब देखता है और डिप्रेसन में चला जाता है। वह क्या समझेगा, उसके सामने कौन nationalist है, उसके सामने कौन सा religion है?

उपसभापति जी, दूसरी बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहूंगा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि कम्युनलिज्म और माओवादी देश के लिए खतरा हैं। मैं किसी का नाम नहीं लेना चाहूंगा। जब हम लोग पोस्टमार्टम करते हैं, ईमानदारी की बात करते हैं, जिसके बारे में हमारा साथी श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी जी ने कहा तथा दूसरे साथियों ने भी कहा, मैं किसी व्यक्ति का नाम नहीं लूंगा। अभी तक जो भी घटनाएं घटी हैं, उन घटनाओं की जांच CBI ने की है, उस CBI जांच के बारे में हम आपसे कहना चाहते हैं कि 2006 में मालेगांव की घटना घटी और दोबारा मालेगांव की घटना 19 सितम्बर 2008 को हुई। उसमें किन लोगों का नाम आया? * का नाम आया। उसके नेता कौन हैं, उनके विषय में मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूं। * का नाम आया।

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

5.00 P.M.

उसके नेता कौन हैं? उनके बारे में कहेंगे तो यह कहा जाएगा कि वे लोग यहां डिफेंड करने वाले नहीं हैं। 18 फरवरी को समझौता एक्सप्रेस की घटना हुई, उसमें किसका नाम था? * के प्रचारक का नाम था। नाम कहेंगे, तो बतला देंगे। *...(व्यवधान)... 18 मई, 2007 को मक्का मस्जिद विस्फोट हुआ, उसमें किसका नाम था? * का नाम था, नाम कहेंगे, तो वह भी बतला देंगे। 11 अक्टूबर, 2007 को अजमेर शरीफ की घटना घटी ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री विजय कुमार रूपाणी (गुजरात): सर, ये * का नाम क्यों ले रहे हैं? ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: ऑर्गेनाइजेशन का नाम नहीं लेना है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सर, मैं रिकॉर्ड की बात कर रहा हूं। ...(व्यवधान)... आप कहें तो मैं लिखकर दे दूंगा। आप कहें तो मैं लिखकर देने के लिए तैयार हूं। यह सी.बी.आई. की जांच कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है। ...(व्यवधान)... जेटली साहब को मालूम है। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार): जनता ने इनको वोट नहीं दिया, इसलिए यहां से वोट लेने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: देखिए ऑर्गेनाइजेशन का नाम आप मत लीजिए।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सर, यदि आप बम ब्लास्ट्स के विषय में चर्चा करते हैं, तो ईमानदारीपूर्वक पोस्टमार्टम होना चाहिए। सिर्फ मुसलमान का नाम लेकर कि सारे के सारे टेररिस्ट मुसलमान हैं, अभी हमारे साथी शिवानन्द तिवारी जी ने कहा कि हिंदू का नाम आएगा तो उसको गुस्सा आता है और मुसलमान का नाम आएगा तो आप लोग ताली बताएंगे। इस तरीके से देश चलता है क्या? ...(व्यवधान)... मैं नाम कर रहा हूं, रिकॉर्ड के मुताबिक नाम कह रहा हूं, इसलिए आप सुनिए। ...(व्यवधान)... सर, मैं चैलेंज करता हूं कि यदि यह गलत होगा और आप माफी मांगने के लिए कहेंगे, तो मैं माफी मांग लूंगा। ...(व्यवधान)... आपने कह दिया ओसामा बिन लादेन, मैं तो कुछ नहीं बोला। अब * का नाम आ रहा है, तो आपके पेट में दर्द क्यों हो रह है? सर, 4 जून को ठाणे सिनेमा हॉल में विस्फोट हुआ, यह होम मिनिस्टर बता रहे हैं। ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, इनका स्टेटमेंट है कि SIMI is a cultural organisation.

श्री रामविलास पासवान: ठीक है... ठीक है। सर, मुझे आपने टाइम दिया है...

श्री उपसभापति: नहीं, अब आप कन्क्लूड कीजिए।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: मैं होम मिनिस्टर से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वे बताएं कि 4 जून, 2008 को ठाणे सिनेमा हॉल में जो विस्फोट हुआ था, उसमें किसका हाथ था? होम मिनिस्टर बताएं कि क्या उसमें मुस्लिम लोग थे? बताएं

*Not recorded.

कि 19 सितम्बर, 2008 को मालेगांव में दूसरा बम विस्फोट हुआ, उसमें किसका नाम था? * का नाम लें तो इनको गुस्सा आने लगता है। सर, 16 अक्टूबर, 2008 को गोवा बम ब्लास्ट हुआ, उसमें किसका हाथ था? कौन है *? अगस्त, 2008 में कानपुर का बम विस्फोट हुआ, कानपुर के साथी यहां बैठे हुए हैं, बी.एस.पी. के लोग हैं। क्या * का उसमें हाथ नहीं था? क्या उसमें दो लोग मारे नहीं गए थे? * कौन है? उसने तहलका में भी कहा कि चालीस लोगों की हत्या की है और मौका मिलेगा तो और हत्या करूंगा। * बंगलौर का अध्यक्ष, * ने अंग्रेजी टी.वी. चैनल में कहा कि तीस लाख दो, जहां चाहे, दंगा करवा लो।

श्री उपसभापति: पासवान जी, आपके सात मिनट हो गए हैं, अब समाप्त कीजिए।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सर, मैं दो मिनट में खत्म करूंगा। सर, इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह मेरा अखबार नहीं है, यह "हिन्दू" अखबार है और इसमें किसने लिखा है? परवीन स्वामी ने लिखा है और क्या लिखा है? उसने लिखा है- Norwegian mass killer's manifesto hails Hindutva.

श्री उपसभापति: आप पेपर मत दिखाइए।

श्री रामविलास पासवान: परवीन स्वामी के संबंध में कोई नहीं कह सकता है कि वह मुसलमान का समर्थक है या किसी का समर्थक है, जो कम से कम * और बी.जे.पी. के लोग हैं। उसने कहा कि हमने जो प्रेरणा ली है, वह * के हिंदुत्व से ली है और पहले वहां नॉर्वे में घटना घटी तो लोगों ने समझा कि मुसलमान उग्रवादियों ने सबको मारा। बाद में मालूम हुआ कि मुसलमान उग्रवादी नहीं थे, वह White था और उसने कहा कि हम चाहते हैं कि यहां से जितने भी non White लोग मारे गए हैं, सबको यहां से हटा दिया जाए।...(समय की घंटी)... और एक प्वाइंट कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूं। उन्होंने "हिन्दू" में लिखा कि Norwegian mass killer Anders Behring Breivik hailed India's Hindu nationalist movement as a key ally in a globe struggle to bring down democratic regimes.

इसलिए जो इनके गुरुजी हैं, * थे...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: नाम निकाल दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)... नाम निकाल दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)... नाम निकाल दिया है, I have removed. ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: किसका नाम ले रहे हैं?...(व्यवधान)... सिमी को सांस्कृतिक संगठन कहते हैं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: इन्होंने यह जवाब नहीं दिया कि ओसामा बिन लादेन ...(व्यवधान)... इसके पीछे क्या मकसद है?...(व्यवधान)...

*Not recorded.

श्री उपसभापति: नाम निकाल दिया है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सर, गुरु जी का नाम हटा दीजिए।...(व्यवधान).... शिवानन्द तिवारी जी की कहने पर गुरु जी का नाम हटा दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: हटा दिया है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रामविलास पासवान: सर, मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप टेररिज्म के ऊपर बहस चलाते हैं, जब आप बम ब्लास्ट के ऊपर बहस चलाते हैं तो खुले दिमाग से बहस करनी चाहिए और एक समुदाय विशेष को पिन प्वाइंट करके, एक समुदाय विशेष को टारगेट बनाकर यदि आप काम करते रहेंगे, तो ठीक नहीं है। उधर से हमारे साथी पाशा जी ने ठीक कहा कि सिर्फ एक समुदाय में आप लोगों को टारगेट नहीं बना सकते हैं। सर, हम चाहते हैं कि जो घटना घटी है, उस घटना का पोस्टमार्टम होना चाहिए। हम होम मिनिस्टर साहब से आग्रह करेंगे कि जब भी अन्य जांच करते हैं तो इन संगठनों की भी जांच करो।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: रामविलास जी, आपने बहुत अधिक टाइम ले लिया है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रामविलास पासवान: * यह भी बताएं।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मोहम्मद अदीब: सर, बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया। आज के इस विषय पर कई बार बहस हो चुकी है।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: सर, ...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: अदीब साहब बोल रहे हैं, आप सुनिए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री मोहम्मद अदीब: सर, मैं यह चाहूंगा कि...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: यह नहीं होगा।...(व्यवधान).... Nothing will go on record.

श्री शिवानन्द तिवारी: *

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद: *

श्री रामविलास पासवान: *

श्री उपसभापति: आप लोग बैठिए।...(व्यवधान).... यह क्या हो रहा है? Nothing will go on record. आप बैठिए। Nothing will go on record. रवि शंकर जी, आप बैठिए। पुंज जी, आप भी बैठिए।...(व्यवधान).... यह क्या है? पुंज जी, आप बैठिए।...(व्यवधान).... शिवानन्द जी, आप भी बैठिए।...(व्यवधान).... देखिए, शिवानन्द जी, आप बिहार की सियासत यहां मत लाइए।...(व्यवधान).... प्लीज, पुंज जी, आप बैठिए।...(व्यवधान).... Hon. Members, I

*Not recorded.

have to take the sense of the House. It has been decided in the Business Advisory Committee that we complete the Short Duration Discussion; and the reply by the hon. Home Minister today itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Okay, Sir.

**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-contd.**

श्री मोहम्मद अदीब (उत्तर प्रदेश): मैं यह बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस हाउस में कई बार इस मुद्दे पर बहस हुई है। लेकिन बुनियादी यह है कि कल हमारे नायक साहब ने एक बात कही थी, जो बुनियादी बात थी कि टेररिज्म को डिफाइन कैसे किया जाए? यह एक बुनियादी मसला है कि टेररिज्म है क्या? अगर इराक खत्म किया जाता है और वहां मुल्क तबाह हो जाता है तो वह टेररिज्म नहीं कहलाता है। फिलिस्तीन का हक छीन लिया जाता है तो वह टेररिज्म नहीं कहलाता है। अगर किसी की मस्जिद तोड़ दी जाती है तो टेररिज्म नहीं कहलाता। इसलिए पहले ये चीजें तय होनी चाहिए कि टेररिज्म के मायने क्या हैं? अगर किसी ट्रेन में आग लगती है तो टेररिज्म होता है और वहां का मुजरिम सात साल तक जेल में रहता है। जब किसी घर में इंसान को जलाकर मार दिया जाता है, जो इस हाउस का मੈबर भी रह चुका होता है तो उसको तीन दिन के अंदर बेल भी दे दी जाती है - उसको क्या कहा जाएगा? यह बुनियादी मसला है। अगर पाकिस्तान इसमें शामिल है तो कतन और मुकम्मल तौर पर हम सबको मिलकर पाकिस्तान से इंतकाम लेना चाहिए। मेरी दुनिया को, मेरे मुल्क को बर्बाद करने वाला अगर कोई है तो उसे छोड़ना नहीं चाहिए। मुझे नहीं मालूम कि जिन लोगों ने मालेगांव में बम फोड़ा, वे कब पाकिस्तान से आए थे। मुझे नहीं मालूम की अजमेर शरीफ में जो बम फटा, वे पाकिस्तान कब गए थे और कब पाकिस्तान से आए थे? यह तय होना चाहिए था।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप उनको बोलने दीजिए।...(व्यवधान)... आप उनको बोलने दीजिए...(व्यवधान)... आप क्यों उठ रहे हैं, उनकी बात उनको बोलने दीजिए, अपनी बात आप बोलिए।...(व्यवधान)... आप बैठिए, आप नए मैम्बर हैं।

श्री मोहम्मद अदीब: जनाबे आली, हमारे होम मिनिस्टर को यह कहना पड़े कि इसलिए मेरे ऊपर यह इल्जाम लगाया जा रहा है। यह कितने अफसोस की बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान का एक होम मिनिस्टर यह कहता है कि साहब, मैंने कुछ अफ़राद पकड़े हैं इसलिए मेरे ऊपर इल्जाम लग रहा है। इस पर भी बहस होनी चाहिए। जब 26/11

का वाक्या हुआ था तो पिछली बार कहा था कि मैंने रात को तीन बजे टी.वी. पर देखा था कि शहीद करकरे के इंतकाल के ऊपर कुछ लोगों को जश्न मनाते हुए टी.वी. पर दिखाया जा रहा था। होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कभी मालूम नहीं किया कि वह कौन सा टी.वी. चैनल था, मैं उसका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ लेकिन उनको मालूम होना चाहिए। खुशियां मनाई गई थीं शहीद करकरे की शहादत पर, जब पहला फ्लेश आया था। तो यह भी हुआ कि मुम्बई में भी खुशियां मनाई गईं। मालूम करना चाहिए था कि वे कौन से पाकिस्तानी हैं जिन्होंने खुशियां मनाई थीं मुम्बई में या वे कौन से लोग हैं जो आज शहीद करकरे को कभी दुश्मन कहते थे फिर वह वतन का मौहब्बत करने वाला हो गया। यह ताली दोनों तरफ से बजती है, आज भी मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, मिनिस्टर साहब हैं नहीं, चार साल पहले मालेगांव के लोग बंद हुए थे, तो आज असीमानन्द ने कह दिया कि मैं मुजरिम हूँ। आज दोनों लोग जेलों में हैं। उनको आप कब तक जेलों में रखेंगे? यह कहा जाता है कि गवर्नमेंट सोफ्ट हो गई है। जरा हमारी तरफ आकर के देखिए तो बताऊं कि सोफ्ट क्या है। सात-सात सालों से लोग जेलों में बंद हैं। 34 लोगों के तो मुकदमें लड़कर मैंने छुड़वाए हैं सात साल के बाद। उन्होंने कोई जुर्म नहीं किया। हमारे दिलों में तो आकर झांकिए। सबसे पहले तो जरूरत इस बात की है कि अपने दिलों से नफरतें निकालिए, सबसे पहले जरूरत इस बात की है कि यह शक और शुबहा छोड़िए और यह तसव्वुर कीजिए कि यह मुल्क मेरा है। इस बार हमारी सरकार है या नहीं है, अगर सरकार पर यह मुसीबत आई हुई है तो हमको एक होना चाहिए, हमको जुड़ना चाहिए, क्योंकि वह वाक्यात जब अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी साहब थे, तब भी होते थे और आज भी हो रहे हैं। कुछ लोग ऐसे हैं जो हमारे मुल्क के पीछे लग गए हैं। लेकिन आपके जहनों में कुछ ऐसे जुल्म भर गए हैं जो सिर्फ नफरत की रोशनी देखना चाहते हैं। रस्मो-नफरत के चश्मे हमने लगा रखे हैं। लेकिन कभी हमारे दिलों से भी पूछा होता? आज एक सवाल यहां डाला गया था कि साहब, पोटा हटा दिया गया। पोटा में क्या जुल्म किया है, वह आपने कभी मालूम किया होता। हमारे बहुत ही सीनियर वकील हैं, मैं उनकी कद्र करता हूँ इसलिए कि पार्लियामेंट से ज्यादा टेलीविजन पर भी उनको देखता हूँ। टेलीविजन पर भी एक अलग हुकूमत चलती है इस मुल्क में। जो कुछ यहां नहीं होता वह टेलीविजन पर दिखाया जाता है। वहां रोज दूसरी पार्लियामेंट चलती है। यहां इसलिए मौजूद होता है कि पार्लियामेंट से ज्यादा टेलीविजन पर बात की जाए। पार्लियामेंट के नज़ाम को तोड़-फोड़ करके रख दिया गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ अपने सारे दोस्तों के साथ, वे इस तरफ के हों या उस तरफ के हों कि मुल्क बचाने की बात है, दिलों को जोड़ने की बात है। कैसे आप नाराज होते हैं? आपको मालूम है कि सन् 1947 में अगर जमीन बंटी है तो हकीकत यह है कि सन् 1992 में भी आपने दिलों को तोड़ा था। तो सन् 1992 में आपने दिल तोड़ करके नफरतें पैदा करदी थीं। आज मेरे नौजवानों को जो आप शक और शुबहा की निगाहों से देखते हैं उसकी वजह यह है कि उनकी दुनिया उजड़ गई। यह सब इल्जाम आपके ऊपर भी उतना ही आता है जितना दूसरों पर आता है। हमने अपने खून को बांटा था। हमारे भाई और हमारे

खानदान के लोग उस तरफ पाकिस्तान चले गए और हम इस जमीं पर आकर बैठे। हमको नेहरू, गांधी और मौलाना आजाद ने पुकार कर कहा था कि तुम इस मुल्क में रहोगे। यह मुल्क हमारा है, इस मुल्क के हम हिस्सेदार हैं। हमको मजबूर मत कीजिए कि जैसा नकवी साहब ने कहा कि हम किराएदार नहीं हैं, हम हिस्सेदार हैं और हम यही कहते हैं कि सेक्युलर मुल्क के अंदर रहकर हम अपना हिस्सा लेंगे। इस वक्त मुल्क पर खराब वक्त पड़ा हुआ है। इस वक्त ऐसा दुख पड़ा है कि दुनिया यह चाहती है कि मेरा मुल्क तरक्की न करने पाए। जिनको हम अपना आका समझते हैं, जो वाशिंगटन में बैठते हैं यह सब उनकी चालें हैं। आज पाकिस्तान के साथ वही पैसे देते हैं, वही लेकर आते हैं, वही हमें लड़वाते हैं और हम आपस में लड़ते हैं। इस वक्त बिल्कुल वाजिब तौर पर नफरतों ने हमको बीच में डाल रखा है और हुकूमत को मुश्किलात में डाल रखा है। ...**(समय की घंटी)**... हुकूमत की जिम्मेदारी बनती है, हमारी जिम्मेदारी बनती है कि हम हुकूमत का साथ दें और इस आतंकवाद से लड़ाई को खत्म करें। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

جناب محمد اديب (اتر پردیش) (Shri Mohd. AdeeB): میں یہ بات کہنا چاہتا

ہوں کہ اس ہاؤس میں کئی بار اس مدعے پر بحث ہوئی ہے۔ لیکن بنیاد یہ ہے کہ کل ہمارے نائک صاحب نے ایک بات کہی تھی، جو بنیادی بات تھی کہ ٹریریزم کو ڈیفائن کیسے کیا جائے؟ یہ ایک بنیادی مسئلہ ہے کہ ٹریریزم ہے کیا؟ اگر عراق ختم کیا جاتا ہے اور وہاں ملک تباہ ہو جاتا ہے تو وہ ٹریریزم نہیں کہلاتا ہے۔ فلسطین کا حق چھین لیا جاتا ہے تو وہ ٹریریزم نہیں کہلاتا ہے۔ اگر کسی کی مسجد توڑ دی جاتی ہے تو وہ ٹریریزم نہیں کہلاتا۔ اس لئے پہلے یہ چیزیں طے ہونی چاہئیں کہ ٹریریزم کے معنی کیا ہیں؟ اگر کسی ٹرین میں آگ لگتی ہے تو ٹریریزم ہوتا ہے اور وہاں کا مجرم سات سال تک جیل میں رہتا ہے۔ جب کسی گھر کے

*Transliteration in Urdu Script.

انسان کو جلا کر مار دیا جاتا ہے، جو اس ہاؤس کا ممبر بھی رہ چکا ہوتا ہے تو اس کو تین دن کے اندر بیل بھی دے دی جاتی ہے۔ اس کو کیا کہا جائے گا؟ یہ بنیادی مسئلہ ہے۔ اگر پاکستان اس میں شامل ہے تو قطعاً اور مکمل طور پر ہم سب کو مل کر پاکستان سے انتقام لینا چاہئے۔ میری دنیا کو، میرے ملک کو برباد کرنے والا اگر کوئی ہے تو اسے چھوڑنا نہیں چاہئے۔ مجھے نہیں معلوم کہ جن لوگوں نے مالیگاؤں میں ہم پھوڑا، وہ کب پاکستان سے آئے تھے۔ مجھے نہیں معلوم کہ اجمیر شریف میں جو ہم پھٹا، وہ پاکستان کب گئے تھے اور کب پاکستان سے آئے تھے؟ یہ طے ہونا چاہئے تھا۔۔۔(مداخلت)۔۔۔

شری اپ سبھا پتی : آپ ان کو بولنے دیجئے۔۔۔(مداخلت)۔۔۔ آپ ان کو بولنے دیجئے۔۔۔(مداخلت)۔۔۔ آپ کیوں اٹھ رہے ہیں، ان کی بات ان کو بولنے دیجئے، اپنی بات آپ بولنے۔۔۔(مداخلت)۔۔۔ آپ بیٹھئے، آپ نئے ممبر ہیں۔

جناب محمد ادیب : جناب عالی، ہمارے ہوم منسٹر کو یہ کہنا پڑا کہ اس لئے میرے اوپر یہ الزام لگایا جا رہا ہے۔ یہ کتنے افسوس کی بات ہے کہ ہندوستان کا ایک ہوم منسٹر یہ کہتا ہے کہ صاحب، میں نے کچھ افراد پکڑے ہیں اس لئے میرے اوپر الزام لگ رہا ہے۔ اس پر بھی بحث ہونی چاہئے۔ جب 26/11 کا واقعہ ہوا تھا تو پچھلی بار کہا تھا کہ میں نے رات کو تین بجے ٹی وی پر دیکھا تھا کہ شہید کرکری کے انتقال کو اوپر کچھ لوگوں کو جشن مناتے ہوئے ٹی وی پر دکھایا جا رہا تھا۔ ہوم منسٹر

صاحب نے کبھی معلوم نہیں کیا کہ وہ کون سا ٹی وی چینل تھا، میں اس کا نام نہیں لینا چاہتا ہوں لیکن ان کو معلوم ہونا چاہئے۔ خوشیاں منائی گئی تھیں شہید کرکے کی شہادت پر، جب پہلا فلیش آیا تھا۔ تو یہ بھی ہوا کہ ممبئی میں بھی خوشیاں منائی گئیں۔ معلوم کرنا چاہئے تھا کہ وہ کون سے پاکستانی ہیں جنہوں نے خوشیاں منائی تھیں ممبئی میں یا وہ کون سے لوگ ہیں جو آج شہید کرکے کر کبھی دشمن کہتے تھے پھر وہ وطن کا محبت کرنے والا ہو گیا۔ یہ تالی دونوں طرف سے جیتی ہے، آج بھی میں پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں، منسٹر صاحب ہے نہیں، چار سال پہلے مالیگاؤں کے لوگ بند ہوئے تھے، تو آج اسیما نند نے کہہ دیا کہ میں مجرم ہوں۔ آج دونوں لوگ جیلوں میں ہیں۔ ان کو آپ کب تک جیلوں میں رکھیں گے؟ یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ گورنمنٹ سافٹ ہو گئی ہے۔ ذرا ہماری طرف آکر کے دیکھئے تو بتاؤں کہ سافٹ کیا ہے۔ سات-سات سالوں سے لوگ جیلوں میں بند ہیں۔ 34 لوگوں کے تو مقدمے لڑ کر میں نے چھڑوائے ہیں سات سال کے بعد۔ انہوں نے کوئی جرم نہیں کیا۔ ہمارے دلوں میں تو آکر جھانکنے۔ سب سے پہلے تو ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ اپنے دلوں سے نفرتیں نکالئے، سب سے پہلے ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ یہ شک و شبہ چھوڑئیے اور یہ تصور کیجئے کہ یہ ملک میرا ہے۔ اس بار ہماری سرکار ہے یا نہیں ہے، اگر سرکار پر یہ مصیبت آئی ہوئی ہے تو ہم کو ایک ہونا چاہئے، ہم کو جڑنا چاہئے، کیوں کہ یہ واقعات جب اٹل بھاری واجپنی صاحب تھے، تب بھی ہوئے تھے اور آج بھی ہو رہے ہیں۔ کچھ

لوگ ایسے ہیں جو ہمارے ملک کے پیچھے لگ گئے ہیں۔ لیکن آپ کے ذہنوں میں کچھ ایسے زہر بھر گئے ہیں جو صرف نفرت کی روشنی دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں۔ نفرت کے چشمے ہم نے لگا رکھے ہیں۔ لیکن کبھی ہمارے دلوں سے بھی پوچھا ہوتا؟ آج یہ سوال یہاں ڈالا گیا تھا کہ صاحب، پوٹا ہٹا دیا گیا۔ پوٹا میں کیا ظلم ہوا ہے، یہ آپ نے کبھی معلوم کیا ہوتا۔ ہمارے بہت ہی سینئر وکیل ہیں، میں ان کی قدر کرتا ہوں اس لئے کہ پارلیمنٹ سے زیادہ ٹیلی ویژن پر بھی ان کو دیکھتا ہوں۔ ٹیلی ویژن پر بھی ایک الگ حکومت چلتی ہے اس ملک میں۔ جو کچھ یہاں نہیں ہوتا وہ ٹیلی ویژن پر دکھایا جاتا ہے۔ وہاں روز دوسری پارلیمنٹ چلتی ہے۔ یہاں اس لئے موجود ہوتا ہے کہ پارلیمنٹ سے زیادہ ٹیلی ویژن پر بات کی جائے۔ پارلیمنٹ کے نظام کو توڑ مروڑ کر رکھ دیا گیا ہے۔ میں چاہتا ہوں اپنے سارے دوستوں کے ساتھ، وہ اس طرف کے ہوں یا اس طرف کے ہوں، کہ ملک بچانے کی بات ہے، دلوں کو جوڑنے کی بات ہے۔ کیسے آپ ناراض ہوتے ہیں؟ آپ کو معلوم ہے کہ سن 1947 میں اگر زمین بنٹی ہے تو حقیقت یہ ہے کہ سن 1992 میں بھی آپ نے دلوں کو توڑا تھا۔ تو سن 1992 میں آپ نے دل توڑ کر کے نفرتیں پیدا کر دی تھیں۔ آج میرے نوجوانوں کو جو آپ شک و شبہ کی نگاہوں سے دیکھتے ہیں اس کی وجہ یہ ہے کہ ان کی دنیا اجڑ گئی۔ یہ سب الزام آپ کے اوپر بھی اتنا ہی آتا ہے جتنا دوسروں پر آتا ہے۔ ہم نے خون کو بانٹا تھا۔ ہمارے بھائی اور ہمارے خاندان کے لوگ اس طرف پاکستان چلے گئے

اور ہم اس زمیں پر آکر بیٹھے۔ ہم کو نہرو، گاندھی اور مولانا آزاد نے پکار کر کہا تھا کہ تم اس ملک میں رہو گے۔ یہ ملک ہمارا ہے، اس ملک کے ہم حصہ دار ہیں۔ ہم کو مجبور مت کیجئے کہ جیسا نقوی صاحب نے کہا کہ ہم کرائے دار نہیں ہیں، ہم حصہ دار ہیں اور ہم یہی کہتے ہیں کہ سیکولر ملک کے اندر رہ کر ہم اپنا حصہ لیں گے۔ اس وقت ملک پر خراب وقت پڑا ہوا ہے۔ اس وقت ایسا دکھ پڑا ہے کہ دنیا یہ چاہتی ہے کہ میرا ملک ترقی نہ کرنے پائے۔ جن کو ہم اپنا آقا سمجھتے ہیں، جو واشنگٹن میں بیٹھتے ہیں یہ سب ان کی چالیں ہیں۔ آج پاکستان کے ساتھ وہی پیسے دیتے ہیں، وہی لے کر آتے ہیں، وہی ہمیں لڑواتے ہیں اور ہم آپس میں لڑتے ہیں۔ اس وقت بالکل واجب طور پر نفرتوں نے ہم کو بیچ میں ڈال رکھا ہے اور حکومت کو مشکلات میں ڈال رکھا ہے۔۔۔ (وقت کی گھنٹی)۔۔۔ حکومت کی ذمہ داری بنتی ہے، ہماری ذمہ داری بنتی ہے کہ ہم حکومت کا ساتھ دیں اور اس آتک واد سے لڑائی کو ختم کریں۔ بہت

بہت شکریہ۔

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have been discussing, since yesterday, the issue of national security, particularly in the wake of the 13th July blasts at three places in Mumbai. Needless to say, the blasts and the actions accompanying them, have to be condemned and have been rightly condemned by every section of this House. They are condemnable and also worrisome for this country. Our worries, Sir, also

increase because three weeks after the blasts, it appears that we do not have serious clues as to who the real culprits are. This attack on Mumbai is actually in a series of attacks where Mumbai has been repeatedly attacked. It started in 1993 with a serial blast in Mumbai. Then you have several important isolated cases which caused extensive damage. Then you had the train blasts. And then was the major 26/11 blast, the attack through the sea route. The 26/11 attack through the sea route, clearly from across the border, after the 9/11, perhaps, has been one of the most major terrorist strikes anywhere in the world. Now you have the 13th July attack where three crowded areas in Mumbai were picked up and bombs were planted in a structured manner in those areas. One of the questions which arises is: Why is Mumbai, repeatedly, chosen for such attacks? I have been closely following the statements of the Home Minister. He has carefully avoided answering the questions saying, "I know the answer; I have a hunch, but I do not want to really specify the reasons". I don't think, Sir, the reasons are a matter of great research being required or they are any closely guarded secret. The attack on Mumbai which comes in this entire chain, increases the credibility and visibility of the terrorist outfit which organizes all attacks. That is why Mumbai is repeatedly chosen. The cities like Mumbai and Delhi, when they are chosen for attack by the outfits, their own visibility, their own credibility as a terrorist organization also gets noticed all over the world.

Secondly, Sir, when these attacks are successful and not prevented, attacks on a place like Mumbai end up resulting in exposing the weakness of our security system. If these people can enter with ammunition, go to a number of places, plant them and then escape, how many people would be involved in organizing this? Those who manufacture these bombs, those who purchase ammonium nitrate and other such chemicals, those who provide the logistical support, transportation, escape, money and, maybe, finally even legal defence, are all involved in this. It always puzzles me that this exposes the weakness of our security system when terrorists infiltrate into the city and successfully organize these blasts.

I beg to differ with the Home Minister when he said, on the morning of 14th at Mumbai, that it was not an intelligence failure. The fact that so many people were involved, the fact that they successfully organized these blasts and managed to escape, the fact the intelligence agencies did

not know any of these things, that they had not infiltrated into these modules, is, itself, an intelligence failure. That the intelligence not knowing any of these things, when so many people must have been involved in this whole conspiracy to commit these ghastly crimes, is an intelligence failure. I think he understands intelligence failure as meaning that the intelligence had not informed and, therefore, nobody had an opportunity to act on the basis of the intelligence information. There is a fundamental difference between the two. The difference being that if the executing agency, normally, the police in Maharashtra, did not have the intelligence information, then, that is a separate issue. If intelligence information had been given and the Mumbai police had not acted, then, that would be a failure of the executing agency. There is a difference when the intelligence agency does not inform you that so many people in these modules are acting in this manner, that they have entered, and a likely warning is given, then, we admit that it is an intelligence failure. The third reason, I come back, why Mumbai is repeatedly chosen is because it is a commercial capital centre of India. And when India's commercial centre is attacked, then, obviously, it catches the global attention. And, fourthly, - I say this with a sense of regret - on an issue where all of us should really be speaking the same language in the national interest, Mumbai is chosen also for reasons that once Mumbai is attacked and people are identified, irrespective of those who are there, you always find people, keeping the character of the city in mind, who will come up and say, "People have been wrongly harassed and, therefore, let us now go soft on this." I shall, in the course of my intervention, try to highlight this point as well. Mumbai having been repeatedly attacked, after the attack, now, a debate starts in this country about the spirit of Mumbai. I am, at times, puzzled that these days on public issues, rather than political thinkers and political leaders, as our colleagues just now rightly mentioned, there is now a convention to get the cinema and fashion celebrities, to give an opinion on serious subjects. So, they always say that the spirit of Mumbai is that yesterday we were attacked and today morning we are all normal. The resilience of Mumbai is the only spirit of Mumbai. Well; resilience is a good thing. Plurality is a good thing. To come back to normalcy is a good thing. Not retaliating is a good thing. But that alone can't be the spirit of Mumbai. The spirit of Mumbai can't be that it gets attacked repeatedly and then gets ready to wait for the next attack. This is the sad history of Mumbai. The real spirit of Mumbai has to be that it has to influence each one of us, those in Government, those in Opposition, those in building public opinion in this country, to resolve, to have a system in this country where nobody

really dare attack Mumbai ever again or, for that matter, any other part of India. If the spirit of Mumbai can lead us to that destination, I think, we would all be discharging our national responsibility much better. The question which then arises is: if you are to reach that destination, that this should be the last attack and that Mumbai should never be attacked again or any other part of India should never be attacked again, then, how do you fight this menace of terrorism? You don't fight it by dividing ourselves into categories of 'your terror' or 'my terror'. Sir, I have always believed that the first essential condition required for any society to fight terror is: does it have the political will to fight terror? I have always believed that after 9/11, not many have dared attack Manhattan or, for that matter, United States ever again. Yesterday, we were at a function where the Home Minister corrected me by saying that the attack did take place. But there is a serious doubt about that whether that was because of an association with a radical organization or because of mental illness. I won't get into that controversy. But there are societies which have been targeted by terrorists and which have shown a resolve and determination to make sure that they are never attacked again. Terrorists may still slip in. No security system can be foolproof.

But do we have that political will? Every time we have a policy, somebody decides to pull down that policy. And I have not the least doubt that we must finally have to make a choice: will India's national security and internal security be guided only by security consideration or will it be guided by other collateral facts? You take a hard line on national security, and that is a correct line to take; then, you will have, for some time, to abandon this thought as to who it hurts. It must hurt only those who indulge in these acts. Those who do not indulge in these acts have nothing to fear about. There is some kind of compromise which takes place with our own freedom and our own human rights. We all do not like being frisked wherever we go. But we are in a vulnerable society which can be repeatedly attacked. There are precautions that the society and the system has to take. Let us not, then, get up and say, "Well, you take this step. This step is, ostensibly, against terrorism but it is intended against a community". No aspersion should be cast on a community; it should only be against the terrorists. And to the extent that you need hard measures, even if they compromise a little with our human rights, then, you will have to take hard measures, and you must have the political will to take those measures.

Sir, a determination to counter terror will have three steps essentially. The first step is your security and intelligence system which prevents terror. Your second step is: if despite that a terrorist

attack takes place, your ability to contain that attack. The third step is: you must have a tough and a fair system so that you are able to inflict, after an honest investigation, a punishment on the man who does it, and that punishment, then, ends up acting as a deterrent for others who want to commit terror.

Therefore, we must have the system, both Intelligence and security, to prevent a terrorist act, to contain an attack when it is on, with our Quick Response Teams and so on. There are several questions. Then, of course, the hon. Foreign Minister is here and we have the privilege of his presence at the moment. Our foreign policy considerations, Sir, also have to factor this in mind that we have to effectively use our foreign policy as an instrument to isolate those nations and societies which make terror as an instrument of their State policy.

Sir, let us honestly introspect. As a society, have we shown our political will? And when I am saying this, I am not only referring to politics, I will refer to other instruments of Indian society also. Much was debated just now about POTA and TADA. An anti-terror law only comes in after the act is committed. It does not prevent a terrorist attack. After a terrorist act is committed, you investigate under special powers; you give a punishment to the person and that punishment will act as a deterrent so that in future the act is not committed again. That is the objective of the law. An anti-terror law is not a replacement for an intelligence agency. It is not a replacement for the security personnel. Those people will do their tasks separately. Let us look at our own track record and let me give a few illustrations. The late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, when he was in power, brought in TADA. At that time, we had a problem in Punjab. Even the serious problem in Kashmir had not started; it was around mid-80s. The present Home Minister was then Internal Security Minister, and he had piloted the law. It was completely well-intentioned because terrorism was raising its head in this country. There were complaints that in some parts of India it was misused; it could have been amended to stop the possibility of its abuse. Nobody then said, 'repeal it'. This law was then not against any community. The maximum misuse took place in the late 80s in Gujarat, where farmers were arrested under this law. Then, somebody stepped in and said, 'you cannot use it against farmers.' It was used in Punjab, it was used in several other parts of India. It was used in Assam. You had insurgency

in Assam in those days. Finally, it was used in 1993 in the Mumbai blasts. Now, the 1993 Mumbai blasts were admittedly terrorist acts; you had a series of blasts at various places. Overnight, you found a campaign for a repeal of TADA because it was used in Mumbai. The Narasimha Rao Government had no option because of this campaign, and that had to repeal TADA. When the next anti-terror law came, you said that it is anti-secular; it is anti-minority.

Look at some of the more serious cases. And this is not for punishing the innocents. Home Minister is a very eminent lawyer. Look at the Parliament attack case. But for some of the special provisions in that law, but for an anti-terror law, which was applicable at that time, you would not have been able to convict the terrorists.

Look at the Akshardham case. I always believe that even though, finally, the accused were convicted only under the IPC in the assassination case of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the rules of evidence of TADA were used by a logic that the Supreme Court gave. And it is only because those rules of evidence were used that some people could be convicted for the assassination of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

So, the moment the political pressure started, other considerations came in and you said, 'We have to repeal the law.' Today, look at the campaign. What is the campaign? "Withdraw the Armed Forces (Special Provisions) Act." You have insurgency but you cannot withdraw the Armed Forces (Special Provisions) Act. Even if you withdraw the Army from some regions, you will have to keep the State Police; you will have to keep the CRPF. All that the law says is that before you prosecute a police officer or an army officer, you need a sanction. So, the whole objective is to remove the sanction so that those who are involved in separatist activities in the Valley can start endlessly prosecuting the army officers and the police officers! Let the Home Minister tell us how many applications for sanction are pending today with the Governments, State and Centre. Give them a free hand to prosecute. Then, we start saying, "Oh! It is absolutely a law which requires to be withdrawn!"

How do you fight an organisation like Lashkar-e-Taiba? Unless we delink this fight from domestic politics and look at it only as a security concern, how do we fight? Today, this is not the occasion, but I will only refer to it and not discuss it in detail. You have the case and the Home

Minister knows it well. He and I will probably differ in our final assessment, in whose connection a Central Intelligence has warned the States as an LeT operative. When the States succeed in an action against them, the Central Government supports the State action, and then politics prevails. You withdraw the affidavit of the Central Government, replace it by an affidavit. And, accordingly, if you remember, what happened, the Lashkar-e-Taiba in its website said, "So and so has become a shaheed, one of our activists." When the Central Government withdrew the affidavit, the Lashkar-e-Taiba also withdrew the obituary. Sir, this is not the way how terror is to be fought. When we start blinking, then the others realise that this is a State which can blink on pressure, one or the other. I am conscious of the kind of pressure the Home Minister and his Government has had to face on the Delhi encounter in Batla House, an admittedly case of separatist terrorists. You had the NHRC going into the matter; you had the courts going into the matter. They all agreed with his Ministry and his Government's assessment, and yet you had repeated efforts of India's domestic politics, and even the Congress Party's domestic politics, intervening to somehow describe those who were culpable as innocent and describe the security as somebody who is culpable. Instead of visiting the house of the police officer or the security officer who lost his life, people start visiting the houses of those who were being accused. This is not the spirit with which a society is able to fight terror, Sir.

What has recently happened? I have no difficulty if you take action against some people who threaten law and order. We have a controversy on. I don't want to give a final opinion on that controversy. Where should one group of citizens sit on a fast from 16th August? The Government feels, "Well, we won't allow the heart of New Delhi, where the other citizens' group had sat on their protest; Ramlila Ground or otherwise. So, Mr. Hazare and Baba Ramdev can't sit at these places. Did we have the courage to show the same spirit where dozen different varieties of separatists came to Delhi and wanted to hold a meeting within yards of the seat of the Central Government? They came here; they came to Lutyens Delhi; they sat here. Before the entire country and the world they made speeches how India is to be broken up. Speeches were made. They were not only separatists from the Valley, they were separatists of different variety. As though they are forming a union or a

confederation, each one said, "The whole idea of India is incorrect. India can never be one country." These were the speeches made. The Home Ministry felt, "No, no, these are the people, whom we should not move out of this place." Sedition - these were seditious speeches - was passed off as a free speech. So, our entire liberal approach surfaced when we found these separatists. We will use kid gloves to tackle them, and use harsh means to tackle the 16th August fast or the earlier action which was taken at Ramlila Ground. Now, if this is, Sir, the approach, not only of the Government, this is the approach of anyone of us, for any colour of terrorism, then that is not how we can really safeguard India's security. Let us look back at 26/11. I only want to urge the Home Minister that the anti-terror policy should not merely be judged from the approach which the Government or his Ministry has adopted in the last 32 months of his tenure. There has been a long-standing policy and, therefore, let us judge the whole thing. When 26/11 took place, where did we stand at that time? How were we caught unawares? Have you had some Intelligence information before that? Sir, I have been reading a lot of material on this and the situation of India or our security apparatus on 26/11 is best described in the following words. Mr. Chidambaram will find these words very familiar and I am quoting them from his speech he delivered, the Intelligence Bureau Centenary Endowment Lecture on 23rd of December, 2009. This was his own description and I quote him. "The Security establishment was in disarray and numerous questions were being asked. Had the Intelligence failed? Did the first responder, the Mumbai Police, prove to be totally inadequate? Was the famed National Security Guard too slow to get off the block? Did the leadership of the Police let down its own men? Did the Central forces take too long to neutralize ten terrorists? Did the Centre and the State Government fail to provide a strong leadership? Did the management system collapse? Did the country pay a heavy price before it repulsed the terrorist attack? Did the Government fail to believe in mounting a swift counter on the perpetrators of terror." The Home Minister said, "I know the answers but I won't give them." Sir, when no answers are given the reason for not giving the answers is also at times obvious. Undoubtedly, the answers to most of these questions were, 'yes'. He then suggested a vision for the future and his vision for the future had several aspects. He first

said, 'Let us first set up a National Investigating Agency.' Some people here and outside the State Government had doubts that the National Investigating Agency may impinge on the federal structure. Some speeches to that effect were also made, but because of considerations of national security we decided to support it. He then suggested that the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act will have to be expanded and according to him the amendments to the Act was an admission that the repeal of the Anti-terrorist Law had left a vacuum. So, barring two major areas of difference, he brought back every provision of quota and I can assure some colleagues who use the words, 'these provisions in a society which is to fight terror are essential'. Then, don't compare them with any law of the past. These are new emerging situations. He then said, "lets have a National Intelligence Grid where everybody who collects information and there are dozens of agencies, has to share that information and that India needs a national centre for counter terrorism." Sir, this was in 2008, and now we are in 2011, and almost three years have passed. Where do we stand? Even the NIA did not investigate 26/11. I am a great personal sympathizer and a supporter of these investigative and Intelligence agencies because of their work being done in national interest, and if excesses are committed by any one of them, the system must be vigilant; we must have checks and balances to correct them. Sir, besides the questions he raised on 26/11, how is it that after investigating the whole case in which several people must have been involved-look at the system that we have — we ended up convicting one man?

We have convicted that one man. And, convicting him was no rocket science. He was there with a weapon in front of us all, before the cameras and going about shooting and killing people. He was caught red-handed. And, he, obviously, had to be convicted. Our internal investigative system ended up convicting one man alone for an attack which was, probably, one of the most powerful attacks anywhere in the world after 9/11. It took no time for the FBI in the US to find out who David Hadley was and who Mr. Rana was. We had some evidence about Pakistan's involvement. But, it was really the Chicago Trial which gave us such conclusive evidence in terms of the involvement of both LeT and the ISI. It was these evidences that we got helped us. I am sure there must have been some domestic evidences also. But the trial itself was ended up in convicting only one man. One purpose the Chicago Trial served was that it completely demolished and obliterated the distinction between State actors and non-State actors in Pakistan. The Let is, ostensibly, a non-State actor. The ISI is a State actor. But, this was completely controlled and the handlers of this attack were in the Pakistan's official agency.

Sir, the National Counter Terrorism Centre has still not become functional; I hope it does. I would only urge the hon. Home Minister one thing. We have followed, through the media, the

arguments and the counter-arguments in setting up of the National Intelligence Grid. I am sure, the Government will, in its wisdom, take all steps keeping two facts in mind. And, these are my causes of worry. In any intelligence grid, actionable intelligence intended to be shared. Sharing actionable intelligence has its own dangers; generic intelligence should be shared. But, actionable intelligence, with specifics, can never be put on such grids. You can never put intelligence on the grid that we know who is staying, say in a house in Abbottabad. The moment you did it, it will be counter productive. One agency may not be willing to share with the other agencies, which is the executing agency.

The second one is this. This, I am sure, is what Mr. Ganguly mentioned about the cyber terrorism and those who use cyber space to invade. Unless we are doubly sure that we have built up fire walls around our grids, it is dangerous to put anything on the grid. The leaks in the US are from such grids. They have come and set the entire world wondering. Therefore, when we become over enthusiastic about these grids and sharing of intelligence and putting it on the grid, the need to know must be kept in mind - who is entitled to know how much, what is not to be shared must also be kept in mind and nothing should be shared till you are able to build fire walls around the sharing mechanism. I hope, all this is kept in mind before these proposals are put into action.

As I said, we have the opportunity that Shri Krishna is here. I come to the Foreign Policy initiative. In India's case, in fighting terror, the Foreign Policy initiatives are extremely important. It is an important instrument for us. Sir, unquestionably, three facts are clear. The hon. Minister says that we live in a disturbed neighbourhood. Some hon. Members have said that this is the most dangerous border in the world. 'The Economists' had a cover story almost using the same language. We have a State in the neighbourhood which has used terror as an instrument of State Policy. We have a nation in the neighbourhood which has become an epicenter of global terror. You have a situation where there is hardly a terror attack anywhere in the world, and some news items have initially indicated that in the recent attack in China Pakistan's hand or a Pakistan connection is always there..whether it is the blasts in the underground trains in London or major attacks in India or in the United States or anywhere in the world. Today, we are, for the first time, reaching a situation where there is a global

convergence on how you deal with a State, which has a nuclear arsenal, which has terror, which has a lack of positive agenda, and which has a lack of great economic development. How does the world deal with a State of this kind? It is a State which is not merely living in denial. That was something we used to say years ago. Today, it is a State which is living in deceit. They are a friend of America, an ally of America, in America's war against terror. They are, simultaneously, an ally of the enemies of America in the war against terror. It is a State which can perform both roles. One important think-tank in the U.S., one of their important spokespersons talking about our neighbour, recently said, "Pakistan is an ally, not a friend. India is not an ally, but, still a friend." That's how they started looking at us and the situation in this region. The Afghan-Taliban was created and supported, virtually, by the ISI. They still want America to have a dialogue or an entry route for them. The Lashkar-e-Taiba was similarly created as an alternative front which was India-centric. It started the blasts in India. That is where the connection of all this security comes in.

When they were found out and action taken in various parts of the world, they kept changing names. Somebody then started operating when there was a different regime in Bangladesh. Huji was there, and the JuD was there. And, then, you had, before the ban on the SIMI took place, - there were several incidents with which SIMI was connected - the armed faction of the SIMI or the wing of the SIMI which was organising this. When they were found out and banned, you now have the Indian Mujahideens. How do we, Sir, use our foreign policy initiatives in combating this? A lot of these activities may even take place by home-grown terrorists and they are externally inspired. Some of these Organisations are externally funded. They are also externally created. Therefore, it is simply said, in the absence of any other alternative, we will continue to engage. The Government sees virtue in engagements. But, please bear in mind that even when you engage, one of the foremost issues you have to raise— one can always negotiate the side issues which are in the grey areas — is; what was contained in the January 2004 understanding between them and us? How can there be a fruitful engagement if your territory is used for terrorist strikes against us? You can always engage. Soz sahib just now said, we want a stable Pakistan. Of course, everybody wants a stable Pakistan. We

want a stable neighbourhood. But if you get a stable neighbourhood which is more transparent, where there is civilian authority, where there is less radicalisation, it will be always welcome. But if you have a situation where the society gets radicalised, the society continues to use terror, the State instruments continue to use terror, the Armed Forces get radicalised, the civilian establishment gets weakened, transparency in the society goes down. Then, in a such case, the outcome of the engagement will be determined not by the fact that we are talking to them, but it will be determined by what their internal developments are. And those internal developments must come on the right track. Your foreign policy initiatives with them and with the rest of the world must be used to find out how we deal with the society which has all these issues which arise out of this.

Sir. I would urge the Home Minister not to take any satisfaction out of this fact that there have been only two terrorist strikes of this kind during his tenure. ...(*Interruptions*)... These are two main strikes. I am not going into Sheetla Ghat or any of these strikes. I am not going into those details. If you are able to lead the nation and overcome this menace, we all stand in one voice behind you. We wish you all success; this is not a battle we can afford to lose. But the fact is that you have various kinds of problems in this country. You may not call what has happened in some States in the North East as terrorism; you may call it as insurgency. You may call the Maoist activities as Left Wing extremism. The Indian society and segments within blink when you fight terror. Even in your battle against Maoists, this has happened. We have repeatedly discussed that issue here. I have always said that Maoism is not a poverty eradication programme. This is a violent movement which wants to overthrow India's Parliamentary democracy.

Therefore, when States take up the fight against them, we take various kinds of social and economic actions. I don't think there is a dispute. You must develop those regions. You must give tribals the full justice and the benefit of economic development. But, then, to do that, to build roads, to build schools, to build institutions, you need the land free from landmines. And, therefore, when you need it free from landmines, you will have to take some security steps. All of us felt very strongly when you, initially, as Home Minister, in your early days in this Ministry, said that these were the steps we would take. We saw discordant voices amongst your friends. From the Left to the Right, everybody supported you. I do not want to go into the details because we have discussed it at length. But, Sir, we have talked about the weakness of the Indian States in dealing with this. I have

6.00 P.M.

dealt with the weakness of our political system and our concern for vote banks. Look at how other institutions look at it. I must confess, Sir, that I am extremely disturbed about what recent pronouncements in this matter have come. We had one precedent and I thought we will wish it away where in Kashmir, our security forces were fighting with the militants who were holed into a place of worship.

The Supreme Court decided that how many calories must be fed to the terrorists on each day. Judges don't fight terror; Governments do; security forces do. Therefore, this was one area where I thought the whole concept, which is so vital to our democracy of separation of powers, was being weakened. When I read, I find that from 1861 onwards, the Police establishment of this country, the security establishment has been aided actively by civilians. The 1861 Police Act, almost 150 years as of today, says that you must have special police officers. The Home Minister will say that "we are understaffed and we are trying to cover it up." So, from traffic to law and order, members of the community are taken to aid the community, to help the community and to protect the community. What were the Village Protection Committees in Punjab? These are Special Police Officers. So, one or two people in every village will get up and protect the village. Today, in Doda, Kishtwar, Soz Sahib will know, in Rajouri, you have the Village Protection Committee comprising of special police officers. You have had them in Maoist-infested areas. You have them in the North-Eastern States. These are not merely employment generating methods. Now, when I read the observations of the Court on these issues, I don't mind, Sir, repeating what I have said in print. "It appears that instead of leaving security issues to the Government of the day, ideology of the authors of the judgement now becomes the ground for determining constitutionality."

Sir, since this is now the law declared, I am sure, the Minister will have no objection if I read out two or three paragraphs. I am quoting it. These are stray paragraphs. I quote, "People do not take up arms, in an organized fashion, against the might of the State, or against fellow human beings without rhyme or reason. Guided by an instinct for survival, and according to Thomas Hobbes, a fear of lawlessness that is encoded in our collective conscience, we seek an order. However, when that order comes with the price of dehumanization, of manifest injustices of all forms penetrated against

the weak, the poor and the deprived, people revolt." So, this is the rationale why people revolt and pick up arms.

The next, Sir, is this, and I quote. "Thus the same set of issues, particularly those related to land, continue to fuel protest politics, violent agitator politics, as well as armed rebellion.... Are governments and political parties in India are able to grasp the socio-economic dynamics encouraging these politics or are they stuck with a security-oriented approach that further fuels them?" Sir, I don't think our constitutional mechanism ever took away this responsibility from the Government. Judicial review, enforcement of law is a domain of the court. But what should be the approach, security or otherwise, is a matter entirely left to the Government. This guides the approach in the matter of how insurgency or left-wing extremism is to be handled. It further says, "Rather than heeding to such advice which echoes the wisdom of our Constitution, what we have witnessed in the present proceedings have been repeated assertions of inevitability of muscular and violent statecraft." So, if people lay down land mines, if they go about killing security staff, demolishing schools, dispensaries, hospitals, roads, it is violent statecraft.

SHRI D. RAJA: If the State violates the Directive Principles of the Constitution how will the people react?

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: If the State violates, the courts must step in.

SHRI D. RAJA: If the Government policies are anti-poor, what will the people do?
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: If the Government's policies are anti-poor, the Government should be voted out. The Government should be protested against on the streets. The courts must step in and say, 'the Government must then act as per law.' But the courts will not say, 'this is the reason why people have turned violent and you must go as a Home Minister and offer a satyagrah before them.' Don't use what the court chooses to describe as violent statecraft. They can go about killing people and then you are to be removed for the fallouts.

Sir, I am not reading the entire text. There are other aspects of this which have nothing whether it is a separatist or an unlawful act of a State. Centre or States should really rationalize this kind of an approach, and in a country which is torn by various forms of extremism, today you have a situation where thousands of SPOs all over the country are removed. Now, I am not so sure whether

the Home Minister can advise the States and the Central organizations to immediately recruit lakhs of people. The result of this was that within two days of this judgment, the Maoists are now giving to the Special Police Officers conditions for amnesty. The conditions for amnesty are, 'you come and join us, we will leave you.' The dice is loaded in their favour. Sir, when I said the political establishment must not blink, there are various aspects of the Indian State, whether it is the media or it is the Police or the State Governments or political parties or courts or institutions, are we going to allow every establishment to start blinking in a case where 210 districts are influenced by Maoism?

The North-East areas have their own problems in some States, which we are trying to resolve; in Jammu & Kashmir, trouble is created from across the border, and then, sporadic attacks elsewhere in the country also take place. Now, if the Government or a State Government violates human rights, the courts must step in. That is their jurisdiction, but how they are to fight insurgency is a matter which is entirely to be determined by the policy of the Governments, whether Centre or the State. Therefore, I would like the response of the Union Home Minister and the Government as to how they intend to deal with this situation.

Sir, lastly, as I said, this is not a battle that we can afford to lose. Now, how do we fight it? Do we have the political will to fight it? Are we going to be over-partisan in doing so? Or, are we going to fight it only on the basis of considerations of national security? We must address the causes which cause such a situation. But then, no effort should be made to weaken the will of the Indian society in order to fight this menace of terrorism and separatism. That is why, we are glad that the Foreign Minister is here. That is an important instrument he has at his disposal that could be used. And I am sure, if the Government of the day looks forward and brings out a policy and an approach with the support and in coordination with the States, we can hope that this is the last time that Mumbai or any other part of India is attacked in this manner.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to the Members of this House who have raised this discussion on terrorism, with special reference to the very sad and condemnable terror attack that took place in Mumbai on July 13 this year. I am grateful to our senior leader, Dr. Manohar Joshi, for initiating the debate and I am grateful to Shri Arun Jaitley, the Leader of the Opposition, who wound up the debate with a very spirited speech.

Sir, we are dealing with a complex subject. As long as there is violence here and violence there, we could deal with it as a law and order problem or, at best, a problem affecting public order, but I think terrorism takes the subject to a new dimension. It is not a simple law and order problem, nor is it a problem affecting public order. It goes beyond that. It affects the nation's security. In fact, it may even affect the nation's survival as one nation.

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition and I were present at a book release function. The name of the book should be a wake-up call to all of us. The title of the book was 'Indian Mujahideen - The Enemy Within'. Both of us jointly released that book and some of the points that I will make now I had made yesterday, very briefly.

We live in the most troubled and most vulnerable neighbourhood in the world. There have been other hotspots in the world. For a while it was Palestine, Israel, Lebanon and Syria. But now the epicentre of terror has shifted to the Afghanistan-Pakistan area, and we are the immediate neighbour. Therefore, let us make no mistake that as long as the epicentre of terror is in this region, we will continue to be under the shadow of terror threats.

It is something which we cannot wish away. Dr. Ganguly said, "We can make our history but we cannot re-write our geography." Adding to that, there are either weak States or fragile States around us. Even as Bhutan moves towards democracy, we find Nepal struggling to hold on to its very fragile democratic system. Bangladesh is fighting forces that threaten her democracy; Sri Lanka is still driven by conflict. So, I think we must acknowledge the fact that we will live under the shadow of terror and we must, therefore, recognize the gravity of the challenge that faces us. Sir, initially we took comfort in the thought that terrorism was cross-border terrorism; it was imported and it came from across the border. That was true. There is no gainsaying the fact that terrorism came from across the border. It started in Kashmir and it has been with us for many many years in Kashmir. Some terrorists came from Bangladesh; many find the Myanmar-Bangladesh route as a convenient route; some come through Nepal and then many of them penetrated deep into the Indian hinterland. Every time a terror attack took place, we pointed the finger at our neighbour and said you are the

cause. That finger pointing was not wrong because at that time that was largely the cause. Most terrorists who committed acts of terror in India were trained, funded, handled and pushed into India to commit acts of terror. The new reality is, that's not the only source of terror any more. We today have home-grown terror groups. We can go into the history of these groups. I can spend several minutes talking to you about SIMI and how SIMI has morphed into the Indian Mujahideen. I can talk to you about the modules of Indian Mujahideen; I can talk about other groups which are operating in India. The second fact that we must realize is even while we live under the shadow of terror in this neighbourhood, many terror groups are home-grown terror groups. These are modules which are totally Indian. They may be inspired by groups outside, but these are totally Indian. These modules exist in India and operate in India. The third fact that we must acknowledge is that these groups, as is popularly believed, are not groups that practise one religion. For many years, we thought that all terror groups belong to one religion. That is not true. In fact, that unquestioning faith led our intelligence and investigating agencies down the wrong path. In a number of cases, they arrested innocent people; they indicted innocent people and young boys have spent several years in jail for no fault of theirs. As Dr. Ganguly pointed out, all over the world right-wing fascist elements are on the rise and India is no exception.

I don't care about the guy's religion. But, I certainly question and oppose, and I am implacably opposed to the kind of right-wing fascist fundamentalist politics that he practises. But, that's the new reality. So, my first appeal to all hon. Members is: we cannot live in denial; we cannot close eyes to facts; we must accept the reality that faces us. And, these are the three facts. First, this is the most troubled neighbourhood. We live under the shadow of terror. Second, these are home-grown modules, Indian boys, and sometimes, even Indian girls. The five boys from Kerala, who were taken to Jammu and Kashmir to be exfiltrated into Pakistan for training, were guided by a girl. There is a second fact. These are Indian modules. And, thirdly, that they do not belong to one religion. In fact, I don't care about the religion they practise. I am questioning the right-wing fascist fundamentalist beliefs that they hold and for which, they are willing to indulge in violence.

Now, when 26/11 happened, I think, it was a rude jolt to this country. The scale of 26/11 terrorist attack was stupendous. It shocked the whole nation. We saw the drama unfold minute by minute on television for three days, and that was what brought me to this Office. In my first statement to the Parliament after 26/11, I said, and this probably accords what the Leader of the Opposition just now said, "South Asia is in the eye of storm of terror. Several terrorist organisations operating from

territories beyond India's borders have been identified as a source of the terrorist attacks in India that have occurred over the last several years." And, I quoted what India told the United Nations Security Council on December 10, "India will act to safeguard and protect its people from such heinous attacks, however long and difficult the task may be. We must do our duty by our people and take all actions as we deem fit to defend and protect them." And, while ending my statement, I said, "I ask you to remember the extraordinary courage of Assistant Sub-Inspector Tukaram Ombale who grabbed the barrel of the gun and took all the bullets in his chest to enable his fellow policemen to overpower Mohammed Ajmal Amir Kasab. I ask you to remember the supreme sacrifice made by Major Sandeep Unnikrishnan who ordered his men to stay back while he confronted the terrorists. Ordinary men and women like us cannot match their bravery, but we can stay united in our resolve and in our actions. Nothing should divide us - not religion, not language, not caste. In our fight against terror, there will be need for self-restraint, discipline and even some sacrifice. I seek your support; and I have no doubt that with your support and the support of the people, we shall overcome and vanquish the forces of terror." Sir, Pune and now Mumbai are two major blots on the record and I accept that. The other incidents fall in a different category. There are couple of cases where groups have claimed that they were behind those attacks. But, there are significant differences between those incidents and these two major incidents. In a couple of other cases, it has not yet been established whether they are terror attacks. They could be incidents committed by other mischievous elements. But, we always take the maximum position. We assume it is a terror attack. We investigate it as a terror attack until the contrary is proved. But, Pune and Mumbai are indeed blots.

There is a difference between Pune and Mumbai. In Pune, we had the intelligence. We shared the intelligence with the Government of Maharashtra, which, in turn, shared it with the Pune Police, who, in turn, shared it with the establishments in that area including the German Bakery. The Manager at the German Bakery actually acknowledged the advice when he was told to take precautionary steps. Yet, Pune case happened. That was a clear case of failure on the part of both the police and the citizenry.

Mumbai blast on 13th July, 2011 was a case of 'no intelligence'. I won't elaborate the point; I will illustrate it. I beg to submit that there is a difference between 'no intelligence' and 'failure of

intelligence'. The reason is obvious. We do not have an intelligence man in every part of the country. We do not have a policeman in every neighborhood. We do not intercept every telephone conversation. We do not hack into every computer. We do not have an easily accessible database of every module that is formed in this country. So, there will be cases of 'no intelligence'; there will be cases where intelligence failed, that is Intelligence was there but intelligence was either ignored, intelligence was misrepresented or intelligence was not acted upon. So, I beg to submit that there is a difference between 'no intelligence' and 'intelligence failure'. I do not know what Shri Advani ji meant but he said, "it is not a case of intelligence failure". I believe that Mumbai was a case of 'no intelligence'. That gives me no comfort. A case of intelligence failure is a warning bell but a case of 'no intelligence' should warn us to be even more careful. We had no intelligence on this module.

Nevertheless, please compare our response to 13th July, 2011 case of Mumbai, and, 26th November, 2008 case of Mumbai. The police reached the scene within minutes. Twenty-one ambulances evacuated every single injured person or dead body within an hour, aided, of course, by local citizens, like Shri Manohar Joshi's constituents. Along with local people, local taxis, 21 ambulances evacuated every single person and got them to 14 hospitals. Two CFSL teams reached Mumbai by midnight; one from Delhi by air, and the other from Pune by road. An NSG post-blast investigating team that was in Mumbai rushed to the scene within minutes. A 14-member NIA team reached Mumbai by midnight. I reached Mumbai by midnight. The entire crime scene in three places was cordoned off. The forensic team started working at about 10 o'clock. There was a drizzle. They worked through the night and collected the forensic data. So, I think, the response to 13/7 as opposed to the questionable delayed response to 26/11 shows that something has indeed happened in the last 30 to 32 months amongst the intelligence and police agencies that we have responded much better.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, 26 people died, 123 were injured, and, some of them were gravely ill. I pray for their recovery. We lost 26 precious lives, innocent lives. We are deeply sad. I condemn the incident. Compensation has been paid. The State Government has paid the compensation, which was announced on television the next morning. The compensation from the Prime Ministers' Relief Fund has been paid. In some cases, relatives are outside Maharashtra, and, the compensation

will be paid as soon as they are traced and their relationship is established. There is no difficulty about compensation. The entire hospitalization expenses have been borne by the Government of Maharashtra.

And we are going to help the families. If they need jobs, if they need other assistance, we will help the families.

Now, Sir, let me deal with some substantive issues as briefly as I can. Firstly, the worst period of terrorist violence in India started in 2002 and culminated in 2008. It was as an ascending graph. Five incidents in 2002, 39 killed and 172 injured. It ascended to 9 incidents in 2008, 333 killed and 833 injured. That was the worst period. That was the period when we pointed to cross border terrorism, which is true, but failed to recognize that even when cross border terrorism was taking place, Indian modules were being formed - SIMI, the Indian Mujahideen. While intelligence agencies had some idea, I think, at the political level, at the Governmental level, there was a failure to recognize the growth of these modules. 2009 was terror free. 2010, we had Pune; 2011, we had Mumbai. In between we had the small cases and I won't dwell on them now.

I just want to share with you what we have done in the last 32 months after the Mumbai blasts. Some of this was recounted by my friend, Tiruchi Siva. But, I think, it is worthwhile sharing with you some of the things we have done. Firstly, as the Leader of Opposition said, we amended the UAPA. I am grateful to him. Despite serious differences on two issues, the principal opposition party extended cooperation; all others extended cooperation. We passed the Bill. There are serious differences on those two issues. But today is not the day to debate it all over again. We passed the Act to establish the NIA. I will tell you briefly about the NIA's record. NSG was empowered. NSG hubs have been set up. NSG's Regional Center is coming up in Hyderabad. NSG today is empowered to requisition any aircraft anywhere at any airport at any time. MAC was set up. MAC was empowered by an executive notification. Subsidiary MACs have been set up in every State capital. MAC and SMAC are in seamless communication 24x7. I have invited Chief Ministers to visit SMACs in their State capitals. We have taken the financial burden of connecting SMAC to the State special branch. Coastal Command has been set up. Coastal security has been entrusted to the

Navy. India has become a Member of the FATF, Financial Action Task Force. We have extradition treaties with 17+18 countries - 17, we have signed and exchanged, 8, we are about to exchange. We have MLATs with 10+9 countries - 10, we have signed and exchanged; 9, we will exchange. And we are putting a lot of money into modernization of police forces, both the Central Armed Police Forces as well as the State Forces. The main drawback has been the lack of enough policemen. We have one of the lowest police-population ratios.

But I am happy to say that, thanks to our prodding, States have recruited 90,359 police personnel in 2010. That is capacity building. That is the building block. That is the foundation. Without policemen, you cannot police this country. But before we take satisfaction, let us remember, despite recruiting 90,000 policemen in 2010, there are nearly 6,00,000 vacancies in the police force. It will take us, at this rate, seven years to fill the vacancies. In the meanwhile, many will retire; there will be attrition. And recruiting a constable is not a one-day affair. If you decide to recruit a constable today, he will join the force twenty months from today. The process of recruitment will take one year and the process of training will take nine months. While the States recruited 90,359 police personnel, the Central Armed Police Forces recruited, in two financial years, 93,757 new personnel. Nearly one lakh people have been added to the Central Armed Police Forces. This year, 2011-12, CAPFs will recruit 92,168 people. Never before have we recruited nearly one lakh people to the CAPF in one year. We are setting up 20 CIAT schools; 13 are operational. The CRPF, the SSB, the ITBP, the BSF and the IB have set up a large number of training academies and training schools. Therefore, capacity building is starting at the basic building block, namely, more people to police us.

Now I come to equipment. Police stations, barracks, vehicles, motorcycles, weapons, including AK-47 and carbines, security equipment and night vision devices. The kind of equipment that has been procured in the last two years equals to the procurement in all the years before. I don't want to burden my speech with the details. But a huge amount of money, running to over several thousand crores of rupees, had been spent in the last two years to procure the equipment. And the equipment is available. And more are being procured. I have taken the risk to procure it. I don't know which C&AG will find fault with them. I am prepared to take the risk.

When I took office, my predecessor, on a complaint by a major industrial house on the last day when the order was to be placed, cancelled it. I revived it, went back to the CCS and said,

'Whatever the complaint is, let us buy these 20,000 bulletproof jackets.'" We bought 20,000 bulletproof jackets by reviving a closed procurement. Subsequently, I procured 59,000 BP jackets, despite the fact that one of the officers and one of the scientists were colluding and we're prosecuting them. I said, 'You prosecute them, but let us continue the procurement.' These are two different things. Prosecute the guilty fellow, but continue the procurement. We have got AK-47s. We have got carbines.

But let me tell you, it is not easy to procure for the Government of India. It is not easy to procure pencils. It is not easy to procure even stationery. Every time you go for procurement, on the day you are going to place the order, you will have a complaint on your table. It is not your system. It is not my system. It is our system. But let me tell you, we have taken risks. In every case, we have recorded exhaustive reasons why we are taking the decision.

I am sure somebody will say this reason is good and that reason is bad. But, as I said, I told my officers to go ahead and procure. Ombule died because he did not have a bullet-proof jacket. If he had a bullet-proof jacket, Ombule may not have died; he would have caught Kasab alive. I said, it doesn't matter, let a future CAG find fault with us, but, let's procure today. We are going ahead and procuring. We will continue to procure and I will record reasons why I am doing something.

States have procured. Mumbai has procured a lot of equipment. Maharashtra has raised forces but yet, as I told Mr. N.K. Singh yesterday, capacity building is work-in-progress. We have not yet built our capacity commensurate with the gravity of the challenge. It will take the State Governments a couple of years more before they fully equip their police forces. And I have received cooperation from all Chief Ministers irrespective of their party affiliations. You can verify this by asking your Chief Ministers. Ask the Chhattisgarh Chief Minister whether we have been helpful or not. He is the one who, sometimes embarrassingly, sings my praises. ...*(Interruptions)*... In this battle with insurgents, Maoists and terrorists, there is no party, there is no religion, there is no ideology. We have to face up to this challenge. ...*(Interruptions)*... First you ask him before you ask me the question. Just ask Dr. Raman Singh. ...*(Interruptions)*... As long as you don't say that Maoists are my friend, I am happy. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Now, Sir, let me deal with the Indian modules. We believe that Pune was perpetrated by an Indian module and, while no conclusion is being drawn about Mumbai, all the indicators point to an

Indian module. It's possible that the same module was there but, as I said, no conclusions have been drawn. We have successfully busted a number of modules. I know that it's a statement that many of you may find hard to believe, but, it is a fact. We don't publicise this. Even now, I am not going to give you details that will alert the adversary. But, we have so far neutralised 51 terror modules in the last two years. I will give you one or two examples because some of this is already in the public domain.

Abdul Latif and Riyaz @ Rehan were arrested in Mumbai in March 2010. They had drawn up plans to blast the ONGC installations and the Mangaldas Market in Mumbai. They were arrested and that terror plot was foiled. I will give you one more example. Zia-uh-Haque @ Abu Abdulla was arrested in Hyderabad in May 2010. He was working as an LeT sleeper under the command and control of Pakistan LeT commander Rehan based in Pakistan. He was planning a major terrorist action against a multinational company. As recently as June 2011, a ten-member SIMI module was busted in Madhya Pradesh that was planning to target leaders of the Hindu community in Madhya Pradesh and three Judges of the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court who had delivered judgment in the Ayodhya case. I won't give you more examples but believe me, our intelligence agencies, both at the Centre and the States, irrespective of the party in power, are working together and that is why, we have been able to bust so many terror modules.

But it is possible that there are other modules we have not yet busted. It is a way of putting things. I cannot claim that every terror module has been busted nor can I claim that there is no terror module which has slipped through the cracks, nor can I claim that a terror module, tomorrow, will not succeed in one of its plots.

I said yesterday in a lighter vein at a function that busting a terror module is not what you see in movies where the hero, as the minute hand of the trigger moves towards 12, he has 60 seconds and he got cutting pliers in his hand, he says, "Should I cut the red wire or the green wire?" And when he cuts the red wire, the hand goes to 50 or 52 or 53¹. That is not the way modules are busted. That is dramatized in movies. Busting a module requires painstaking investigative work, identifying the right

people. You cannot hit the wrong group. Identifying the right people, working with the State police, working with the State intelligence in very close coordination, and then using the State police to arrest them. We don't arrest them. It is the State police which arrests them. But we work with the State police. All these cases of Mumbai or Madhya Pradesh were done with the help of the State police. But there is a pact among intelligence agencies. Nobody says it outside unless it becomes absolutely necessary to share this information. So, today, our intelligence gathering has improved. Intelligence sharing has improved tremendously. I say this without fear of contradiction that no State today is not cooperating with me on sharing of intelligence. Every State, irrespective of the party in power, is sharing intelligence with us. We are sharing intelligence with them and we are working together to neutralize these terrorist modules.

Sir, questions were raised about what happened to all these cases in Mumbai. "Have you taken action?" I got a list with me. I can share with whoever wishes to read it. In the case of Mumbai which Dr Manohar Joshi wanted, I want to inform him that bomb blasts in the Best bus at Ghatkopar in December, 2002, trial was concluded, 10 were discharged, 8 were acquitted, and one died in police custody, appeal has been filed by the State against the acquittal of five.

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

In January, 2003, bomb explosions in McDonald's restaurant, Ville Parle, blast in train at Mulund, 17 persons were charge-sheeted. Trial has not yet started. Then, in four cases which are by the same module, December, 2002 to August, 2003, six Best bus blasts in Mumbai, twin blasts near the Gateway and the Zhaveri Bazaar, Kalba Devi blast, 7 persons were arrested, trial concluded on 6th August, 2009. Three accused were discharged. One turned approver. Three were convicted and sentenced to death. Appeal by the prosecution was filed in Mumbai against the discharge order; and the defence has filed appeals against their conviction. Appeals are still pending.

Serial blasts in Mumbai trains, 16 were arrested. Trial is on; and the trial will be concluded shortly. So, in every case either there has been conviction or acquittal in one case. Appeals are pending. Trial is on. We are following very, very closely. I do not think anybody can find fault. The trial process in India is very slow and everybody knows that. In a multi-accused trial with hundreds of witnesses the process is indeed very slow.

Sir, NIA has been entrusted with 29 cases. Some of these cases arise out of money laundering

to fund terror. Some of these cases arise out of the North East, again money laundering to fund terror. But today NIA has major cases of terror of two distinct groups.

One is those who claim to be jihadi terrorists. A set of cases are with the NIA. Another is right wing fundamentalists, fascist groups. A set of those cases are with the NIA. I can take you case by case. In many of the cases the charge sheets have been filed and in a handful of cases the trial has already started. In several cases there is reinvestigation because their earlier charge sheet was false. There is reinvestigation. I don't want to say anything that will prejudice or harm the persons who are being tried. But the NIA today has a very successful record of filing charge sheets. The NIA came into existence on 1st January, 2009. It is building capacity, in-house capacity. Twenty-nine cases are with it and it has been able to file charge sheets in a vast majority of cases. I think that it has already filed charge sheets in over a dozen cases. The NIA has been one of our recent success stories. I think, as the NIA develops capacity, it will become like the Scotland Yard or like the FBI a major federal investigating agency.

Now, there is some dispute about how well do we compare with the world? I am not claiming that we are the best in the world. But I think that the world's best have also their occasions when they stumble and fall. Take, for example, the London bomb blasts. I hope some of you have read Ian Blairs' book, the then Commissioner of Police, Scotland Yard. The first bomb blast took place in the Liverpool Street-Aldgate East tube station at 8.50 a.m. The second explosion took place in another train at 8.50 a.m. The third explosion took place in another tube station at 8.50 a.m. Three bomb blasts at 8.50 a.m. At 9.47 a.m. an explosion took place in a bus. The Commissioner, the Scotland Yard Chief, got the first telephone call after 9.47 a.m. From 8.50 a.m., when three explosions took place in a train, the head of the London Police did not have information. Of course, in his book he goes on to say why it happened. He calls it, of course, a great failure of the system. But the system failed? The point I am trying to make is that the system can fail.

The next one is a point which Mr. Arun Jaitley and I discussed yesterday. We tend to believe that America has not had a terror attack after 9/11. That is a tribute to America's myth making. That is not true. That is simply not true. The first was the Los Angeles Airport shooting in 2002. I will give

them date-wise. Then comes the Little Rock Recruitment Office shooting. Then, there is the Fort Hood shooting in 2009 when 16 people were killed. Then comes the underwear bomber who almost blew up the plane. In fact, he attempted once. It did not detonate. The passengers on the flight, as the flight was landing, pounced upon him. There was no intelligence. Then there is the shoe bomber and then the Times Square bomber. Now, in some of these cases the Americans have themselves classified it as "no intelligence" and in some of the cases they have classified it as "failure of intelligence". ...*(Interruptions)*... Please. Did I say that? Why are you putting words in my mouth? We had a serious debate and let us conclude it on a serious note. All that I am pointing out is that, as we build capacity, as we improve our system, as our police force becomes better and better, we hope to overcome some of the glaring deficiencies in our system. There will be cases where there is no intelligence; we must improve our intelligence gathering. There will be cases where there is a failure of intelligence; we must improve our intelligence analysis capacity. That is the point I am making. Where there is no intelligence, we must improve intelligence gathering and where there is intelligence failure, we must improve our capacity to analyse intelligence.

Sir, let me deal with two or three points which Shri Jaitely made. I want to reassure this House on some of the things that are in the process and are pending, that has caused me disappointment. The speech that I had made at the Intelligence Bureau Centenary, was a speech on which I had reflected for nearly a year. So the questions that I had asked were the questions that had been troubling me for nearly a year. You are right. When I said, I know the answers, I won't give the answers," the answer is an obvious answer. It's a rhetorical question and answers are obvious.

Now, the several pillars on which the new architecture must stand, one is the NIA which is in place - I am talking about the Central architecture - second is the NSG which has been empowered and spread out throughout the country and the third is NATGRID. Now there is a NATGRID in every country. I have been to the USA, France, the UK and Russia. They have a NATGRID. It goes by different names. I am willing to have the Chief Executive Officer of the NATGRID brief leaders of political parties in a closed door briefing on the safeguards that we have built in NATGRID. When the Leader of the Opposition wanted to visit the United States and he wanted a briefing, we sent our officers to brief him because he is representing the country, even as a Leader of the Opposition.

I am willing to brief leaders of political parties in a closed door briefing. I will ask the CEO to brief you. Every precaution that is conceivable, every precaution that has been taken care of in other countries of the world, every safeguard, every firewall has been built into our system. We have got clearance on the 6th of June, 2011. It will take me 18 months to build NATGRID. Indian software companies, let me underline, Indian software companies, are helping us build NATGRID. There will be no foreign company involved. It will be completely built by Indian engineers and it will be run by Indian engineers. NATGRID will be a reality. At least, the first phase of NATGRID will be a reality in 18 months. The fourth pillar is NCTC. When NCTC is set up, NATGRID will be subsumed the NCTC because NATGRID is intended then to feed the NCTC. NATGRID will have a lot of information, but we are going to use it only for counter terrorism. NCTC is dedicated for counter terrorism. Now I am part of a Cabinet system of Government. My colleague is here. When you were in Government, you were also part of a Cabinet system of Government. I don't have the freedom which the Chinese Interior Minister has or the Israeli Interior Minister has. I have to work within the Cabinet system.

Questions have been raised about the NCTC, we are resolving those issues. The Prime Minister has told us that he will have a final round of discussion on NCTC and we will take a decision on NCTC. With NIA, an empowered NSG, NATGRID and NCTC, I am confident, we can put together an architecture that will considerably improve the intelligence gathering, intelligence sharing and counter terrorism capacity in India. It will not happen overnight. The work is in progress. We have to work together. States have to work together. All of us working together can build a capacity that a country of this size, this spread and this complexity needs. We are a huge country. We are a large country spread over several hundred thousand sq. kilometres. We need to build massive capacity. The work is in progress and more work will be done. Sir, I think I have answered the major points raised by the hon. Members including the hon. Leader of the Opposition. ...*(Interruptions)*... Now I come to the last issue about the judgement.

I did say yesterday that Chhattisgarh has promulgated the Ordinance. I have asked Orissa to consider whether they are inclined to promulgate a similar Ordinance because those are the only two States where the SPOs are engaged in anti-Naxal activity. I am reading the judgement narrowly, that it applies to anti-Naxal operations.

Therefore, I have asked Orissa to consider whether they will promulgate an Ordinance in Orissa also. As far as we are concerned, I have done my homework. I have consulted the Attorney-General. We are on the anvil of taking an appropriate decision and, when we take the decision, I will share it with this House. But I entirely agree that, to borrow the words of the Supreme Court, there can be no rhyme and there can be no reason for anyone in this country to take up arms to overthrow a parliamentary democracy. However well meaning he may be, however highly motivated he may be, however altruistic he may be, however pro-poor he may be, as long as we swear by this Constitution and as long as we believe in parliamentary democracy, there can be no ground whatsoever for anyone to take to violence to overthrow a parliamentary democracy. With that in mind, I will approach the judgement and I will share with you when we take a decision.

With these words, I thank the hon. Members.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

The situation in Sri Lanka

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, the Minister of External Affairs to make a statement on 'The situation in Sri Lanka'.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI S.M. KRISHNA): Sir, I rise to inform the House on the situation in Sri Lanka.

There have been a number of requests for Calling Attention Motions and Short Duration Discussions as well as Parliamentary Questions on issues relating to Sri Lanka in both the Houses of Parliament. I, therefore, propose to make a Suo Motu statement which, I hope, will respond to most, if not all, issues of interest and concern to my fellow Parliamentarians.

The relationship between India and Sri Lanka is based upon shared historical, cultural, ethnic and civilizational ties and extensive people-to-people interaction. In recent years, the relationship has become multifaceted and diverse, encompassing all areas of contemporary relevance.

Sri Lanka has borne the brunt of terrorism for nearly three-decades. The end of the long period of armed conflict in Sri Lanka in May 2009, left around 3,00,000 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) living in camps in Northern Sri Lanka and general devastation of infrastructure in the affected areas.